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## Appendix A: Summaries of the state of the field

****Table 1.** Gender differences in news visibility as discussed in existing literature**

|  |
| --- |
| Women politicians or candidates receive less coverage: |
| * Women who run for office receive **less attention** from the media than men (Teele, Kalla, & Rosenbluth, 2018: 527). |
| * This pattern [that in general **males are given a benefit in quantity of coverage** over females] is confirmed by similar findings in races for other offices (Falk, 2010: 106). |
| * Women politicians typically receive **less media coverage** than their male peers [..]. Even when a government has a gender-balanced composition, male ministers still obtain **much more coverage** than female ministers (Verge & Pastor, 2018: 3). |
| * The literature reports that women presidential candidates consistently garner **less press coverage** than men (Miller, Peake, & Boulton, 2010: 176). |
| * [..] women **still struggle for publicity**. (Ross, Evans, Harrison, Shears, & Wadia, 2013: 5). |
| The literature is contradictory: |
| * Several studies have found that female political aspirants receive **less attention** in the form of news stories, commentary and cartoons than do their male counterparts [..]. Yet other research shows women may receive **more coverage** because of their sex (Trimble, 2007: 972). |
| * Some scholars have uncovered **few major differences** in the amount of news coverage [..], while others have discovered women receive significantly **more media attention** [..] or significantly **less** depending upon the electoral context, candidates, or news format examined (Wagner, Trimble, Sampert, & Gerrits, 2017: 475). |
| * The question of quantity of coverage also often emerges: Do women candidates receive less coverage than their male counterparts? Some studies **lend credence** to those concerns, while others have found **little difference**, and still others have demonstrated that female candidates actually receive **more coverage** than male candidates overall (Brooks, 2013: 150). |
| * Kahn [..] concludes that female candidates in the US receive **less coverage** than their male contenders [..]. More recent studies validate her findings [..]. However, other researchers **do not find a gender bias** in terms of quantity of coverage (Vos, 2013: 391). |
| The bias from the past has equalized over time: |
| * Both U.S. and international gender and politics scholarship has repeatedly found that female candidates receive less coverage than their male counterparts [..]. However, some studies suggest that this gap **may have closed or at least be waning** (Ward, 2016: 321). |
| * More recent work indicates that the patterns of gender difference in the coverage of candidates seen in the 1980s and 1990s are changing and becoming more equitable [..]. Looking across a range of offices, it is clear that women are **generally receiving as much total coverage** as men and as much coverage on policy and political positions, although some work still finds that women’s “novelty” as candidates is a continuing frame (Dolan, 2014: 29). |
| * A number of studies have found that men politicians usually receive more press attention than women [..]. However, more recent work shows that, as women have attained higher levels of representation over time, the **amount of coverage has balanced** [..] or even reversed to women’s advantage (Fernandez-Garcia, 2016: 143). |

*Note:* Emphasis was added.

## Appendix B: Full Models Visibility

The analysis presented in the paper is done using robust variance estimation (RVE) with random effects weights, based on the number of candidates in the sample (specification 1 in Table B1). Random effects weights are suited to account for dependency due to correlated effects, while fixed effects weights are better suited for dependency due to hierarchical effects (Hedges, Tipton, & Johnson, 2010; Tanner‐Smith & Tipton, 2014; Tipton, 2015). The dependency in our dataset is a mixture of both, since multiple observations per publication can come from separate estimates on the same sample for different types of media (correlated effects) and from estimates on separate samples of different types of politician in one publication (hierarchical effects). We therefore replicated the analysis with fixed effects weights as well (specifications 3-4). In addition, we alternatively weighted using the 10log of the number of politicians in the sample (specifications 2 and 4), instead of the number of politicians in the sample, so instead of . Furthermore, we also estimated ordinary least squares (OLS) models, with and without weights for the number of candidates and with and without clustering on publication (specifications 5-8). The results can be found in Table B1.

Three additional robustness analyses are presented in Table B2, each leaving out a different set of studies. Each is estimated using RVE and random effects weight (like specification 1). The first (specification 9) focusses only on only zero-order *d’* scores, i.e., visibility scores that used no statistical control variables. The second (specification 10), leaves out studies for which we had to estimate the number of politicians studied. Finally, in specification 11, we excluded studies based on two reasons. One, for one study we could not find or construct predicted probabilities and could not obtain original data, so we used the value of the regression constant for the reference category (e.g. men), and the constant plus the coefficient of gender for the target category (e.g. women) to –imperfectly- gauge their visibility. Two, there were ten studies which did not explicitly interpret visibility results, but did present numbers on the amount of attention to men and women politicians nonetheless. In Table B2, specification 11 excludes studies both these types of study.

Table B3 shows additional modes that were estimated and mentioned in the text. The first additional model shows that the effect negative effect of female representation appears to have been spurious, as it disappears when combined with electoral systems as independent variable. Then two models show the effect of medium characteristics. The final four models consider the effect of the gender of the author(s) of the publication on the reported visibility result.

**Table B1.** Full models explaining difference in visibility between men and women politicians (*d’*)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | | **Specification 1** | | | **Specification 2** | | | **Specification 3** | | | **Specification 4** | | | **Specification 5** | | **Specification 6** | | **Specification 7** | | **Specification 8** | | |
|  | | RVE, random effects weights | | | RVE, random effects weights | | | RVE, fixed effects weights | | | RVE, fixed effects weights | | | OLS | | OLS, clustered | | OLS, weighted | | OLS, weighted | | |
| w calculated with N politicians | | | w calculated with log10 N politicians | | | w calculated with N politicians | | | w calculated with log10 N candidates | | | and clustered | | |
|  | **Independent variables** | b | se | dfs | b | se | dfs | b | se | dfs | b | se | dfs | b | se | b | se | b | se | b | se | |
| **Base (N=70)** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
|  | Constant | -0.02 | 0.03 | 18.1 | -0.03 | 0.03 | 28.6 | -0.11 | 0.07 | 2.6 | -0.03 | 0.03 | 28.6 | -0.03 | 0.02 | -0.03 | 0.03 | -0.08 | 0.02 | -0.08 | | 0.05 |
|  | Control variables (1=yes) | -0.10 | 0.05 | 25.6 | -0.09 | 0.05 | 27.3 | -0.02 | 0.07 | 4.2 | -0.09 | 0.05 | 27.3 | -0.06 | 0.05 | -0.06 | 0.04 | -0.06 | 0.02 | -0.06 | | 0.05 |
| **Officelevel (N=70)** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
|  | Constant (1. Supranational or mix) | -0.04 | 0.07 | 5.0 | -0.04 | 0.06 | 6.2 | -0.16 | 0.05 | 1.5 | -0.04 | 0.06 | 6.2 | -0.01 | 0.06 | -0.01 | 0.04 | -0.16 | 0.02 | -0.16 | | 0.03 |
|  | 2. National | 0.05 | 0.07 | 9.2 | 0.02 | 0.06 | 10.1 | 0.15 | 0.07 | 4.4 | 0.02 | 0.06 | 10.1 | -0.01 | 0.07 | -0.01 | 0.05 | 0.15 | 0.02 | 0.15 | | 0.03 |
|  | 3. Sub-national | -0.03 | 0.08 | 9.9 | -0.04 | 0.07 | 12.3 | -0.05 | 0.07 | 4.7 | -0.04 | 0.07 | 12.3 | -0.05 | 0.07 | -0.05 | 0.06 | -0.05 | 0.03 | -0.05 | | 0.04 |
|  | Control variables (1=yes) | -0.09 | 0.05 | 20.6 | -0.09 | 0.04 | 25.9 | 0.02 | 0.06 | 2.9 | -0.09 | 0.04 | 25.9 | -0.05 | 0.05 | -0.05 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | | 0.03 |
| **Officetype (N=70)** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
|  | Constant (1. Executive) | -0.04 | 0.04 | 13.3 | -0.06 | 0.04 | 18.7 | -0.05 | 0.04 | 10.4 | -0.06 | 0.04 | 18.7 | -0.06 | 0.03 | -0.06 | 0.05 | -0.04 | 0.11 | -0.04 | | 0.04 |
|  | 2. Legislative | 0.03 | 0.05 | 17.8 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 28.0 | -0.05 | 0.07 | 10.7 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 28.0 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.05 | -0.04 | 0.11 | -0.04 | | 0.05 |
|  | 3. Executive and legislative | -0.05 | 0.08 | 10.8 | -0.02 | 0.08 | 11.6 | -0.13 | 0.07 | 11.5 | -0.02 | 0.08 | 11.6 | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.07 | -0.13 | 0.12 | -0.13 | | 0.05 |
|  | 4. Other | 0.25 | 0.07 | 2.5 | 0.25 | 0.07 | 2.7 | 0.27 | 0.08 | 2.5 | 0.25 | 0.07 | 2.7 | 0.23 | 0.10 | 0.23 | 0.07 | 0.26 | 0.21 | 0.26 | | 0.05 |
|  | Control variables (1=yes) | -0.10 | 0.05 | 21.4 | -0.10 | 0.05 | 24.0 | -0.03 | 0.08 | 4.0 | -0.10 | 0.05 | 24.0 | -0.07 | 0.05 | -0.07 | 0.04 | -0.06 | 0.02 | -0.06 | | 0.05 |
| **Electoralsystemtype (N=68)** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
|  | Constant (1. Plurality/majority) | 0.01 | 0.03 | 13.1 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 28.5 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 3.3 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 28.5 | -0.02 | 0.03 | -0.02 | 0.03 | -0.01 | 0.01 | -0.01 | | 0.03 |
|  | 2. Mixed Member Proportional | -0.03 | 0.04 | 1.9 | -0.01 | 0.04 | 2.0 | -0.01 | 0.06 | 1.9 | -0.01 | 0.04 | 2.0 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.01 | | 0.03 |
|  | 3. Proportional Representation | -0.17 | 0.03 | 8.2 | -0.16 | 0.03 | 11.5 | -0.18 | 0.05 | 4.7 | -0.16 | 0.03 | 11.5 | -0.14 | 0.06 | -0.14 | 0.04 | -0.17 | 0.02 | -0.17 | | 0.03 |
|  | Control variables (1=yes) | -0.02 | 0.03 | 8.8 | -0.02 | 0.03 | 14.0 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 3.1 | -0.02 | 0.03 | 14.0 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.03 | | 0.03 |
| **Electiontype (N=70)** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
|  | Constant (1. General election) | 0.00 | 0.04 | 13.8 | -0.01 | 0.03 | 19.3 | -0.11 | 0.11 | 1.5 | -0.01 | 0.03 | 19.3 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.03 | -0.08 | 0.02 | -0.08 | | 0.06 |
|  | 2. Primary election | -0.03 | 0.07 | 9.8 | -0.04 | 0.07 | 15.1 | 0.10 | 0.12 | 5.4 | -0.04 | 0.07 | 15.1 | -0.07 | 0.05 | -0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.16 | 0.07 | | 0.08 |
|  | 3. Both or not applicable | -0.09 | 0.04 | 9.1 | -0.08 | 0.04 | 10.5 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 2.5 | -0.08 | 0.04 | 10.5 | -0.07 | 0.06 | -0.07 | 0.04 | -0.03 | 0.04 | -0.03 | | 0.06 |
|  | Control variables (1=yes) | -0.11 | 0.05 | 24.4 | -0.11 | 0.05 | 27.3 | -0.02 | 0.11 | 3.4 | -0.11 | 0.05 | 27.3 | -0.07 | 0.05 | -0.07 | 0.04 | -0.06 | 0.03 | -0.06 | | 0.06 |
| **Campaign (N=70)** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
|  | Constant (1. Campaign) | -0.01 | 0.04 | 17.6 | -0.02 | 0.03 | 27.5 | -0.11 | 0.10 | 1.6 | -0.02 | 0.03 | 27.5 | -0.02 | 0.02 | -0.02 | 0.03 | -0.08 | 0.02 | -0.08 | | 0.06 |
|  | 2. Routine | -0.04 | 0.05 | 11.3 | -0.04 | 0.05 | 11.5 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 3.2 | -0.04 | 0.05 | 11.5 | -0.04 | 0.06 | -0.04 | 0.05 | -0.01 | 0.04 | -0.01 | | 0.06 |
|  | 3. Both | -0.17 | 0.07 | 5.1 | -0.15 | 0.07 | 6.1 | -0.18 | 0.03 | 1.6 | -0.15 | 0.07 | 6.1 | -0.08 | 0.08 | -0.08 | 0.07 | -0.17 | 0.06 | -0.17 | | 0.03 |
|  | Control variables (1=yes) | -0.06 | 0.04 | 18.1 | -0.05 | 0.04 | 18.1 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 3.3 | -0.05 | 0.04 | 18.1 | -0.04 | 0.05 | -0.04 | 0.04 | -0.04 | 0.02 | -0.04 | | 0.06 |
| **Time (N=70)** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
|  | Constant (1960) | -0.06 | 0.11 | 4.4 | -0.08 | 0.12 | 3.6 | -0.34 | 0.27 | 7.8 | -0.08 | 0.12 | 3.6 | -0.13 | 0.08 | -0.13 | 0.10 | -0.28 | 0.13 | -0.28 | | 0.21 |
|  | Time (1=ten years) | 0.01 | 0.03 | 4.5 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 3.8 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 6.6 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 3.8 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.04 | | 0.05 |
|  | Control variables (1=yes) | -0.10 | 0.05 | 24.8 | -0.10 | 0.05 | 28.0 | -0.04 | 0.07 | 5.2 | -0.10 | 0.05 | 28.0 | -0.07 | 0.05 | -0.07 | 0.05 | -0.07 | 0.03 | -0.07 | | 0.05 |
| **Femalerepresentation (N=66)** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
|  | Constant (0%) | 0.10 | 0.04 | 22.5 | 0.08 | 0.04 | 25.5 | -0.05 | 0.13 | 5.4 | 0.08 | 0.04 | 25.5 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.06 | -0.05 | 0.04 | -0.05 | | 0.11 |
|  | Femalerepresentation (1=10%) | -0.06 | 0.02 | 9.4 | -0.06 | 0.02 | 11.9 | -0.03 | 0.03 | 3.3 | -0.06 | 0.02 | 11.9 | -0.03 | 0.02 | -0.03 | 0.03 | -0.01 | 0.02 | -0.01 | | 0.03 |
|  | Control variables (1=yes) | -0.06 | 0.04 | 15.9 | -0.06 | 0.04 | 18.5 | -0.01 | 0.07 | 3.7 | -0.06 | 0.04 | 18.5 | -0.05 | 0.05 | -0.05 | 0.04 | -0.05 | 0.03 | -0.05 | | 0.05 |

*Note:* Regression coefficients (b), standard errors (se), and degrees of freedom (dfs). The first model specification is the main result presented in the paper. Note that robust variance estimates with degrees of freedom lower than 4 may be untrustworthy (see Tipton, 2015).

**Table B2.** Full models explaining *d’*, excluding subsets of studies

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Specification 9** | | | **Specification 10** | | | **Specification 11** | | |
|  |  | Only studies without statistical controls  (N=62) | | | Excluding results with no precise number of politicians reported (N=65) | | | Excluding studies without (predicted) means and studies without explicit visibility interpretation (N=59) | | |
|  |  | b | se | dfs | b | se | dfs | b | se | dfs |
| **Base** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Constant | -0.08 | 0.03 | 32.6 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 12.3 | -0.02 | 0.03 | 18.1 |
|  | Control variables (1=yes) |  |  |  | -0.13 | 0.05 | 21.8 | -0.10 | 0.05 | 25.6 |
| **Officelevel** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Constant (1. Supranational or mix) | -0.08 | 0.05 | 4.6 | 0.09 | 0.06 | 5.6 | -0.05 | 0.06 | 4.9 |
|  | 2. National | 0.05 | 0.06 | 9.6 | -0.07 | 0.07 | 4.9 | 0.03 | 0.07 | 10.2 |
|  | 3. Sub-national | -0.10 | 0.11 | 10.7 | -0.14 | 0.08 | 4.7 | -0.07 | 0.07 | 9.2 |
|  | Control variables (1=yes) |  |  |  | -0.14 | 0.05 | 19.9 | -0.08 | 0.05 | 16.1 |
| **Officetype** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Constant (1. Executive) | -0.07 | 0.04 | 13.2 | -0.04 | 0.04 | 11.7 | -0.04 | 0.04 | 13.3 |
|  | 2. Legislative | -0.01 | 0.05 | 19.7 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 14.3 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 17.8 |
|  | 3. Executive and legislative | -0.11 | 0.14 | 10.7 | -0.07 | 0.14 | 8.1 | -0.05 | 0.08 | 10.8 |
|  | 4. Other | 0.25 | 0.10 | 2.5 | 0.26 | 0.06 | 2.5 | 0.25 | 0.07 | 2.5 |
|  | Control variables (1=yes) |  |  |  | -0.12 | 0.05 | 12.7 | -0.10 | 0.05 | 21.4 |
| **Electoralsystemtype** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Constant (1. Plurality/majority) | 0.01 | 0.02 | 18.7 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 10.9 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 13.1 |
|  | 2. Mixed Member Proportional | -0.03 | 0.04 | 1.9 | -0.02 | 0.06 | 2.0 | -0.03 | 0.04 | 1.9 |
|  | 3. Proportional Representation | -0.24 | 0.06 | 19.9 | -0.15 | 0.05 | 7.2 | -0.17 | 0.03 | 8.2 |
|  | Control variables (1=yes) |  |  |  | -0.03 | 0.03 | 7.4 | -0.02 | 0.03 | 8.8 |
| **Electiontype** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Constant (1. General election) | -0.07 | 0.05 | 21.7 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 10.0 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 13.8 |
|  | 2. Primary election | 0.03 | 0.08 | 9.5 | -0.04 | 0.07 | 8.6 | -0.03 | 0.07 | 9.8 |
|  | 3. Both or not applicable | -0.05 | 0.05 | 9.0 | -0.08 | 0.04 | 6.1 | -0.09 | 0.04 | 9.1 |
|  | Control variables (1=yes) |  |  |  | -0.15 | 0.05 | 17.2 | -0.11 | 0.05 | 24.4 |
| **Campaign** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Constant (1. Campaign) | -0.03 | 0.03 | 18.0 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 9.9 | -0.01 | 0.04 | 17.6 |
|  | 2. Routine | -0.05 | 0.05 | 11.1 | -0.02 | 0.07 | 7.0 | -0.04 | 0.05 | 11.3 |
|  | 3. Both | -0.37 | 0.10 | 3.6 | -0.20 | 0.05 | 2.9 | -0.17 | 0.07 | 5.1 |
|  | Control variables (1=yes) |  |  |  | -0.09 | 0.05 | 13.3 | -0.06 | 0.04 | 18.1 |
| **Time** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Constant (1960) | -0.03 | 0.14 | 4.1 | -0.10 | 0.10 | 3.9 | -0.06 | 0.11 | 4.4 |
|  | Time (1=ten years) | -0.01 | 0.03 | 4.3 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 4.1 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 4.5 |
|  | Control variables (1=yes) |  |  |  | -0.15 | 0.05 | 20.1 | -0.10 | 0.05 | 24.8 |
| **Femalerepresentation** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Constant (0%) | 0.15 | 0.06 | 22.5 | 0.13 | 0.05 | 15.4 | 0.10 | 0.04 | 22.5 |
|  | Femalerepresentation (1=10%) | -0.10 | 0.03 | 13.9 | -0.09 | 0.02 | 10.3 | -0.06 | 0.02 | 9.4 |
|  | Control variables (1=yes) |  |  |  | -0.04 | 0.05 | 9.7 | -0.06 | 0.04 | 15.9 |

*Note:* Regression coefficients (b), standard errors (se), and degrees of freedom (dfs). RVE models with random effects weights. Note that robust variance estimates with degrees of freedom lower than 4 may be untrustworthy (see Tipton, 2015).

**Table B3.** Models explaining *d’* with medium characteristics and gender of the authors

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | **Independent variables** | **b** | **se** | **dfs** | **n** |
| **Female representation and electoral system** | | |  |  | 65 |
|  | Female representation | -0.013 | 0.031 | 7.2 |  |
|  | 2. Mixed Member | -0.016 | 0.057 | 1.9 |  |
|  | 3. Proportional Representation | -0.151 | 0.070 | 3.6 |  |
|  | Control variables (1=yes) | -0.028 | 0.036 | 8.8 |  |
|  | Constant | 0.032 | 0.052 | 7.9 |  |
| **Medium type (ref = 1. newspapers)** | |  |  |  | 70 |
|  | 2. TV | -0.187 | 0.065 | 7.5 |  |
|  | 3. TV and newspapers | -0.126 | 0.063 | 1.5 |  |
|  | Control variables (1=yes) | -0.036 | 0.041 | 13.3 |  |
|  | Constant | -0.012 | 0.030 | 14.0 |  |
| **Newspaper type (ref = 1. Quality / broadsheet)** | | |  |  | 58 |
|  | newspapertype2 | -0.060 | 0.041 | 2.9 |  |
|  | newspapertype3 | -0.157 | 0.057 | 4.1 |  |
|  | newspapertype4 | -0.083 | 0.045 | 3.2 |  |
|  | Control variables (1=yes) | -0.069 | 0.035 | 14.6 |  |
|  | Constant | 0.081 | 0.041 | 2.9 |  |
| **Gender of researchers** | |  |  |  | 70 |
|  | Share of female authors | 0.097 | 0.049 | 7.3 |  |
|  | Control variables (1=yes) | -0.090 | 0.051 | 22.6 |  |
|  | Constant | -0.104 | 0.050 | 6.8 |  |
| **Studies by male only researchers** | |  |  |  | 6 |
|  | Constant | -0.16 | 0.043 | 1.8 |  |
| **Studies by mixed teams** | |  |  |  | 15 |
|  | Constant | -0.15 | 0.048 | 4.0 |  |
| **Studies by female only researchers** | |  |  |  | 49 |
|  | Constant | -0.03 | 0.032 | 20.3 |  |

*Note:* Regression coefficients (b), standard errors (se), and degrees of freedom (dfs). RVE models with random effects weights. The dummy variable for control variables in not included in the lowest three models due to low number of observations in these subsamples. Note that robust variance estimates with degrees of freedom lower than 4 may be untrustworthy (see Tipton, 2015).

## Appendix C: Citations analysis

Table C1. Poisson models predicting number of citations

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| Year (1990=0) | 0.901 |  | 0.890 | 0.901 | 0.901 | 0.883 | 0.878 |
| (0.000) |  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) |
| d' |  | 3.422 | 0.405 |  |  | 0.011 | 0.012 |
|  |  | (0.000) | (0.008) |  |  | (0.000) | (0.000) |
| d' \* year |  |  | 1.116 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | (0.000) |  |  |  |  |
| Share female authors |  |  |  | 0.917 |  | 1.212 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.040) |  | (0.004) |  |
| Female first author |  |  |  |  | 0.890 |  | 1.139 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.001) |  | (0.008) |
| Share female authors \* d' |  |  |  |  |  | 340.528 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.000) |  |
| Female first author \* d' |  |  |  |  |  |  | 446.943 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.000) |
| Constant | 305.277 | 60.988 | 377.130 | 341.753 | 330.866 | 340.007 | 390.693 |
|  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) |
| N | 74 | 58 | 58 | 74 | 74 | 58 | 58 |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.42 | 0.03 | 0.56 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.59 | 0.61 |

*Note:* Exponentiated Poisson regression coefficients (incidence rate ratios) with p-values in parentheses. The unit of analysis is the publication (rather than study within publication).

Figure C1. Citations of study depending on visibility result and publication year (model 3)





Figure C2. Citations of study depending on visibility result and gender authors (model 6)



Figure C3. Citations depending on visibility result and gender of first author (model 7)



## Appendix D: Detailed Results of Types of Coverage

Table 1 in the paper summarizes the findings of the systematic review on gender differences in the type of coverage. The coded results per study can be found in the full dataset in the supplementary material. In the table below, the results are presented per aspect of coverage and results category. Note that one publication can yield more than one study (e.g., due to multiple samples) per aspect of coverage.

**Table D1.** Results Systematic Review per Aspect of Coverage.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General  Tone  Positive | Men more – significant | Conroy et al. (2015) |
| Miller et al. (2010) |
| Lawrence and Rose (2010) |
| Fridkin and Kenney (2014) |
| Men more – mixed significance | Fernandez-Garcia (2016) |
| Men more – unknown significance | Semetko and Boomgaarden (2007) |
| Ross and Comrie (2012) |
| Rausch et al. (1999) |
| Niven (2005) |
| Equal | Heldman et al. (2005) |
| Kittelson and Fridkin (2008) |
| Semetko and Boomgaarden (2007) |
| Fernandez-Garcia (2016) |
| Bystrom and Dimitrova (2014) |
| Women more – significant | Smith (1997) |
| Robertson et al. (2002) |
| Tor (2011) |
| Women more – mixed significance | Goodyear-Grant (2013) |
| Women more – unknown significance | Lühiste and Banducci (2016) |
| Bystrom et al. (2001) |
| Semetko and Boomgaarden (2007) |
| Horse Race | Men more – significant | Heldman et al. (2005) |
| Men more – mixed significance | - |
| Men more – unknown significance | Niven (2005) |
| Hinojosa (2010) |
| Sampert and Trimble (2003) |
| Equal | Kahn (1994) |
| Devitt (2002) |
| Smith (1997) |
| Jalalzai (2006) |
| Kittelson and Fridkin (2008) |
| Atkeson and Krebs (2008) |
| Bystrom et al. (2001) |
| Banwart et al. (2003) |
| Bode and Hennings (2012) |
| Dunaway et al. (2013) |
| Semetko and Boomgaarden (2007) |
| Ross et al. (2013) |
| Everitt (2003) |
| Trimble (2007) |
| Lavery (2013) |
| Miller (2001) |
| Serini et al. (1998) |
| Lawrence and Rose (2010) |
| Women more – significant | Bode and Hennings (2012) |
| Goodyear-Grant (2013) |
| Women more – mixed significance | Goodyear-Grant (2013) |
| Women more – unknown significance | Dan and Iorgoveanu (2013) |
| Lawrence and Rose (2011) |
| Valenzuela and Correa (2009) |
| Viability Assessment | Men more – significant | Kahn and Goldenberg (1991) |
| Kahn (1994) |
| Jalalzai (2006) |
| Lawrence and Rose (2010) |
| Men more – mixed significance | - |
| Men more – unknown significance | Heldman et al. (2005) |
| Bode and Hennings (2012) |
| Rausch et al. (1999) |
| Falk and Jamieson (2003) |
| Falk (2012) |
| Equal | Atkeson and Krebs (2008) |
| Robertson et al. (2002) |
| Dan and Iorgoveanu (2013) |
| Everitt (2003) |
| Bystrom and Dimitrova (2014) |
| Goodyear-Grant (2013) |
| Women more – significant | Jalalzai (2006) |
| Women more – mixed significance | - |
| Women more – unknown significance | Valenzuela and Correa (2009) |
| Background | Men more – significant | Fernandez-Garcia (2016) |
| Men more – mixed significance | Atkeson and Krebs (2008) |
| Men more – unknown significance | Aday and Devitt (2001) |
| Dan and Iorgoveanu (2013) |
| Bystrom (2005) |
| Equal | Fowler and Lawless (2009) |
| Lavery (2013) |
| Valenzuela and Correa (2009) |
| O’Neill et al. (2016) |
| Fernandez-Garcia (2016) |
| Lawrence and Rose (2010) |
| Goodyear-Grant (2013) |
| Women more – significant | Devitt (2002) |
| Robertson et al. (2002) |
| Miller et al. (2010) |
| Miller (2001) |
| Women more – mixed significance | - |
| Women more – unknown significance | Ross et al. (2013) |
| Everitt (2003) |
| Trimble (2007) |
| O’Neill et al. (2016) |
| Quotes | Men more – significant | Aday and Devitt (2001) |
| Lawrence and Rose (2010) |
| Fridkin and Kenney (2014) |
| Men more – mixed significance | Bystrom (2005) |
| Men more – unknown significance | Ross and Comrie (2012) |
| Dan and Iorgoveanu (2013) |
| O’Neill et al. (2016) |
| Bystrom and Dimitrova (2014) |
| Equal | Gidengil and Everitt (2000) |
| Wagner (2011) |
| Wagner et al. (2017) |
| Goodyear-Grant (2013) |
| Women more – significant | - |
| Women more – mixed significance | - |
| Women more – unknown significance | O’Neill et al. (2016) |
| Physical Appearance | Men more – significant | - |
| Men more – mixed significance | - |
| Men more – unknown significance | Wagner (2011) |
| Bystrom (2005) |
| Equal | Bystrom et al. (2001) |
| Bode and Hennings (2012) |
| Everitt (2003) |
| Fowler and Lawless (2009) |
| O’Neill et al. (2016) |
| Bystrom and Dimitrova (2014) |
| Women more – significant | Heldman et al. (2005) |
| Bode and Hennings (2012) |
| Robertson et al. (2002) |
| Conroy et al. (2015) |
| Valenzuela and Correa (2009) |
| Goodyear-Grant (2013) |
| Women more – mixed significance | Atkeson and Krebs (2008) |
| Miller et al. (2010) |
| Lawrence and Rose (2010) |
| Women more – unknown significance | Aday and Devitt (2001) |
| Dan and Iorgoveanu (2013) |
| Trimble (2007) |
| Niven (2005) |
| O’Neill et al. (2016) |
| Fernandez-Garcia (2016) |
| Falk (2012) |
| Falk (in press) |
| Foster Shoaf and Parsons (2016) |
| Trimble (2017) |
| Family Life | Men more – significant | - |
| Men more – mixed significance | Wagner (2011) |
| Men more – unknown significance | Trimble (2017) |
| Goodyear-Grant (2013) |
| Equal | Heldman et al. (2005) |
| Aday and Devitt (2001) |
| Kittelson and Fridkin (2008) |
| Fowler and Lawless (2009) |
| Lavery (2013) |
| Miller (2001) |
| Bystrom and Dimitrova (2014) |
| Women more – significant | Bystrom et al. (2001) |
| Banwart et al. (2003) |
| Bode and Hennings (2012) |
| Robertson et al. (2002) |
| Conroy et al. (2015) |
| Miller et al. (2010) |
| Lawrence and Rose (2010) |
| Goodyear-Grant (2013) |
| Women more – mixed significance | Atkeson and Krebs (2008) |
| Valenzuela and Correa (2009) |
| Women more – unknown significance | Everitt (2003) |
| Trimble (2007) |
| Niven (2005) |
| Fernandez-Garcia (2016) |
| Foster Shoaf and Parsons (2016) |
| Trait Amount | Men more – significant | - |
| Men more – mixed significance | - |
| Men more – unknown significance | Bystrom (2005) |
| Equal | Dan and Iorgoveanu (2013) |
| Miller et al. (2010) |
| Fowler and Lawless (2009) |
| Lavery (2013) |
| Miller (2001) |
| Hayes and Lawless (2015) |
| Fernandez-Garcia (2016) |
| Bystrom et al. (2012) |
| Fridkin and Kenney (2014) |
| Women more – significant | Dunaway et al. (2013) |
| Women more – mixed significance | Fernandez-Garcia (2016) |
| Women more – unknown significance | Aday and Devitt (2001) |
| Niven (2005) |
| Sampert and Trimble (2003) |
| Mention of Sex | Men more – significant | - |
| Men more – mixed significance | - |
| Men more – unknown significance | Wagner (2011) |
| Trimble (2017) |
| Hayes (2011) |
| Equal | Hayes and Lawless (2015) |
| Women more – significant | Bystrom et al. (2001) |
| Banwart et al. (2003) |
| Miller et al. (2010) |
| Meeks (2012) |
| Valenzuela and Correa (2009) |
| Fernandez-Garcia (2016) |
| Women more – mixed significance | - |
| Women more – unknown significance | Semetko and Boomgaarden (2007) |
| Dan and Iorgoveanu (2013) |
| Niven (2005) |
| Falk (in press) |
| Issue Amount | Men more – significant | Aday and Devitt (2001) |
| Devitt (2002) |
| Dunaway et al. (2013) |
| Fridkin and Kenney (2014) |
| Men more – mixed significance | - |
| Men more – unknown significance | Banwart et al. (2003) |
| Everitt (2003) |
| Wagner (2011) |
| Niven (2005) |
| Hinojosa (2010) |
| Bystrom (2005) |
| Falk and Jamieson (2003) |
| Falk (2012) |
| Equal | Kahn and Goldenberg (1991) |
| Kahn (1994) |
| Heldman et al. (2005) |
| Smith (1997) |
| Jalalzai (2006) |
| Trimble (2007) |
| Conroy et al. (2015) |
| Miller et al. (2010) |
| Lavery (2013) |
| Miller (2001) |
| Serini et al. (1998) |
| Hayes and Lawless (2015) |
| Lawrence and Rose (2010) |
| Goodyear-Grant (2013) |
| Women more – significant | Fowler and Lawless (2009) |
| Women more – mixed significance | Jalalzai (2006) |
| Women more – unknown significance | Robertson et al. (2002) |
| Dan and Iorgoveanu (2013) |
| Leadership Trait Amount | Men more – significant | Bystrom et al. (2001) |
| Aaldering and Van der Pas (2018) |
| Men more – mixed significance | - |
| Men more – unknown significance | Semetko and Boomgaarden (2007) |
| Equal | Miller et al. (2010) |
| Valenzuela and Correa (2009) |
| Hayes and Lawless (2015) |
| Women more – significant | - |
| Women more – mixed significance | - |
| Women more – unknown significance | - |
| Issue Stereotypes | Men more on male stereotypes, women more on female stereotypes - significant | Kahn and Goldenberg (1991) |
| Kittelson and Fridkin (2008) |
| Bode and Hennings (2012) |
| Men more on male stereotypes, women more on female stereotypes – mixed significance | Kahn (1994) |
| Serini et al. (1998) |
| Miller (2001) |
| Goodyear-Grant (2013) |
| Men more on male stereotypes, women more on female stereotypes – unknown significance | Jalalzai (2006) |
| Banwart et al. (2003) |
| Semetko and Boomgaarden (2007) |
| Bystrom et al. (2012) |
| Goodyear-Grant (2013) |
| Men more on male stereotypes, men more on female stereotypes - significant | Bystrom and Dimitrova (2014) |
| Men more on male stereotypes, men more on female stereotypes - mixed significance | Fridkin and Kenney (2014) |
| Women more on male stereotypes, women more on female stereotypes - significant | Meeks (2012) |
| Women more on male stereotypes, women more on female stereotypes – unknown significance | Semetko and Boomgaarden (2007) |
| Women more on male stereotypes, men more on female stereotypes – mixed significance | Kahn (1994) |
| Equal | Smith (1997) |
| Jalalzai (2006) |
| Atkeson and Krebs (2008) |
| Bystrom et al. (2001) |
| Banwart et al. (2003) |
| Bode and Hennings (2012) |
| Robertson et al. (2002) |
| Dan and Iorgoveanu (2013) |
| Lavery (2013) |
| Niven (2005) |
| Hayes and Lawless (2015) |
| Fridkin and Kenney (2014) |
| Kahn (1994) |
| Kittelson and Fridkin (2008) |
| Men more on male stereotypes, women more on female stereotypes – unknown significance | Falk (2012) |
| Women more on male stereotypes, women more on female stereotypes - significant | Meeks (2012) |
| Women more on male stereotypes, women more on female stereotypes – mixed significance | Fridkin and Kenney (2014) |
| Women more on male stereotypes, women more on female stereotypes – unknown significance | Miller et al. (2010) |
| Equal | Kahn (1994) |
| Atkeson and Krebs (2008) |
| Dan and Iorgoveanu (2013) |
| Fridkin and Kenney (2014) |
| Hayes (2011) |