Tables

Table 1.
Study Details: Participant Gender, Mean Age/SD and Split by Information Condition.

Study	**Total *N* – Hidden Profile (Pre-Exclusion)**	**Total Hidden Profile Gender Split (Pre-exclusion)**	**Total *N* – Hidden Profile (Post-Exclusion)**	**Total Hidden Profile Gender Split (Post-exclusion): M/F**	**Total *N* - Manifest Profile**	**Total Manifest Profile Gender Split: M/F**
1	42	22 males 19 females (1 gender undisclosed)	33	20 Males (M_{age} = 27.55, *SD* = 6.37), Age Range = 18-40 13 Females (M_{age} = 35.54, *SD* = 12.00), Age Range = 24-64	37	20 males (M_{age} = 30.45, *SD* = 11.02), Age Range = 18-55 17 females (M_{age} = 28.18, *SD* = 5.35), Age Range = 19-38
2	84	42 males 41 females (1 gender undisclosed)	67	33 Males (M_{age} = 34.67, *SD* = 10.25), Age Range = 19-62 34 Females (M_{age} = 35.38, *SD* = 7.99), Age Range = 24-53	76	36 males (M_{age} = 33.08, *SD* = 10.68), Age Range = 19-63 40 females (M_{age} = 32.87, *SD* = 11.05), Age Range = 18-61
3	87	45 males 42 females	56	27 Males (M_{age} = 30.48, *SD* = 9.42), Age Range = 19-58 29 Females (M_{age} = 37.31, *SD* = 11.73), Age Range = 21-61	73	40 males (M_{age} = 30.63, *SD* = 9.74), Age Range = 19-61 33 females (M_{age} = 34.82, *SD* = 10.95), Age Range = 20.57
4	110	53 males 57 females (1 gender undisclosed)	70	35 Males (M_{age} = 32.30, *SD* = 10.23), Age Range = 21-60 35 Females (M_{age} = 35.63, *SD* = 12.54), Age Range – 20-62	126	64 males (M_{age} = 32.73, *SD* = 9.33), Age Range = 18-57 62 females (M_{age} = 36.26, *SD* = 12.35), Age Range = 18-66 (2 gender undisclosed)
5	147	79 males 64 females	109	61 Males (M_{age} = 33.28, *SD* = 8.98), Age Range = 21-60	132	62 males (M_{age} = 34.35, *SD* = 8.93), Age Range = 20-62 (1 age undisclosed)

		(4 gender undisclosed)		48 Females (M_{age} = 34.44, *SD* = 9.61), Age Range = 21-63		69 female (M_{age} = 34.30, *SD* = 8.68), Age Range = 22-59 (1 gender undisclosed)
6	165	82 males 83 females	137	73 Males (M_{age} = 26.74 *SD* = 9.21), Age Range = 18-61 64 Females (M_{age} = 27.30, *SD* = 8.90), Age Range = 18-57	N/A	
7	174	93 males 81 females	126	65 Males (M_{age} = 31.35 *SD* = 11.81), Age Range = 18-67 61 Females (M_{age} = 32.39, *SD* = 12.04), Age Range = 18-62	N/A	
8	79	38 males 41 females	56	24 Males (M_{age} = 31.75, *SD* = 11.42), Age Range = 19-54 32 Females (M_{age} = 25.84, *SD* = 6.42), Age Range = 18-44	77	49 males (M_{age} = 27.84, *SD* = 10.04), Age Range = 18-67 28 females (M_{age} = 31.64, *SD* = 12.80), Age Range = 19-61
9	78	42 males 36 females	52	27 Males (M_{age} = 32.15, *SD* = 15.80), Age Range = 18-68 25 Females (M_{age} = 32.96, *SD* = 12.03), Age Range = 19-64	76	42 males (M_{age} = 33.05, *SD* = 14.51), Age Range = 18-74 34 females (M_{age} = 33.03, *SD* = 11.95), Age Range = 18-62

Table 2.
Hidden Profile Results By Hypotheses (excludes participants who did not select the intended initial preference).

H No.	**Hypothesis Description**	**Overall Results**				**Heterogeneity**				
		OR/ Cohen's d	90% CI	Z-Value	*p*-value	Q	P_q	I^2%	T^2	T
1[2]	Female participants will be better able to overcome the IPE and demonstrate more improved decision-making than their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	0.56[1]	0.36,0.88	-2.38	.017	13.23	.10	39.54	0.18	0.43
2[3]	Female participants will be more confident in the Optimal Candidate (A) than their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	0.14	-0.07,0.34	1.21	.23	14.27	0.08	43.93	0.04	0.20
3[4]	Female participants will be less confident in the Suboptimal Candidate (C) than their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	-0.15	-0.36,0.05	-1.39	.16	14.07	0.08	43.13	0.04	0.20
4[3]	Female participants will report lower overall confidence in their candidate selection decision compared to their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	0.20	0.07,0.33	2.93	.00	6.49	0.59	0	0	0
5[3]	Female participants will report less difficulty in correcting and amending their candidate selection decision than their male counterparts, having viewed full candidate attribute information.	-0.09	-0.26,0.09	-0.95	.34	10.75	0.22	25.61	0.02	0.14

Note[1]. Odds Ratio for H1 and Cohen's d for H2-H5.
Note[2]. N = 699.
Note[3]. N = 704
Note.[4] N =702

Table 2 *(a).*
Hidden Profile Results By Hypotheses (includes all participants irrespective of selection the intended initial preference).

H No.	**Hypothesis Description**	**Overall Results**				**Heterogeneity**				
		OR/ Cohen's d	90% CI	Z-Value	*p*-value	Q	P_q	I^2%	T^2	T
***1*[2,2a]**	Female participants will demonstrate more improved decision-making than their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	0.93[1,1a]	0.74,1.18	-0.54	.586	3.07	.93	0	0	0
		0.61[1,1b]	0.43,0.86	-2.65	.008	12.82	.12	37.61	0.11	0.33
***2*[3]**	Female participants will be more confident in the Optimal Candidate (A) than their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	0.17	0.05,0.29	2.59	.01	8.09	0.43	1.07	0	0.02
***3*[4]**	Female participants will be less confident in the Suboptimal Candidate (C) than their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	-0.06	-0.25,0.12	-0.64	.52	16.50	0.04	51.51	0.04	0.20
***4*[3]**	Female participants will report lower overall confidence in their candidate selection decision compared to their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	0.18	0.10,0.25	4.42	.00	3.01	0.93	0	0	0
***5*[3]**	Female participants will report less difficulty in correcting and amending their candidate selection decision than their male counterparts, having viewed full candidate attribute information.	-0.07	-0.21,0.06	-0.98	.33	9.45	0.31	15.36	0.01	0.08

Note[1]. Odds Ratio for H1 and Cohen's d for H2-H5.
Note[1a,1b.] Top row = gender differences at Time 1 (partial information); Second Row = gender differences at Time 2 (full information).
Note[2]. N = 964.
Note[2a.] N = 954.
Note[3.] N = 962
Note[4] N =960

Table 3.
Manifest Profile - Results compared to Hidden Profile hypotheses (Seven studies only)

H No.	**Hypothesis Description**	**Overall Results**				**Heterogeneity**				
		OR/ Cohen's d	90% CI	Z-Value	*p*-value	Q	P_q	I^2%	T^2	T
***1*[2,3]**	Female participants will demonstrate more improved decision-making than their male counterparts when presented with a one-page structured Manifest Profile (comprising full candidate attribute information).	0.76[1]	0.54,1.06	-1.60	.110	4.44	0.62	0	0	0
***2*[2]**	Female participants will be more confident in the Optimal Candidate (A) than their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	0.07	-0.09,0.22	0.83	.41	5.47	0.49	0	0	0
***3*[2]**	Female participants will be less confident in the Suboptimal Candidate (C) than their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	-0.12	-0.36,0.12	-1.00	.32	11.60	0.07	48.27	0.05	0.21
***4*[2]**	Female participants will report lower overall confidence in their candidate selection decision compared to their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	0.01	-0.17,0.19	0.08	.93	7.52	0.28	20.26	0.01	0.11

Note[1]. Odds Ratio for H1 and Cohen's d for H2-H4.
Note[2]. N = 597.
Note[3]. Since there is only one decision point in the Manifest Profile condition, this decision quality comparison is simply whether male/female participants chose the correct candidate (Candidate A) at the single decision point.