Online Appendix

Engaging Women: Addressing the Gender Gap in Women's Networking and Productivity

Tiffany D. Barnes
tiffanydbarnes@uky.edu

Emily Beaulieu
emily.beaulieu@uky.edu

Online Appendix

Summary of Programs Addressing the Gender Gap

CeMent: **"**The CeMENT mentoring workshops are funded by the American Economic Association to help female junior economists overcome the tenure hurdle…At the mentoring workshops, participants are arranged into small groups based on their teaching/research areas and matched with a senior mentor. The format and curriculum are designed to create and cement relationships among the participants, as well as between the participants and the mentors. Small and large group sessions will address issues such as identifying successful teaching strategies, tips from journal editors, networking strategies, work/life balance, and issues regarding the tenure process." For more details see: https://www.aeaweb.org/committees/cswep/mentoring/.

Journeys in World Politics: "The Journeys workshop brings together junior and senior women working in International Relations. The weekend experience is highlighted by research presentations by junior scholars, feedback on research from conference participants, sessions on career and gender topics (e.g., networking, mentoring, balancing family & work, women in the classroom, negotiations), and oral autobiographies by senior scholars." For more details see: http://www.saramitchell.org/journeys.html

Description of the VIM Recruitment Process[1]

For the first few years of the conference (2008-2012) the call was targeted to those women who were identified as methodologists. These early hosts put a great deal of effort into identifying women working in methodology: reviewing past Polmeth summer meeting programs, and programs from the methods sections of APSA & MPSA, searching department websites, identifying graduate students of known methodologists, and eventually creating a listserv. In more recent years (2013-2015), calls were distributed more widely, both through the now-extant VIM listserv and through other professional venues: Polmeth, MPSA, APSA, etc. Across the years, many of the conferences have sought to balance types of methodology, rank of attendants, and range of institutions represented; some have selected a particular methodological or substantive focus. Consistent to all descriptions of recruitment, however, was the review of

---

[1] Based on narrative descriptions provided by all former VIM hosts, at the request of the authors.

proposals by multiple individuals, and selection of those proposals perceived to be of the highest

quality.

Summary Statistics for VIM Attendees

Summary statistics were collected based on information available for each year's conference on the website.

Table A1: VIM Attendees by Number of Times Attended

Times Attending	Attendees
1	64
2	7
3	4
4	2
5	2
Total	**79**

Table A2: VIM Attendees by Professional Rank and Conference Cohort

Rank	2008	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Full	3	5	4	5	3	**20**
Associate	4	3	3	4	4	**18**
Assistant	14	11	12	6	10	**53**
Postdoc			1	1	1	**3**
Lecturer					1	**1**
Graduate Student			6	3	4	**13**
Total	**21**	**19**	**26**	**19**	**23**	**108**

Discussion of Survey Design, Participation, & Differential Response Rates

In fielding this survey, we targeted individuals who has attended VIM who we expected to have reaped maximal benefit from the conference—those presenting and receiving feedback on their research. The figure of 79 participants listed on pg. 6 includes individuals who have attended in another capacity—paper discussant, professional development facilitator—but have not presented a paper. Such individuals may also be benefitting from VIM, but likely not to the same extent as individuals who get to present and receive feedback on their research. Two VIM

participants were overlooked—though the institution for one of these individuals was included in the sample, the other was not. These omissions were completely random and we have no reason to think that this affected the survey results.

The survey was fielded with a mailer feature in Qualtrics, which allows us to identify those individuals who took the survey and those who did not. Results were anonymized so that we cannot match any particular results to a given participant. An additional 58 individuals were included in the original sample, but could not be reached by email and, thus, did not receive the survey.

Approximately 66% of VIM participants who received our email responded to the survey, compared to approximately 33% of individuals in the comparison group.

This difference in response rates is likely explained by the fact that we primed the VIM attendees to respond by telling them they were being surveyed because they attended VIM. Comparison group members, by contrast, just received a request to take a survey about professional development, with a focus on methodology.

We might be concerned about differential response rates if we thought there was something systematic driving the lower response rate among non-VIM participants. As Table A3 shows below, there are no systematic differences that predict who took our survey and who did not, such that we would be concerned that there were distinctive characteristics driving the lower response rate in the comparison group.

We might also be concerned about the differential response rates if we had assigned a random treatment—then this would be an indication of an intent-to-treat problem. But since there was no treatment assigned in this study, this is also not a concern.

Table A3: Factors Predicting Survey Participation in the Comparison Group

	Model 1
Sex (Female=1)	.052
	(.159)
Tenure-track Rank	.003
	(.002)
PhD Rank	.003
	(.003)
Years to PhD	-14.131
	(643.662)
Assistant	-13.933
	(643.662)
Associate	-14.027
	(643.662)
Postdoc	-14.801
	(643.663)

Constant	13.150
	(643.662)
N	773
Pseudo R^2	.009

Note: Logit coefficients (standard errors).

*P<.05

Table A3 shows there are no significant factors predicting participation in our survey. This model excludes VIM participants, as they were targeted separately, with an additional email. When VIM participants are included, gender is a significant predictive factor in participation. This is to be expected, as all VIM participants are women. In order to include all recipients of the recruitment email, missing information for individuals (most typically Ph.D.-granting institution and ranking information for individuals at universities outside the US) was coded as 0. Results are robust to dropping observations with missing data as well.

Method for calculating rates of article submission

For VIM participants the average rate of article submission was calculated by asking how many submissions since VIM, and then dividing by years since VIM; for comparison group women and men, the average is calculated based on asking how many submissions in the past 3 years, and then dividing by 3.

Survey Instrument

[All Participants]

[Consent in separate document]

[Note: VIM is Visions in Methodology, a methodological conference]

[Instructions:]

Please consider the following questions. You may skip any question you do not wish to answer.

1. How would you characterize your overall approach to research?
   a. Mostly Quantitative
   b. Mostly Qualitative
   c. Mostly Mixed-methods
   d. Mostly Normative theory
   e. Mostly Formal Theory
   f. Mostly Experimental

2. Which of the following methods do you use in your research? (Select all that apply)
   a. Statistical analysis
   b. Experiments
   c. Surveys
   d. Long-form interviews

      e. Historical analysis
      f. Text or content analysis
      g. Other [text box]

3. In terms of your work, would you describe yourself as someone who takes independent initiative or is more responsive to suggestions from mentors and peers?
[Slider scale, 0 = completely independent, 100 = completely responsive]

4. How well does the term "methodologist" describe you?
      a. Not at all like me
      b. Not much like me
      c. Somewhat like me
      d. Quite a lot like me
      e. Just like me

5. How much professional support do you feel like you receive from peers and mentors?
      a. None
      b. Little
      c. Some
      d. A Lot

6. How true is the following statement for you: I have high self-esteem
[Scale 1 – 7]

7. How often do you feel qualified to do each aspect of your job as a faculty member or graduate student (select N/A if one of the options is not a part of your job)

[Scale: All the time, Most of the time, Some of the time, Almost none of the time, Never, N/A]
- Teaching
- Researching
- Service
- Mentoring Graduate Students
- Mentoring Undergraduate Students

8. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself
      a. Strongly Agree
      b. Agree
      c. Disagree
      d. Strongly Disagree

9. How well does the following statement describe you: I decide how well I am doing at my job based on the performance of others in my profession.
[Scale 0 to 100, Not at all to Describes me perfectly]

10. For the next set of questions, consider how well each statement describes you
[Options are: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree]
- I can handle the challenges I face in this profession
- At times I think I am no good at all
- When I have difficult professional decisions to make, I have peers and mentors I can turn to for help.
- I am able to do things as well as most other people in this profession
- I feel I do not have many professional accomplishments to be proud of

11. How many National or Regional political science conferences have you been to in 2013 (APSA, ISA, MPSA, etc)?
   a. One
   b. Two
   c. More than two

12. Have you ever in your academic career attended a VIM conference?
   - Yes
   - No

13. Have you been to any other smaller, specialized political science conferences in the past year?
   a. Yes
   b. No

[Next set of questions are shown only to respondents who attended VIM]

14. What year did you attend VIM?
   [Open text-box]

15. Did someone encourage you to apply, or did you decide to apply on your own?
   a. Encouraged to apply
   b. Applied on my own
   c. Don't remember

16. Who encouraged you to apply?
   a. Peer
   b. Faculty advisor
   c. Other mentor

17. How useful was VIM for you?
   a. Very Useless
   b. Useless
   c. Somewhat Useless
   d. Somewhat Useful

e. Useful
f. Very Useful

18. [If useful] In what ways was the conference useful [check all that apply]:
    a. Professional advice
    b. Feedback on research
    c. Networking
    d. Other reasons [text box]

19. [If useless] Why was VIM conference useless [check all that apply]:
    a. Professional advice was not helpful
    b. Feedback on research was not helpful
    c. Networking was not helpful
    d. Other reasons? [text box]
20. About how many conferences have you attended since VIM?
    [Categories of # of conferences, 1-3, 4-6, etc]

21. How many new co-authorships have you developed since VIM?
    [Categories of # of conferences, 1-3, 4-6, etc]

22. How many new mentorship relationships have you entered since VIM (either as mentor or mentee)
    [Categories of # of conferences, 1-3, 4-6, etc]

23. How many new independent research projects have you started since VIM?
    [Categories of # of conferences, 1-3, 4-6, etc]

24. How many manuscripts have you submitted for review to a journal since VIM?
    [Categories of # of conferences, 1-3, 4-6, etc]
25. How many grant proposals have you submitted since VIM (internal or external)?
    [Categories of # of conferences, 1-3, 4-6, etc]
26. How many job offers have you had since VIM? [Categories of # of conferences, 1-3, 4-6, etc]
27. How many interviews have you had since VIM? [Categories of # of conferences, 1-3, 4-6, etc, also, "have not gone on the job market since VIM"]

[Next questions shown to all participants]

28. How many conferences have you attended in the past three years?
    [Categories of # of conferences, 1-3, 4-6, etc]

29. How many new co-authorships have you developed in the past three years? [Categories of # of conferences, 1-3, 4-6, etc]

30. How many new mentorship relationships have you entered in the past three years as a mentee [Categories of # of conferences, 1-3, 4-6, etc]

31. How many new independent research projects have you started in the past three years? [Categories of # of conferences, 1-3, 4-6, etc]

32. How many manuscripts have you submitted for review to a journal in the past three years? [Categories of # of conferences, 1-3, 4-6, etc]

IF Anything other than 0 selected:

To which of the following types of journals have you submitted manuscripts? (select all that apply)

> Top three general journals (APSR, AJPS, JOP)
> Top journals in your subfield
> Second tier general journals
> Second tier journals in your subfield
> Other types of journals

33. Have you applied for Academic Jobs in the past 3 years

If Yes: How many interviews have you had in the past three years? [Categories of # of conferences, 1-3, 4-6, etc]

34. How many job offers have you had in the past three years? [Categories of # of conferences, 1-3, 4-6, etc]

35. How many grant proposals have you submitted in the past three years (internal or external)? [Categories of # of conferences, 1-3, 4-6, etc]

36. What percentage of your research effort was devoted to writing a book in the past three years? [% 0 to 100]

37. [Only for those who have not attended VIM] Are you familiar with VIM?
   * Yes
   * No

38. What year were you born?

39. How many years ago did you obtain your PhD [categories of years]

40. Are you male or female?

- Male
- Female

41. What is your current status?

- Single, never married
- Married without children
- Married with children
- Divorced
- Separated
- Widowed
- Living w/ partner

42. What is your race?

- White/Caucasian
- African American
- Hispanic
- Asian
- Native American
- Pacific Islander
- Other

43. Are you currently on the job market, or have you been on the job market within the past year?

- Yes
- No

44. When was the last time you were on the job market? (how many years ago) [Categories of years]

45. Was your Ph.D. completed (dissertation defended) when you began applying for jobs?

- Yes
- No

46. About many years were you in graduate school before you submitted articles for publication?

- one year
- two years
- three years
- four years
- five years
- I never submitted articles for publication while in graduate school

47. How would you describe the institution where you received your Ph.D.?

- Elite
- Top 10
- Top 25
- Top 50
- Lower-ranked Research Institution

48. Are you currently employed in a Tenure Track position?

- Yes
- No

49. How would you describe the institution where you work?

- Elite
- Top 10
- Top 25
- Top 50
- Lower-Ranked Research Institution
- Liberal Arts Institution
- Regional/teaching College

50. How many faculty in your department?

- fewer than 10
- 10-15
- 16-20
- 21-25
- 26-30
- 31-35
- More than 35

51. How many female faculty members are there in your department?

- None
- fewer than 10
- 10-15
- 16-20
- 21-25
- 26-30
- 31-35
- More than 35

52. How many faculty members of color are there in your department?

- None
- fewer than 10
- 10-15
- 16-20
- 21-25
- 26-30
- 31-35
- More than 35

53. How many female faculty and/or faculty of color at rank of full professor in your department?

- None
- fewer than 10
- 10-15
- 16-20
- 21-25
- 26-30
- 31-35
- More than 35

54. How important is your gender to your professional identity?

- Not at all Important
- Very Unimportant
- Somewhat Unimportant
- Somewhat Important
- Very Important
- Extremely Important

55. Do you belong to any gender-specific political science organizations?

- Yes
- No

56. Do you belong to any political science organizations specific to your race or ethnicity?

- Yes
- No

57. [Visible only to women] Do you think that the career success of other female academics in

political science will have something to do with your own career?

- Yes
- No

58. [Visible only to women] Do you think it will affect you a lot, some, or not very much?

- A lot
- Some
- Not very much

59. [Visible only to VIM participants] Do you have any additional comments on your VIM experience? [Open Text Box]