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**Coding Appendix**

Note: The full survey codebook (and eventually the data) is available here: http://pauldjupe.com/data/

**Article reviewing** “How many article reviews have you conducted for academic journals in the past year?  Please check your records to be accurate and then enter a number in the form field.” Values were truncated at 30 (which affected 6 responses).

**Review Requests** “Whether or not you said yes, how many times, if any, were you invited to engage in any type of peer review in the past year? You may not have records, so please use your best judgment and enter a number in the form field.” Values were truncated at 50 (which affected 10 responses).

**Published articles** “How much have you published in the past 3 years? Please enter numbers of publications you have had of each type in the form fields below. Please only record the items that have actually appeared in print (thus, do not include forthcoming work). Academic, peer-reviewed, journal articles.” Values were truncated at 10 (which affected 2 percent of the sample – 14 responses).

**PhD granting institution** “At what sort of institution are you employed (or are you currently unemployed)?” “My institution offers a PhD in political science as its terminal degree”=1, 0 otherwise.

**Published a book** Began with the same introduction as “published articles” and then offered: “Books.” Truncated to 0-1.

**In a non-TT position** “What is your current academic rank?” Coded 1 if “Untenured, not on tenure track,” “Visiting Assistant Professor, not on tenure track,” or “PhD, practitioner” and 0 otherwise.

**Assistants** “What is your current academic rank?” 1= Assistant Professor, on tenure track; 0 otherwise.

**Associates** “What is your current academic rank?” 1= Associate Professor, tenured; 0 otherwise.

**Males** =1, 0=female.

**White** =1, 0=other race.

**Editorial board/editor** “Do you serve on a journal's editorial board and/or are you an editor?” 0=no, 1=yes.

**Reviewing efficacy** Averages responses across the following items (all coded so that agreement/more efficacy is high): “I believe in the value of peer reviewing;” “I can make a difference in the discipline through peer reviewing;” “When I peer review, I feel recognized for my effort;” “Keeping up to date with the latest research is an important reason to peer review;” “Recognition by journal editors is an important reason to peer review;” and “Recognition in the discipline is an important reason to peer review.” α=.71.

**Review uptake rate/Percent of review requests accepted** “How often do you agree to peer review? Please estimate the percentage of requests to review that you agree (or would agree) to complete for journals.” Ranges from 0 to 1.

For Figure 5:

**Believe in PR** “I believe in the value of peer reviewing.”

**PR rarely worth it** “Peer review is rarely worth the time that could be spent in other ways.”

**Keep up with PR** “Keeping up to date with the latest research is an important reason to peer review.”

**Gatekeeping through PR** “Gatekeeping research is an important reason to peer review.”

**Recognized for PR** “When I peer review, I feel recognized for my effort.”

**Professional stature** “Being asked to peer review is a measure of professional stature.”

**PR counts toward tenure** “Peer reviewing \*is\* an important form of “service” that counts toward tenure/promotion.”

**PR should count toward tenure** “Peer reviewing \*should\* be considered a form of service that counts toward tenure/promotion.”