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Presidential, but not prime minister, candidates with lower-pitched voices stand a better chance of winning the election in conservative countries
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S.1 Separate main effect models for each of the three separate voice pitch measures

This sections reports models that predict election outcome and percentage of received votes based on each of the three separate voice pitch measures (rather than the average voice pitch measure applied in the main text analyses). Table S.1.a reports predictions of election outcome, while Table S.1.b. reports predictions of percentage of received votes.

Table S.1.a. Predictions of electoral outcome from candidate voice pitch. Models 1-3 employ each of the three separate voice pitch measures. Unstandardized logit regression coefficients with standard errors clustered at the election level in parentheses.

|                | Model 1 Voice Pitch Measure 1 | Model 2 Voice Pitch Measure 2 | Model 3 Voice Pitch Measure 3 |
|----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Voice Pitch    | -0.354* (0.167)               | -0.725*** (0.200)             | -0.701*** (0.183)             |
| Voice Intensity| -0.267† (0.160)               | -0.227 (0.171)                | -0.266 (0.168)                |
| Constant       | -0.002 (0.043)                | -0.021 (0.072)                | -0.018 (0.072)                |
| N              | 138                           | 138                           | 138                           |

Note: † p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Using all three separate voice pitch measures we find significant relationships between candidate voice pitch and electoral outcome (Model 1: b = -0.354, p = 0.033; Model 2: b = -0.725, p < 0.001; Model 3: b = -0.701, p < 0.001).
Table S.1.b. Predictions of percentage of received votes from candidate voice pitch. Models 1-3 employ each of the three separate voice pitch measures. Unstandardized OLS regression coefficients with standard errors clustered at the election level in parentheses.

|                  | Model 1 Voice Pitch Measure 1 | Model 2 Voice Pitch Measure 2 | Model 3 Voice Pitch Measure 3 |
|------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Voice Pitch      | -2.047 (1.238)                | -3.499 (1.228)                | -2.337 (1.218)                |
| Voice Intensity  | -2.747 (1.551)                | -2.460 (1.479)                | -2.742 (1.575)                |
| Constant         | 37.577*** (1.241)             | 37.577*** (1.246)             | 37.577*** (1.251)             |

N = 138

Note: †p < 0.10, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Across all three separate voice pitch measures we find negative relationships between candidate voice pitch and the percentage of obtained votes. Moreover, these are all (almost) significant at conventional levels of statistical significance (Model 1: b = -2.047, p = 0.103; Model 2: b = -3.499, p = 0.006; Model 3: b = -2.337, p = 0.059).
S.2 Separate estimations of interaction between candidate voice pitch and type of election (presidential vs. parliamentary) using each of the three separate voice pitch measures

This section shows full regression models testing if the main relationship between candidate voice pitch and each of the dependent variables is moderated by election type (presidential vs. parliamentary). Table S.2.a and S.2.b report results for predictions of election outcome and percentage of received votes, respectively.

Table S.2.a. Predictions of electoral outcome from candidate voice pitch, election type and the interaction between voice pitch and election type. Models 1-3 employ each of the three separate voice pitch measures. Unstandardized logit regression coefficients with standard errors clustered at the election level in parentheses.

|                      | Model 1 (Voice Pitch Measure 1) | Model 2 (Voice Pitch Measure 2) | Model 3 (Voice Pitch Measure 3) |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| **Voice Pitch**      | -0.375 (0.348)                  | -1.016* (0.394)                 | -0.633* (0.286)                 |
| **Election type**    |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Parliamentary election | 0.051 (0.111)                   | 0.115 (0.164)                   | 0.036 (0.138)                   |
| **Voice Pitch X el. Type** |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Voice pitch X Parl. election | 0.025 (0.396)                   | 0.387 (0.446)                   | -0.100 (0.372)                  |
| **Voice Intensity**  | -0.266† (0.161)                 | -0.211‡ (0.172)                 | -0.265 (0.169)                  |
| **Constant**         | -0.034 (0.089)                  | -0.103 (0.132)                  | -0.037 (0.085)                  |
| **N**                | 138                             | 138                             | 138                             |

Note: Reference category for Election type is “Presidential elections”.

\[\dagger p < 0.10, \ast p < 0.05, \ast\ast p < 0.01, \ast\ast\ast p < 0.001\]

Using all three separate voice pitch measures we find no statistically significant interactions between candidate voice pitch and election type (Model 1: \(b = 0.025, p = 0.950\); Model 2: \(b = 0.387, p = 0.386\); Model 3: \(b = -0.100, p = 0.787\)).
Table S.2.b. Predictions of percentage of votes from candidate voice pitch, election type and the interaction between voice pitch and election type. Models 1-3 employ each of the three separate voice pitch measures. Unstandardized OLS regression coefficients with standard errors clustered at the election level in parentheses.

|                      | Model 1 (Voice Pitch Measure 1) | Model 2 (Voice Pitch Measure 2) | Model 3 (Voice Pitch Measure 3) |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| **Voice Pitch**      | -1.907 (3.375)                  | -6.164† (3.128)                 | -0.378 (2.767)                  |
| **Election type**    |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| - Parliamentary election | -13.789*** (2.003)             | -13.275*** (1.974)              | -13.995*** (1.865)              |
| **Voice Pitch X el. Type** |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| - Voice pitch X Parl. election | 0.888 (3.516)                  | 4.249 (3.336)                   | -2.042 (2.989)                  |
| **Voice Intensity**  | -3.207* (1.467)                 | -2.785† (1.399)                 | -3.156* (1.437)                 |
| **Constant**         | 45.922*** (1.421)               | 45.473*** (1.385)               | 46.157*** (1.228)               |
| **N**                | 138                             | 138                             | 138                             |

Note: Reference category for Election type is “Presidential elections”.
† p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

As for predictions of electoral outcome, we find no statistically significant interactions between candidate voice pitch and election type for predictions of percentage of received votes (Model 1: b = 0.888, p = 0.801; Model 2: b = 4.249, p = 0.207; Model 3: b = -2.042, p = 0.497). That is, the main effect of candidate voice pitch on electoral outcome and percentage of received votes is found for presidential as well as for parliamentary elections.
S.3 Main effect models of candidate voice pitch also controlling for incumbency

This section reports full regression models testing if the main relationship between candidate voice pitch and each of the dependent variables holds when also controlling for candidate incumbency. Note however that controlling for incumbency comes with a flavor of post estimation bias because incumbent candidates might already have benefitted from having a lower-pitched voice at the previous election (thus causing them winning this previous election). Yet, the results displayed in Table S.3 below shows that voice pitch still relates significantly to electoral outcome ($b = -0.583, p < 0.001$) and percentage received votes ($b = -2.371, p = 0.056$) when incumbency is controlled for.

Table S.3. Predictions of electoral outcome (Model 1) and percentage of received votes (Model 2) from candidate voice pitch (average voice pitch variable) also controlling for incumbency. Model 1 and 2 report unstandardized logit and OLS regression coefficients, respectively, with standard errors clustered at the election level in parentheses.

|                  | Model 1                  | Model 2                  |
|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                  | Electoral outcome (logit) | Percentage of votes (OLS)|
| Voice Pitch      | -0.583***                | -2.371†                  |
|                  | (0.161)                  | (1.221)                  |
| Voice Intensity  | -0.224                   | -2.303                   |
|                  | (0.165)                  | (1.468)                  |
| Incumbency       |                          |                          |
| - Incumbent      | 1.264*                   | 9.051**                  |
|                  | (0.515)                  | (3.278)                  |
| Constant         | -0.319*                  | 35.151***                |
|                  | (0.133)                  | (1.532)                  |
| N                | 138                      | 138                      |

Note: Reference category for Incumbency is “Non-incumbent”.
Note: † $p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$
S.4 Interactive relationship between candidate voice pitch and national-level ideology using each of the three separate voice pitch measures

In the main analyses we find no signs of a two-way interaction between candidate voice pitch and national-level ideology based on the average voice pitch variable. This section reports similar results for each of the three separate voice pitch variables. Table S.4.a and S.4.b report such models for predictions of electoral outcome and percentage of votes, respectively.

Table S.4.a. Predictions of electoral outcome from candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology and their interaction. Models 1-3 employ each of the three separate voice pitch measures. Unstandardized logit regression coefficients with standard errors clustered at the election level in parentheses.

|                  | Model 1 |          | Model 2 |          | Model 3 |          |
|------------------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------|----------|
|                  | Voice Pitch Measure 1 | Voice Pitch Measure 2 | Voice Pitch Measure 3 |
| Voice Pitch      | -0.668  | -0.426   | 0.031   |
|                  | (1.453) | (1.712)  | (1.521) |
| Ideology         | -0.059  | -0.043   | 0.005   |
|                  | (0.085) | (0.127)  | (0.122) |
| Voice Pitch X ideology | 0.056   | -0.053   | -0.131  |
|                  | (0.261) | (0.305)  | (0.279) |
| Voice Intensity  | -0.272† | -0.225   | -0.257  |
|                  | (0.159) | (0.170)  | (0.168) |
| Constant         | 0.335   | 0.223    | -0.045  |
|                  | (0.477) | (0.718)  | (0.677) |
| N                | 138     | 138      | 138     |

Note: †p < 0.10, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Across all three separate voice pitch variables we find no significant interactions between national-level ideology and candidate voice pitch in predicting electoral outcome (Model 1: b = 0.056, p = 0.831; Model 2: b = -0.053, p = 0.861; Model 3: b = -0.131, p = 0.638).
Table S.4.b. Predictions of percentage received votes from candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology and their interaction. Models 1-3 employ each of the three separate voice pitch measures. Unstandardized OLS regression coefficients with standard errors clustered at the election level in parentheses.

|                | Model 1 Voice Pitch Measure 1 | Model 2 Voice Pitch Measure 2 | Model 3 Voice Pitch Measure 3 |
|----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Voice Pitch    | -4.952 (11.336)               | -5.322 (13.254)               | -0.847 (10.807)               |
| Ideology       | -2.185 (1.994)                | -2.034 (2.045)                | -1.827 (2.028)                |
| Voice Pitch X ideology | 0.503 (2.132)       | 0.319 (2.471)               | -0.264 (2.016)                |
| Voice Intensity| -2.811† (1.555)               | -2.502† (1.485)               | -2.744† (1.587)               |
| Constant       | 49.969*** (11.156)            | 49.098*** (11.444)            | 47.924*** (11.369)            |

N | 138 | 138 | 138

Note: †p < 0.10, ‡p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Across all three separate voice pitch variables we find no significant interactions between national-level ideology and candidate voice pitch when predicting percentage received votes (Model 1: b = 0.503, p = 0.814; Model 2: b = 0.319, p = 0.898; Model 3: b = -0.264, p = 0.896).
S.5 Three-way interactions between candidate voice pitch, country-level ideology and type of election using each of the three separate voice pitch measures

In this section we predict electoral outcome and percentage received votes from three-way interactions between candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology and election type using each of the three separate voice pitch measures. Below, Table S.5.a reports full models for these analyses for predictions of electoral outcome and Figure S.5.a displays the patterns obtained from these analyses. Likewise, Table S.5.b and Figure S.5.b report and illustrate results for predictions of percentage received votes.
Table S.5.a. Predictions of electoral outcome from candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology, election type and their interactions. Models 1-3 employ each of the three separate voice pitch measures. Unstandardized logit regression coefficients with standard errors clustered at the election level in parentheses.

|                      | Model 1 Voice Pitch Measure 1 | Model 2 Voice Pitch Measure 2 | Model 3 Voice Pitch Measure 3 |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Voice Pitch          | 8.837†                        | 4.217                         | 6.979†                        |
|                      | (4.629)                       | (3.676)                       | (4.080)                       |
| Ideology             | -0.240                        | 0.067                         | -0.003                        |
|                      | (0.231)                       | (0.253)                       | (0.194)                       |
| Voice Pitch X ideology | -1.593*                      | -0.922*                       | -1.337†                       |
|                      | (0.786)                       | (0.649)                       | (0.724)                       |
| Election Type        |                               |                               |                               |
| Parliamentary election | -1.068                       | 0.777                         | 0.053                         |
|                      | (1.724)                       | (1.852)                       | (1.601)                       |
| Voice pitch X election Type | -11.690*                      | -6.317                        | -8.746†                       |
| Parliamentary election | (5.042)                      | (4.366)                       | (4.646)                       |
| Ideology X election Type | 0.189                        | -0.119                        | -0.004                        |
| Parliamentary election | (0.304)                      | (0.325)                       | (0.285)                       |
| Voice pitch X Ideology X el. Type | 2.044*                      | 1.184                         | 1.523†                       |
| Parliamentary election | (0.859)                      | (0.768)                       | (0.825)                       |
| Voice Intensity      | -0.283†                       | -0.217                        | -0.247                        |
|                      | (0.162)                       | (0.171)                       | (0.168)                       |
| Constant             | 1.407                         | -0.462                        | -0.019                        |
|                      | (1.296)                       | (1.433)                       | (1.062)                       |

N 138 138 138

Note: Reference category for Election type is “Presidential elections”.

† p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Across analyses employing each of the three separate voice pitch measures we get the same positive direction of the three-way interaction although only approaching significance using voice pitch measure 2 (Model 1: b = 2.044, p = 0.017; Model 2: b = 1.184, p = 0.123; Model 3: b = 1.523, p = 0.065). Moreover, as illustrated in Figure 5.a below, the same pattern emerges based
on all three separate voice pitch variables: The largest difference in predicted probability of winning the election for a candidate voice one standard deviation below and above the mean emerges for presidential elections in conservative countries (the upper right-hand set of bars within each panel below). In addition, differences between liberal and conservative countries with respect to the role played by candidate voice pitch are much more pronounced for presidential than for parliamentary elections (the relative difference between bars for “-1 SD Pitch” and “1 SD Pitch” are substantially much clearer between liberal and conservative presidential elections (upper row within panels) than between liberal and conservative parliamentary elections (lower row panels)).

**Figure 5.a:** Predicted probabilities for winning the election for candidate voice pitches one standard deviation below and above the sample mean pitch (voice intensity kept at its mean across all panels). Panels a), b) and c) illustrate results for each of the three separate voice pitch measures. Within panels, bars in the upper and lower rows report predicted probabilities for presidential and parliamentary elections, respectively, and left- and right-hand columns report results for liberal and conservative countries, respectively. Bars are predicted probabilities of electoral victory and black lines are 95 percent CIs.
b) Voice pitch variable 2
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c) Voice pitch variable 3
Table S.5.b. Predictions of percentage received votes from candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology, election type and their interactions. Models 1-3 employ each of the three separate voice pitch measures. Unstandardized OLS regression coefficients with standard errors clustered at the election level in parentheses.

|                          | Model 1 Voice Pitch Measure 1 | Model 2 Voice Pitch Measure 2 | Model 3 Voice Pitch Measure 3 |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Voice Pitch              | 57.042*                       | 19.933                        | 40.354                        |
|                          | (25.519)                      | (21.067)                      | (25.011)                      |
| Ideology                 | -6.157*                       | -4.171†                       | -4.645*                       |
|                          | (2.834)                       | (2.401)                       | (2.271)                       |
| Voice Pitch X ideology   | -9.970*                       | -4.379                        | -6.940                        |
|                          | (4.260)                       | (3.732)                       | (4.348)                       |
| Election Type            |                               |                               |                               |
| - Parliamentary election | -33.853                       | -22.110                       | -25.647                       |
|                          | (20.711)                      | (18.392)                      | (17.546)                      |
| Voice pitch X election Type |                               |                               |                               |
| - Voice pitch X Parl. election | -68.780*                     | -31.968                       | -49.034†                      |
|                          | (28.693)                      | (24.890)                      | (28.228)                      |
| Ideology X election Type |                               |                               |                               |
| - Ideology X Parl. election | 3.323                        | 1.421                         | 1.900                         |
|                          | (3.693)                       | (3.322)                       | (3.161)                       |
| Voice pitch X Ideology X el. Type |                               |                               |                               |
| - Voice X Ideo. X Parl. election | 11.877*                      | 6.180                         | 8.065                         |
|                          | (4.934)                       | (4.513)                       | (5.022)                       |
| Voice Intensity          | -3.304*                       | -2.940*                       | -3.143*                       |
|                          | (1.457)                       | (1.440)                       | (1.426)                       |
| Constant                 | 82.047***                     | 69.800***                     | 73.205***                     |
|                          | (16.101)                      | (13.388)                      | (12.756)                      |

N = 138

Note: Reference category for Election type is “Presidential elections”.

† p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Across analyses employing each of the three separate voice pitch measures we get the same positive direction of the three-way interaction although it does not fully reach conventional levels of statistical significance using voice pitch measure 2 and 3 (Model 1: b = 11.877, p =
0.019; Model 2: b = 6.180, p = 0.175; Model 3: b = 8.065, p = 0.113). Importantly—and as illustrated in Figure 5.b below we obtain the same substantial pattern across the three separate voice pitch variables: The most negative relationship between candidate voice pitch (on the X-axis) and the predicted percentage of votes (the Y-axis) is always obtained for presidential elections in conservative countries (the dotted line in the left-hand panel).

**Figure 5.b:** Predicted relationships between candidate voice pitch and percentage received votes for conservative (dotted line), median (dashed line), and liberal countries (solid black line) (voice intensity kept at its mean across all panels). Panels a), b) and c) illustrate results for each of the three separate voice pitch measures. Within panels presidential and parliamentary elections are to the left- and right-hand side, respectively.
In sum, when testing the three-way interaction between candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology and election type using each of the three separate voice pitch variables rather than the average measure (from the main analyses) substantially similar results are found. Yet, in some
analyses these patterns are based on weaker statistical significance, which is, however, expected given that each separate voice pitch variable is more noisy than the average variable.
S.6 Three-way interactions between candidate voice pitch, country-level ideology and type of election controlling for candidate incumbency

In this section of the supplementary materials we estimate the three-way interaction between candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology and election type controlling also for candidate incumbency when predicting each of the dependent variables. Table S.6 reports the full models for predictions of electoral outcome (Model 1) and percentage received votes (Model 2), respectively. Subsequently, Figure S.6 illustrates the relationships for each of the outcome measure in Panel a) and b), respectively.
Table S.6 Predictions of electoral outcome (Model 1) and percentage received votes (Model 2) from candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology, election type and their interactions when controlling for candidate incumbency. Unstandardized logit and OLS regression coefficients, respectively, with standard errors clustered at the election level in parentheses.

|                      | Model 1          | Model 2          |
|----------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                      | DV: Electoral outcome | DV: Percentage received votes |
| Voice Pitch          | 5.639 (4.237)    | 34.695 (22.248)  |
| Ideology             | 0.015 (0.242)    | -4.732* (2.292)  |
| Voice Pitch X ideology| -1.096 (0.729)  | -6.145 (3.830)   |
| Election Type        |                  |                  |
| Parliamentary election| 0.122 (1.899)    | -27.511 (17.409) |
| Voice pitch X election Type| -7.398 (4.683) | -39.335 (24.502) |
| Ideology X election Type| -0.034 (0.335) | 2.093 (3.078)    |
| Voice pitch X Ideology X el. Type| 1.313 (0.807) | 6.691 (4.302)    |
| Voice Intensity      | -0.326* (0.162)  | -2.342† (1.238)  |
| Incumbency           |                  |                  |
| Incumbent            | 1.215* (0.513)   | 10.298** (2.912) |
| Constant             | -0.335 (1.361)   | 71.396*** (13.021) |

N 138 138

Note: Reference category for Election type is “Presidential elections”.
† p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

The three-way interaction between candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology and election
type is sizably similar to the results obtained in the main models (see Table 2, Models 3 and 4 in the main text). Yet, they fall just short of conventional levels of statistical significance (Model 1, predicting electoral outcome: \( b = 1.313, p = 0.104 \); Model 2, predicting percentage received votes: \( b = 0.125 \)). However, it is important to note that controlling for incumbency comes with a flavor of post estimation bias because candidates’ voice pitches potentially already affected their election result in the former election (which they now benefit from insofar as they won it). Thus, it is quite remarkable that the substantial size of the three-way interactions are not markedly reduced in these analyses (controlling for incumbency) compared to the main results. Below, Figure 6 breaks down the relationship between candidate voice pitch and electoral outcome (Panel a)) or percentage received votes (Panel b)), respectively, by national-level ideology and type of election when also controlling for candidate incumbency. Importantly, these patterns are almost identical to the results presented in Figure 1 and 2 in the main text. This suggests that—although the p-value for the three-way interaction has increased a bit when incumbency is controlled for—the underlying substantial pattern remains unchanged:

**Figure 6:** Predicted probability of winning election (Panel a)) and percentage received votes (Panel b)) based on three-way interactions between candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology and type of election also controlling voice intensity and incumbency.
a) Predicting electoral outcome

- Liberal country (10th percentile), Pres. election
- Conservative country (90th percentile), Pres. election
- Liberal country (10th percentile), Parl. election
- Conservative country (90th percentile), Parl. election

b) Predicting percentage received votes

- Presidential elections
- Parliamentary elections

Legend:
- Dotted Dash Dash: Conservative country (90th percentile)
- Dash Dash: Moderate country (50th percentile)
- Solid: Liberal country (10th percentile)
S.7 Three-way interaction between candidate voice pitch, country-level ideology and type of election also controlling for three-way interaction for voice intensity

In this section we control for the potential three-way interaction between candidate voice intensity, national-level ideology and election type, when testing the interaction between candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology and election type. As reported in the main text, we predicted a two-way interaction between candidate voice pitch and national-level ideology building on experimental work by Laustsen, Klofstad & Petersen, 2015. However, analyses (see Table 2, Model 1 & 2 and Supplementary Material S.4) show that this two-way interaction was supported for Presidential elections only. That is, we found significant three-way interactions between candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology and election type, but because the role played by election type was unexpected, these analyses remain somewhat exploratory. One consideration in this regard is whether it is candidate voice pitch per se, or any feature in candidate voices that interacts with national-level ideology and election type. In the main analyses and the different robustness analyses reported in sections S.5 and S.6 we have only included candidate voice intensity as a control, while not including the potential three-way interaction between voice intensity, national-level ideology and election type. In this section we include this three-way interaction (and all possible two-way interactions), to clarify if it is candidate voice pitch per se that interacts significantly with national-level ideology and election type. Table S.7 reports the full regression models predicting electoral outcome in Model 1 and oercentage received votes in Model 2. Subsequently, Figure S.7 illustrates if the underlying relationship between candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology and election type remains unchanged when controlling for the other three-way interaction including voice intensity.
Table S.7 Predictions of electoral outcome (Model 1) and percentage received votes (Model 2) from candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology, election type and their interactions when also controlling for three-way interaction between voice intensity, national-level ideology and type of election. Unstandardized logit and OLS regression coefficients, respectively, with standard errors clustered at the election level in parentheses.

|                      | Model 1 DV: Electoral outcome | Model 2 DV: Percentage received votes |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| **Voice Pitch**      | 7.678†                        | 54.642*                             |
|                      | (4.135)                       | (24.743)                            |
| **Ideology**         | -0.185                        | -4.869†                             |
|                      | (0.339)                       | (2.753)                             |
| **Voice Pitch X ideology** | -1.453*                      | -9.686*                             |
|                      | (0.713)                       | (4.212)                             |
| **Election Type**    |                               |                                     |
| - Parliamentary election | -0.890                      | -26.404                             |
|                      | (2.264)                       | (19.738)                            |
| **Voice pitch X election Type** | -9.589*                      | -62.833*                             |
| - Voice pitch X Parl. election | (4.677)                       | (27.743)                            |
| **Ideology X election Type** | 0.136                        | 1.894                               |
| - Ideology X Parl. election | (0.380)                       | (3.499)                             |
| **Voice pitch X Ideology X El. Type** | 1.689*                       | 10.752*                             |
| - Voice pitch X Ideo. X Parl. election | (0.808)                       | (4.854)                             |
| **Voice Intensity**  | -5.212                        | -51.310†                            |
|                      | (5.262)                       | (30.622)                            |
| **Voice Intensity X Ideology** | 0.732                       | 7.976                               |
|                      | (0.893)                       | (5.111)                             |
| **Voice Intensity X election Type** | 6.567                       | 45.850                              |
| - Voice intensity X Parl. election | (5.930)                       | (33.632)                            |
| **Voice Intensity X Ideology X El. Type** | -0.969                     | -7.100                              |
| - Voice Intensity X Ideo. X Parl. election | (1.005)                       | (5.658)                             |
| **Constant**         | 1.208                         | 75.404***                           |
|                      | (2.036)                       | (15.815)                            |

N = 138

Note: Reference category for Election type is “Presidential elections”.
†p < 0.10, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001
Figure 7: Predicted probability of winning election (Panel a)) and percentage received votes (Panel b)) based on three-way interactions between candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology and type of election also controlling for three-way interaction between voice intensity, national-level ideology and type of election (in the figures below intensity is kept at its mean value).
As reported in Table S.7, the three-way interaction between candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology and election type remains significant when also controlling for the potential three-way interaction between voice intensity, national-level ideology and election type (Electoral outcome (Model 1): $b = 1.689$, $p = 0.037$; Percentage received votes (Model 2): $b = 10.752$, $p = 0.030$). In contrast the alternative three-way interaction including voice intensity never reaches statistical significance (Electoral outcome (Model 1): $b = -0.969$, $p = 0.335$; Percentage received votes (Model 2): $b = -7.100$, $p = 0.214$). Moreover, as illustrated in Figure S.7 the pattern between candidate voice pitch and the dependent variables—when broken down by national-level ideology and election type also controlling for the alternative three-way interaction—is substantially similar to the patterns displayed in Figure 1 and 2 in the main text. That is, the interactive relationship between candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology and election type relates to the pitch of candidates’ voices and not any candidate voice variable (such as for instance intensity).
S.8 Three-way interaction between candidate voice pitch, country-level ideology and type of election based on dichotomous measure of national-level ideology

In this final part of the supplementary materials we seek to replicate the three-way interaction between candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology and election type using a dichotomous measure for national-level ideology rather than the continuous variable applied above. The reasoning behind this specific robustness analysis is that we assume a linear interaction between candidate voice pitch and the continuous ideology measure in the models presented in the preceding sections (and in the main text). However, it could be—both because of random noise in the national-ideology variable which is based on aggregated individual-level data form the World Values Studies and because of non-linearity in the interaction between voice pitch and ideology—that this assumption might somehow drive the presented patterns between candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology and election type. To investigate this consideration, we split the continuous national-ideology variable by its median and re-estimate the three-way interaction using this dichotomous measure. Table S.8 reports the full models for this analysis, while Figure S.8 displays the underlying relationships.
Table S.8. Predictions of electoral outcome and percentage received votes from candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology, election type and their interactions. Model 1 and 2 report results for electoral outcome and percentage votes, respectively. Unstandardized logit (Model 1) and OLS (Model 2) reg. coefficients with std. errors clustered at the election level in parentheses.

|                  | Model 1 DV: Electoral outcome | Model 2 DV: Percentage received votes |
|------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Voice Pitch      | -0.042 (0.442)                | 0.162 (1.973)                        |
| Ideology         |                               |                                      |
| - Conservative country | -0.049 (0.265)                | -2.380 (2.456)                       |
| Voice Pitch X ideology |                            |                                      |
| - Voice pitch X Cons. country | -1.336† (0.723)            | -5.134 (5.392)                       |
| Election Type    |                               |                                      |
| - Parliamentary election | 0.067 (0.158)                | -15.892*** (1.980)                   |
| Voice pitch X election Type |                           |                                      |
| - Voice pitch X Parl. election | -0.747 (0.555)             | -2.979 (2.077)                       |
| Ideology X election Type |                           |                                      |
| - Cons. country X Parl. election | -0.052 (0.329)            | 3.953 (3.752)                        |
| Voice pitch X Ideology X el. Type |                      |                                      |
| - Voice X Cons. country X Parl. El. | 1.726* (0.844)            | 7.360 (5.866)                        |
| Voice Intensity  | -0.342* (0.165)               | -2.568† (1.390)                      |
| Constant         | -0.016 (0.097)                | 47.344*** (1.009)                    |
| N                | 138                           | 138                                  |

Note: Reference category for Election type is “Presidential elections”.
† p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Importantly, when we use the dichotomous—rather than the continuous—measure of national-level ideology the three-way interaction between candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology and election type is still statistically significant when predicting electoral outcome (Model 1: b =
1.726; p = 0.041). However, when predicting percentage received votes using the dichotomous ideology variable the three-way interaction falls somewhat short of conventional levels of statistical significance (b = 7.360, p = 0.214). However, Figure S.8 shows that when we break down the underlying relationship between candidate voice pitch and each of the dependent by national-level ideology and election type, we get patterns substantially identical to the results reported in the main text:

**Figure 8:** Predicted probability of winning election (Panel a)) and percentage received votes (Panel b)) based on three-way interactions between candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology and type of election using the dichotomous national-ideology variable (in the figures below candidate voice intensity is also controlled for and kept at its mean value in the figures).
The pattern presented in Figure S.8 panel a) shows that also when we use the dichotomous national-level ideology variable, the largest difference between a “-1 SD Pitch” and a “1 SD Pitch” candidate voice obtains for conservative countries with presidential elections (the upper right-hand figure within panel a)). Moreover, panel b) shows that even when predicting the percentage received votes, candidate voice pitch relates the strongest to percentage of votes for presidential elections in conservative countries (the dashed line in the left-hand figure within panel b)). That is, although the three-way interaction between candidate voice pitch, national-level ideology and election type does not fully reach conventional levels of statistical significance when predicting percentage received votes measuring ideology with the dichotomous variable (as also reported above and in table S.8), the same underlying pattern as shown in the main text—using the continuous national-level ideology variable—obtains when we break down the relationship between voice pitch and percentage of votes by liberal/conservative countries and presidential/parliamentary elections.
### S.9 Candidates’ speeches URLs

ID- identification of sample mp3 file

| ID  | COUNTRY     | DATE       | CANDIDATE                | URL                                      |
|-----|-------------|------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| 01A | Andorra     | 26.04.09   | Jaume Bartumeu           | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KFGd1LH4hFQ |
| 01B | Andorra     | 26.04.09   | Joan Gabriel             | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g6RPssKp0X0 |
| 02A | Australia   | 24.11.07   | Kevin Rudd               | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zgcsLSMKDgs |
| 02B | Australia   | 24.11.07   | John Howard              | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uOC5wXAFgyQ |
| 03A | Brazil      | 29.10.06   | Luiz Inácio Lula De Silva | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Sx8VxgmZoUQ |
| 03B | Brazil      | 29.10.06   | Geraldo Alckmin          | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XXjqXFDoOFM |
| 04A | Bulgaria    | 25.06.05   | Sergei Stanishev         | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q53mErv1-5w |
| 04B | Bulgaria    | 25.06.05   | Simeon Saksoburggotski   | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0nUUWRgTqXU |
| 05A | Canada      | 14.10.08   | Stephen Harper           | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QHUlhTXA2CE |
| 05B | Canada      | 14.10.08   | Stéphane Dion            | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Sm6jr4ggjrA |
| No. | Country     | Date      | Leader Name           | URL                              |
|-----|-------------|-----------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 06A | Colombia    | 28.05.06  | Alvaro Uribe          | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pbl8AK1wUg0 |
| 06B | Colombia    | 28.05.06  | Carlos Gaviria        | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qVWTyVEO8MY |
| 07A | Cyprus      | 24.02.08  | Demetris Christofias  | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=am3i5SHuo08 |
| 07B | Cyprus      | 24.02.08  | Ioannis Kassoulides   | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=i-qB6sD7fk8 |
| 08A | Ethiopia    | 15.05.05  | Meles Zenawi          | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9IrjPhT1A7M |
| 08B | Ethiopia    | 15.05.05  | Hailu Shawul          | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hq2jXpEMq6k |
| 10A | France      | 17.06.07  | François Fillon       | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A1WwJGK3Ncs |
| 10B | France      | 17.06.07  | François Hollande     | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ihb49zvscIA |
| 11A | Ghana       | 28.12.08  | John Evans Atta Mills | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2eqS_whGZ2A |
| 11B | Ghana       | 28.12.08  | Nana Addo Dankwa Akufo-Addo | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GE8W3DvW-vU |
| 12A | Guatemala   | 04.11.07  | Alvaro Colom          | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=i_0IFbq7wJl |
| 12B | Guatemala   | 04.11.07  | Otto Perez Molina     | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XHVbkn5XkMM |
| No. | Country    | Date    | Name                  | Video Link                                      |
|-----|------------|---------|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| 13A | Hong Kong  | 07.09.08| Jasper Tsang Yok-Sing | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gtfKiE0lK4Q     |
| 13B | Hong Kong  | 07.09.08| Martin Lee Chu-Ming   | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UJLo6Pz5vxQ     |
| 14A | Hungary    | 23.04.06| Ferenc Gyurcsány      | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6HTKhm7rlKs     |
| 14B | Hungary    | 23.04.06| Viktor Orbán          | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ygAbvkuGJBE     |
| 15A | India      | 13.05.09| Manmohan Singh        | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-luxLCoCpag     |
| 15B | India      | 13.05.09| Lal Krishna Advani    | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ErupeNpxIRw      |
| 16A | Italy      | 13.04.08| Silvio Berlusconi     | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pZ9P6s8WkKg     |
| 16B | Italy      | 13.04.08| Walter Veltroni       | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SIwjaFcyE4&list=PL8EK3HkCnB |
| 17A | Japan      | 11.09.05| Junichiro Koizumi     | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=woTHTPUqjNM     |
| 17B | Japan      | 11.09.05| Katsuya Okada         | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QIksKSZvMIU      |
| 18A | Mexico     | 02.07.06| Felipe Calderon       | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YsmHpSD21ys      |
| 18B | Mexico     | 02.07.06| Andrés Manuel López Obrador | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HkpSELrKw6U  |
|   | Country     | Date     | Name                  | YouTube Link                                      |
|---|-------------|----------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| 19A| Moldova     | 29.07.09 | Vladimir Voronin      | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CHtDangmhrk       |
| 19B| Moldova     | 29.07.09 | Vlad Filat            | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9P1E0_szyQ0       |
| 20A| Netherlands | 22.11.06 | Jan Peter Balkenende  | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aW3y1HEOXag       |
| 20B| Netherlands | 22.11.06 | Wouter Bos            | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yk6Ul9TCsc        |
| 21A| Norway      | 12.09.05 | Jens Stoltenberg      | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FJHPpNAXlak       |
| 21B| Norway      | 12.09.05 | Carl I. Hagen         | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0p0NKHvF3Xw       |
| 22A| Peru        | 04.06.06 | Alan Garcia Pérez     | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DnpHe6dhT00       |
| 22B| Peru        | 04.06.06 | Ollanta Humala Tasso   | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ju7ocGU5BKg       |
| 23A| Poland      | 21.09.07 | Donald Tusk           | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6BU6jB4fu3A       |
| 23B| Poland      | 21.09.07 | Jarosław Kaczyński    | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HimxcHDO1Xs       |
| 23C| Poland      | 23.10.05 | Lech Kaczyński        | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cvED4lmoG1A       |
| 23D| Poland      | 23.10.05 | Donald Tusk           | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6BU6jB4fu3A       |
| 24A | Rwanda | 25.08.03 | Paul Kagame | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VA472KvI_A4 |
|-----|--------|----------|-------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 24B | Rwanda | 25.08.03 | Faustin Twagiramungu | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zf_fOoDAVXY |
| 25A | Slovenia | 21.09.08 | Borut Pahor | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=clhkRcAygtw |
| 25B | Slovenia | 21.09.08 | Janez Jansa | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0j4FKY65gE4 |
| 26A | South Africa | 14.04.04 | Thabo Mbeki | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4QDRweEBFkU |
| 26B | South Africa | 14.04.04 | Tony Leon | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vYx6EfQY47U |
| 27A | Spain | 09.03.08 | José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IvaBU2FCx1U |
| 27B | Spain | 09.03.08 | Mariano Rajoy | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IRhzhIfGAc8 |
| 28A | Sweden | 17.09.06 | Göran Persson | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KAzrVg4NFUY |
| 28B | Sweden | 17.09.06 | Fredrik Reinfeldt | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=12yt_H_ht4E |
| 29A | Thailand | 23.12.07 | Samak Sundaravej | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DuoqLiLSgnI |
| 29B | Thailand | 23.12.07 | Abhisit Vejjajiva | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h9cWVAnCbVU |
|   | Country          | Date     | Name               | Video Link                                      |
|---|------------------|----------|--------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| 30A| Trinidad and Tobago | 05.11.07 | Patrick Manning    | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U5occD_nLfU     |
| 30B| Trinidad and Tobago | 05.11.07 | Basdeo Panday      | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qs7eB3Lwm3E     |
| 32A| United Kingdom   | 05.05.05 | Tony Blair         | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OOqMfKAM9Bo     |
| 32B| United Kingdom   | 05.05.05 | Michael Howard     | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qS261L5gTjQ      |
| 33A| Uruguay          | 31.10.04 | Tabaré Vázquez     | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cHBTcqlbm3s      |
| 33B| Uruguay          | 31.10.04 | Jorge Larranaga    | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sR0AI-eTNMo      |
| 35A| Algeria          | 10.05.12 | Abdelmalek Sellal  | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XXKq9k8Ja5Q      |
| 35B| Algeria          | 10.05.12 | Ahmed Ouyahia      | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=reb5Pv9yPdQ       |
| 36A| Armenia          | 06.05.12 | Serzh Sargsyan     | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lujprjk2E1Q       |
| 36B| Armenia          | 06.05.12 | Gagik Tsarukyan    | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RpfARYFV7nY       |
| 37A| Chile            | 17.01.10 | Sebastian Pinera   | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Qp62nkFgWB0       |
| 37B| Chile            | 17.01.10 | Eduardo Frei Ruiz-Tagle | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ScBGOk9HW8I |
|   | Country     | Date       | Person                  | URL                        |
|---|-------------|------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 38A| Colombia    | 20.06.10   | Juan Manuel Santos Calderón | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=se8T2z8ml54 |
| 38B| Colombia    | 20.06.10   | Aurelijus Antanas Mockus Sivic | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eKzSW5rq9s8 |
| 39A| Cyprus      | 18.04.10   | Derviş Eroğlu          | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WB_Bru0jLM8 |
| 39B| Cyprus      | 18.04.10   | Mehmet Ali Talat         | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=i4oB7o9mOPQ |
| 40A| Ecuador     | 26.04.09   | Rafael Correa            | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BZ1oggwjGsE |
| 40B| Ecuador     | 26.04.09   | Lucio Gutiérrez            | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gfpgFcU8o80 |
| 41A| Estonia     | 06.03.11   | Andrus Ansip             | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iUrj0eEAGPw |
| 41B| Estonia     | 06.03.11   | Edgar Savisaar            | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cDa1wlraHwQ |
| 42A| Georgia     | 01.10.12   | Bidzina Ivanishvili     | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L9l4GkAce1U |
| 42B| Georgia     | 01.10.12   | Vano Merabishvili        | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KMhmyMLmTPU |
| 42C| Georgia     | 05.01.08   | Mikheil Saakashvili     | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NOV915IKJO0 |
| 42D| Georgia     | 05.01.08   | Levan Gachechiladze     | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R18KJCDgKvY |
|   | Country     | Date       | Name               | Link                                      |
|---|-------------|------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| 43A| Ghana       | 07.12.12   | John Dramani Mahama | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hIwTvRLZt1A |
| 43B| Ghana       | 07.12.12   | Nana Akufo-Addo    | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GE8W3DvW-vU |
| 44A| Hong Kong   | 09.09.12   | Tam Yiu-Chung      | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3bixYlgWSI0 |
| 44B| Hong Kong   | 09.09.12   | Alan Leong         | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DgouhaJPquM |
| 45A| India       | 07.04.14   | Narendra Modi      | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WIKn4P0TOMM |
| 45B| India       | 07.04.14   | Rahul Gandhi       | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SzZ48xcwoQQ |
| 46A| Iraq        | 07.03.10   | Ayad Allawi        | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PIUnL_r2kEI |
| 46B| Iraq        | 07.03.10   | Nouri Al-Maliki    | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tP3jpnek2HI |
| 47A| Japan       | 30.08.09   | Yukio Hatoyama     | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5-pk2_eY_5o |
| 47B| Japan       | 30.08.09   | Taro Aso           | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=386OSRNSkCM |
| 48A| Kazakhstan  | 15.01.12   | Nursultan Nazarbayev | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5INGJiMah34 |
| 48B| Kazakhstan  | 15.01.12   | Azat Peruashev     | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=giXMer_RthU |
| Region     | President          | Date    | Name                           | URL                                      |
|------------|--------------------|---------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Kyrgyzstan | Kamchibek Tashiyev | 10.10.10|                                | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uLI2MhXS7cw |
| Kyrgyzstan | Almazbek Atambaev  | 10.10.10|                                | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jYSgGO1qNMU   |
| Mexico     | Enrique Pena Nieto | 01.07.12|                                | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y0QzvM3u0WU   |
| Mexico     | Andrés Manuel Lopez Obrador | 01.07.12|                                | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iymz1sToO-A   |
| Morocco    | Abdelilah Benkirane | 25.11.11|                                | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XhC139oDcxg |
| Morocco    | Abbas El Fassi     | 25.11.11|                                | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=plIMQQ1mSM&list=PLaIaOUPMum2jOYmu3AJVioJqwWDTfZ |
| Netherlands| Mark Rutte         | 12.09.12|                                | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fk29jPvooHg   |
| Netherlands| Diederik Samsom    | 12.09.12|                                | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rfAEk96TjGg  |
| New Zealand| John Key           | 26.11.11|                                | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xVDoj5u6M4M |
| New Zealand| Phil Goff          | 26.11.11|                                | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pjfpQn54YS4 |
| Nigeria    | Goodluck Ebele Jonathan | 16.04.11|                                | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j6Nc-WV-Q5M |
| Nigeria    | Muhammadu Buhari   | 16.04.11|                                | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JSEZwOPV0G4 |
|   | Country | Date   | Name                  | YouTube Link                              |
|---|---------|--------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| 55A | Pakistan | 11.05.13 | Nawaz Sharif | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MHjRH-vIxEQ |
| 55B | Pakistan | 11.05.13 | Ameen Faheem | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=opgljRanxx0 |
| 56A | Philippines | 10.05.10 | Benigno Simeon Cojuangco-Aquin | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8JWyScwuTeI |
| 56B | Philippines | 10.05.10 | Joseph Estrada | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sHXFIVqcoI4 |
| 57A | Romania | 09.12.12 | Victor Ponta | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p0uCKDwS7ac&t=341s |
| 57B | Romania | 09.12.12 | Vasile Blaga | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x_65Bw95fyQ |
| 57C | Romania | 16.11.14 | Klaus Iohannis | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DIYJTO3__bs |
| 57D | Romania | 16.11.14 | Victor Ponta | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p0uCKDwS7ac&t=341s |
| 58A | Russia | 04.12.11 | Dmitry Medvedev | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vUdLe6ciO_g |
| 58B | Russia | 04.12.11 | Gennady Zyuganov | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wT8f4C4bQj0 |
| 58C | Russia | 04.03.12 | Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kqD8lIdIMRo |
| 58D | Russia | 04.03.12 | Gennady Andreyevich Zyuganov | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wT8f4C4bQj0 |
|   | Country   | Date    | Leader                          | URL                                      |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| 59A| Slovenia  | 04.12.11| Zoran Janković                  | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cEM5zGkXNac |
| 59B| Slovenia  | 04.12.11| Janez Janša                     | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0j4FKY65gE4 |
| 60A| Zimbabwe  | 27.06.08| Robert Gabriel Mugabe           | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5XuQisPnBB0 |
| 60B| Zimbabwe  | 27.06.08| Morgan Tsvangirai               | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JVwn6ZCf-9Y |
| 61A| Spain     | 20.11.11| Mariano Rajoy                   | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IRhzhlfGAc8 |
| 61B| Spain     | 20.11.11| Alfredo Pérez Rubalcaba         | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z6CuioW9oso |
| 62A| Tunisia   | 23.10.11| Rashid Al-Ghannushi             | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SFzAqj33hkM |
| 62B| Tunisia   | 23.10.11| Moncef Marzouki                 | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fjncwC962kU |
| 62C| Tunisia   | 21.12.14| Beji Caid Essebsi               | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VhUsXO9i0GA |
| 62D| Tunisia   | 21.12.14| Moncef Marzouki                 | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fjncwC962kU |
| 63A| Turkey    | 12.06.11| Recep Tayyip Erdogan            | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9YagbT8ocZI |
| 63B| Turkey    | 12.06.11| Kemal Kılıçdaroğlu              | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d5uTq1fXfEs |
|   | Country  | Date      | Name                          | Link                                      |
|---|----------|-----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| 64A | Ukraine  | 28.10.12  | Mykola Azarov                 | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2v033nO-51l |
| 64B | Ukraine  | 28.10.12  | Arseniy Yatsenyuk             | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eRHA6swhCg8 |
| 65A | Uruguay  | 29.11.09  | José Mujica                   | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hteGnL-8SeU |
| 65B | Uruguay  | 29.11.09  | Luis Alberto Lacalle          | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ytv1AV0DBbQ |
| 66A | Poland   | 04.07.10  | Bronisław Komorowski          | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H29KYtiPz2Q |
| 66B | Poland   | 04.07.10  | Jaroslaw Kaczyński            | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HimxcHDO1Xs |
| 67A | Romania  | 06.12.09  | Traian Basescu                | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hHmPALFxFiU |
| 67B | Romania  | 06.12.09  | Mircea-Dan Geoana             | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S_PJiC9pOHo |