Appendix Table 1. Testing the Validity of Tweet-Based Ideology Measure

	All legislators	Only Democrats	Only Democrats	Only Republicans	Only Republicans
Twitter Ideology	3.090**	0.634**	0.216*	0.792**	0.413**
	(0.171)	(0.138)	(0.113)	(0.122)	(0.112)
State Fixed Effects			included		included
Constant	-0.314**	-1.059**		0.858**	
	(0.033)	(0.022)		(0.027)	
Observations	1,722	782	782	937	937
Adjusted R-squared	0.159	0.026	0.55	0.043	0.477

Notes: Dependent variable in all models is roll call ideology measure taken from Shor and McCarty (2011). Observations are all state lower house legislators elected before 2016 with Twitter accounts. Standard errors in parentheses, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Appendix Table 2. How does Legislative Professionalism Shape the Impact of Gender on Twitter Activity?

	Does the Legislator have a Handle?	Tweet Count	Tobit Model
Female Legislator	0.127**	197.543*	416.702**
	(0.031)	(109.611)	(113.095)
Female Legislator * Squire Index	-0.104	-336.456	-417.191
	(0.111)	(396.981)	(432.828)
Democratic Legislator	0.053**	310.355**	354.673**
	(0.013)	(45.477)	(46.348)
State Fixed Effects	included	included	included

Observations	5,323	3,066	5,323
Adjusted R-squared	0.159	0.082	

Notes: Observations are all state lower house legislators in the first and third models, and all state legislators with Twitter accounts in the second model. Standard errors in parentheses, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05, one-tailed test

Appendix Table 3. How does Legislative Professionalism Shape the Impact of Gender on Sentiment and Attention to "Women's Issues"?

	Sentiment Score	Women's Issues	Education	Health Care
Female Legislator	3.362 (2.416)	1.487** (0.306)	0.674** (0.223)	0.813** (0.208)
Female Legislator * Squire Index	1.24 (8.243)	-3.320** (1.128)	-1.422 (0.714)	-1.898** (0.696)
Democratic Legislator	-4.992** (0.988)	0.782** (0.128)	0.263** (0.094)	0.519** (0.086)
State Fixed Effects	included	included	included	included
Observations	3,066	3,066	3,066	3,066
Adjusted R-squared	0.108	0.087	0.087	0.060

Notes: Observations are all state lower house legislators with Twitter accounts. Standard errors in parentheses, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05, one-tailed test

Appendix Table 4. Controlling for Years Since First Election to Estimate the Impact of Gender on Twitter Activity

	Does the Legislator have a Handle?	Tweet Count	Tobit Model
Female Legislator	0.100** (0.032)	253.707* (113.562)	424.168** (116.218)

Years Since First Elected	-0.013** (0.002)	-7.538 (7.807)	-35.614** (8.664)
Democratic Legislator	0.024 (0.031)	430.635** (112.888)	282.917** (106.756)
State Fixed Effects	included	included	included
Observations	914	548	914
Adjusted R-squared	0.219	0.143	

Notes: Observations are all state lower house legislators in the first and third models, and all state legislators with Twitter accounts in the second model. Standard errors in parentheses, ** $p<0.01$, * $p<0.05$, one-tailed test

Appendix Table 5. Controlling for Years Since First Election to Estimate the Impact of Gender on Sentiment and Attention to "Women's Issues"

	Sentiment Score	Women's Issues	Education	Health Care
Female Legislator	2.438 (2.374)	1.010** (0.383)	0.615* (0.361)	0.395* (0.173)
Years Since First Elected	0.031 (0.282)	0.032 (0.042)	0.018 (0.041)	0.014 (0.016)
Democratic Legislator	-7.894** (2.433)	0.986** (0.337)	0.385 (0.291)	0.601** (0.170)
State Fixed Effects	included	included	included	included
Observations	548	548	548	548
Adjusted R-squared	0.089	0.127	0.120	0.042

Notes: Observations are all state lower house legislators with Twitter accounts. Standard errors in parentheses, ** $p<0.01$, * $p<0.05$, one-tailed test