Appendix

A. There were some errors in the original Masuoka, Grofman, and Feld dataset about who was a regular faculty member that we found when we looked at individual faculty websites and CVs. These authors took their data from information provided by each department to the American Political Science Association, but departments varied in who they included on their list of members. The most common problem of comparability was the inclusion on the list of individuals who were lecturers or visiting faculty rather than tenured or tenure track faculty. Because there was no easy way to check the accuracy of the APSA coding for everyone on the 2002 list, we simply took the original dataset coding except in those cases where we were able to replace it with more accurate data. In particular, when we found an error in Ph.D. institution or date of Ph.D. in the dataset we changed the coding accordingly. There were around four dozen corrections made, most for errors in the scholars' year of Ph.D.

B. Gender is estimated on the basis of first names, with a look at university or personal websites in cases of uncertainty. If the name is gender neutral (e.g. Jaimie, Jean, Leslie, etc.), we looked up the faculty member's listed biography and used the third-person gender pronoun listed there to determine gender.

2017 Status of the 3,715 Scholars in the 2002 MGF Database

Title	# of People	% of People
Assistant	31	0.8%
Associate	427	11.5%
Full	1601	43.1%
Emeritus	810	21.8%
Non-Tenure	62	1.7%
University Admin	28	0.8%
Research	54	1.5%
Government	17	0.5%
Non-Academic	51	1.4%
Unknown	218	5.9%

Deceased	416	11.2%
Total	3715	100%

Proportion of Males and Females by Title/Rank

	Males	% Males	Females	% Females	Total
Assistant	164	75.2%	54	24.8%	218
Associate	14	45.2%	17	54.8%	31
Full	277	64.9%	150	35.1%	427
Emeritus	1249	78.0%	352	22.0%	1601
Non-Tenure	708	87.4%	102	12.6%	810
Admin	39	62.9%	23	37.1%	62
Research	18	64.3%	10	35.7%	28
Government	37	68.5%	17	31.5%	54
Other	14	82.4%	3	17.6%	17
Deceased	31	60.8%	20	39.2%	51
NA	379	91.1%	37	8.9%	416
	2930		785		3715

C: Data on the rank of faculty ca. 2002 was not collected by Masuoka and her colleagues, and our efforts to track that data down via the American Political Science Association has proved unavailing. Thus, we cannot directly examine changes in status. Rather we look at present rank of the faculty in the 2002 data by grouping faculty into cohorts by date of their Ph.D.

D. Any university with a PhD program in political science was considered an R1 university. To establish prestige rankings of R1 universities we used the 2017 *U.S. News and World Report*, *"Best Graduate Political Science Programs."* Departments at R1 universities not listed here were ranked at 97, since the last ranking they provided was 96. Treating all unranked universities as equivalent is not fully satisfactory since there were unusual cases of omitted departments of high prestige, most notably CalTech, but *U.S. News* seemed the most consistent recent source to use. We did not assign ranks to non-R1 universities.

E. We searched for each member online, tracking their information through University websites, University news articles, LinkedIn pages, CVs, and other web postings. There were 219 for whom we found no current information. Information about current status was only coded if we could be satisfied that we had correctly matched identities, e.g., if their name matched and their previous work history included the university that existed in the original dataset. A number of those in the list had common names and some scholars changed their names (due to marriage and for other reasons). If there was not a name match but we had good reasons to believe that it was the same person (including a Ph.D. university and Ph.D. year match), we also included them in the updated dataset with a name change.

F. The numbers in each cohort reflect both the original production of Ph.D.s during the period in question who got a job in a Ph.D. granting department and the drop-off caused by deaths and retirements. There is only one person with a Ph.D. received between 1930 and 1934 and two people receiving Ph.D.s in the period from 1935 to 1939 in our dataset, so we combine them with the 1940-1944 cohort to create a pre-1945 category. Similarly, we created a post-2000 category.

2017 Status of the 3,715 Scholars in the 2002 MGF Database

Cohort by PhD Year	# of People	Assistant	Associate	Full	Emeritus	Deceased	Other	Female	Male
Pre-1945	15	0	0	0	3	12	0	1	14
1945-1949	28	0	0	0	4	21	3	2	26
1950-1954	100	0	0	0	33	58	9	4	96
1955-1959	142	0	0	4	46	77	15	5	137
1960-1964	246	0	1	38	113	71	23	12	234
1965-1969	407	1	8	104	205	53	36	39	368
1970-1974	490	2	16	170	213	52	37	59	431
1975-1979	420	2	17	232	114	26	29	88	332
1980-1984	325	0	32	209	44	13	27	86	239
1985-1989	362	1	50	238	20	18	34	94	268
1990-1994	491	4	106	286	11	7	77	149	342
1995-1999	530	13	140	264	4	5	104	177	353

Post-2000	159	8	57	56	0	3	38	69	90

G. By categorizing the dataset in regards to those in Ph.D.-granting institutions in the US, non-Ph.D.-granting institutions in the US, and those that went international, we are left with 2,492 living and non-emeritus (2,273, excluding those for whom we have no information), of whom 2,060 are tenure track professors in the dataset. Out of those, 150 are at non-Ph.D.-granting institutions, 1,844 are at U.S. Ph.D.-granting institutions, and 65 have gone international (one professor kept the title without explicitly stating their current affiliation).

H. *For Professors:* Twenty-three retired professors who did not explicitly identify their status as emeritus, are included in the category of emeritus professors. The current position listed includes non-Ph.D. institutions as well as community colleges. Essentially, it includes professors from all institutions, including departmental chairs. Nine of the professors listed are currently departmental chairs. For *Non-Tenured*: Non-Tenure includes lecturers, visiting scholars, and adjuncts. We have placed the 20 adjunct faculty in the non-tenured category so as to avoid too many categories. Most of the faculty listed as adjuncts (16 of 20) do not have a tenured position in another unit. For *University Administration*: This includes those who have taken up administrative positions within the university that are unrelated to being a faculty member in the political science department. It includes two chancellors, eight deans, fourteen Directors of Centers, and four others with miscellaneous administrative positions within some academic institution. For *Non-Academics*: Some scholars who took a non-academic route have pursued careers that draw on their Ph.D. training, such as the fourteen people who went into consulting, and the nine who left to pursue other forms of education, serving as principals or teachers at

elementary, middle, and high schools. Others have become tutors, authors, curriculum editors, journalists etc. Twenty-two have gone into the business/private sector, two into religion (i.e. clerics), one into the military, and one remains unemployed.

I. Of course, date of Ph.D is confounded with likelihood of becoming a full professor since the "normative" time to become a full professor is twelve years. Still, all cohorts in our 2002 dataset would have had more than twelve years to rise to the rank of Full Professor. The handful of those who are still only assistant professors are presumably at a different university from the one at which they began their career.

J. "Same" ranking, different university is measured as a move to an institution that has a ranking within 5 ranks of the previous department. As noted earlier, we treat R1 institutions that were unranked as being ranked at 97 since the *U.S. News* ranking ends at 96. Those who moved to international institutions are excluded since *U.S. News* does not provide rankings for them.

K. Many social media initiatives have begun to promote the work of women political scientists to decrease the gender, and citation, gap through platforms such as Women Also Know Stuff and the online Gender Balance Assessment Tool (Beaulieu et al. 2017; Sumner 2018). APSA's Committee for the Status of Women in the Profession (CSWP) has also been making strides in regards to overcoming these challenges, building networks and mentor programs, as well as creating awareness of discrimination. Nadia Brown has integrated the race discrimination literature and gender gap literature in examining the scholarship of women of color in the discipline (Brown et al. 2017). Her goal has been to help women of color navigate the hurdles of professional development.

L.

Proportion of those in Non-R1 Jobs by Gender and Cohort

Cohort	Period	# Non R1	% of Non R1	% Non R1 Female	% Non R1 Male
1	pre-1945	0	0%	0%	0%
2	1945-1949	0	0%	0%	0%
3	1950-1954	1	1%	0%	1.0%
4	1955-1959	1	1%	0%	0.7%
5	1960-1964	2	1%	0%	0.9%
6	1965-1969	8	2%	0%	2.2%
7	1970-1974	15	3%	1.7%	3.2%
8	1975-1979	20	5%	3.4%	5.1%
9	1980-1984	14	4%	1.2%	5.4%
10	1985-1989	26	7%	3.2%	8.6%
11	1990-1994	54	11%	12.8%	10.2%
12	1995-1999	84	16%	13.6%	17.0%
13	post-2000	35	22%	24.6%	20.0%