**Online Appendix for When and Where Do Women’s Legislative Caucuses Emerge?**

**Table 1 Caucus Formation Sources**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| State | Year Caucus Founded | Source Used |
| Alaska | 1985 | DeVries, Edna. Email Communication. 12 July 2016. (former state legislator) |
| Arkansas | 1991 | Spring 1992 CAWP newsletter |
| California | 1985 | Caucus website |
| Colorado | 2009 | Middleton, Karen. Telephone Interview. 11 March 2011. (founder, former legislator) |
| Delaware | 1993 | Summer/Fall CAWP newsletter in 1994  |
| Florida | 1975 | Bloom, Elaine. Telephone Interview. 29 June 2016. (co-founder and former state legislator) |
| Georgia | 1990 | Orrock, Nan. Personal Interview. 26 July 2009. (state legislator) |
| Hawaii | 1986 | Summer 1994 CAWP newsletter |
| Illinois | 1979 | Caucus website |
| Indiana | 1993 | Gard, Beverly. Telephone Interview. 9 May 2011. (state legislator) |
| Iowa | 1981 | Winter 1989 CAWP newsletter |
| Kansas | 1983 | Wagnon, Joan. Telephone Interview. 24 June 2016. (former state legislator) |
| Louisiana | 1986 | Caucus website  |
| Maryland | 1972 | Caucus website |
| Massachusetts | 1975 | Caucus website |
| Mississippi | 1988 | Spring 1992 CAWP newsletter |
| Missouri | 1980 | Mueller (1984) edited volume |
| Nebraska | 1992 | Schimek, Diana. Telephone Interview. 19 October 2015. (former state legislator) |
| New Mexico | 1997 | Spring 1998 CAWP newsletter |
| New York | 1983 | New York State General Assembly |
| North Carolina | 1981 | Summer 1994 CAWP newsletter |
| Oregon | 1973 | Cease, Jane. Telephone Interview. 1 July 2016. (former state legislator) |
| Pennsylvania | 1987 | Ritter, Karen. Telephone Interview. 20 October 2015. (former state legislator) |
| Rhode Island | 1988 | Letter from Linda Kushner, then president of the organization, requesting meeting space in December 1988 /\*also mentioned in Spring 1989 CAWP newsletterKushner, Linda. Personal Interview. 2 August 2011. (former state legislator) |
| South Carolina | 2004 | Kanthak, Kristin, and George A. Krause. 2012. The Diversity Paradox: Political Parties, Legislatures, and the Organizational Foundations of Representation in America. New York: Oxford University Press. 138. |
| Texas | 1992 | Spring 1992 CAWP newsletter |
| Vermont | 1980 | Confirmed by State Archives and Records Administration/Personal communication |
| Virginia | 1981 | Spring 1989 CAWP newsletter |
| West Virginia | 1988 | Summer 1994 CAWP |
| Wisconsin | 1985 | Robson, Judith. Telephone Interview. 21 March 2016. (founder and former state legislator) |
| Wyoming | 2006 | Turley, Melissa. Telephone Interview. 22 February 2011. |

Sources: Bloom, Elaine. Telephone Interview. 29 June 2016.
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**Table 2 Pearson’s Correlation Between Independent Variables**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | % Women StateLegislators | % Women State Legislators Squared | Dem. Control of State Legislature | Black Caucus | Leg. Prof. | Party Competition (Ranney Index) | % Women State Legislators\* Dem.Control of StateLegislature |
| % State Legislators  | 1.00 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| % Women State LegislatorsSquared | .965 | 1.00 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Dem. Control of State Legislature | -.332 | -.263 | 1.00 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Black Caucus | -.236 | -.224 | .228 | 1.00 | -- | -- | -- |
| Leg. Prof. | -.159 | -.143 | .067 | .397 | 1.00 | -- | -- |
| Party Competition | .345 | .286 | -.392 | .019 | .191 | 1.00 | -- |
| % of Women State Legislators\*Dem. Control of State Legislature | .265 | .275 | .672 | .029 | -.011 | -.002 | 1.00 |

**Table 3 Estimating Women’s Caucus Emergence with Different Assumptions about Duration Dependency**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | No Duration Dependency | Linear | Quadratic | Natural Log |
| Percentage of Women State Legislators | .093(.061) | .11(.069) | .099(.062) | .07(.088) |
| Percentage of Women State Legislators Squared | -.001(.001) | -.001(.001) | -.001(.001) | -.001(.002) |
| Democratic Control of State Legislature | .138(.648) | -.009(.599) | -.133(.607) | .039(.639) |
| Black Caucus | -.296(.728) | -.137(.718) | -.105(.714) | -.444(.708) |
| Legislative Professionalism | .579(1.86) | .053(2.14) | -.073(2.07) | .883(2.11) |
| Party Competition (Ranney Index) | -.613(1.53) | -.833(1.45) | -.909(1.46) | -.23(1.47) |
| Percentage of Women State Legislators\*Democratic Control of State Legislature | .031(.028) | .038(.026) | .044\*(.026) | .034(.027) |
| Duration Dependency | -- | -.023(.022) | -.001\*(.0004) | .079(.308) |
| Constant | -3.99\*\*(.159) | -3.64\*\*(1.49) | -3.54\*\*(1.5) | -4.23\*\*\*(1.52) |
| Number of Observations | 1217 | 1217 | 1217 | 1168 |
| Log Pseudolikelihood | -218.26 | -217.56 | -216.71 | -213.39 |
| Pseudo R-Squared | .076 | .079 | .082 | .075 |

Note: Table entries are estimated coefficients of a logistic regression model. Robust standard errors are in parentheses and are clustered by state.

\*p≤.10, \*\* p≤.05. and \*\*\* p≤.01

**Table 4 Results from the Test of the Proportional Hazards Assumption**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Test | Chi-Squared | Degrees of Freedom | P>Chi-Squared |
| Schoenfeld residuals (global test) | 36.25 | 7 | .0001 |

Note: Rejection of the null hypothesis indicates that the proportional hazards assumption has not been met, thus making the Cox proportional hazards model an inappropriate one to employ.

**Table 5 Estimating Women’s Caucus Emergence with Different Cutoff Points about which States are At-Risk**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | 5% Cutoff for % Women State Legislators | 10% Cutoff for % Women State Legislators | 15% Cutoff Point for % Women State Legislators | 20% Cutoff Point for % Women State Legislators |
| Percentage of Women State Legislators | -.008(.114) | -.041(.207) | -.002(.37) | 1.04\*\*\*(.395) |
| Percentage of Women State Legislators Squared | .001(.002) | .001(.004) | .001(.007) | -.017\*\*\*(.007) |
| Democratic Control of State Legislature | .18(.675) | .292(.867) | -.472(1.71) | -4.31\*(2.55) |
| Black Caucus | -.532(.731) | -.886(.808) | -1.23(1.11) | -2.59\*(1.52) |
| Legislative Professionalism | 1.24(2.27) | 1.16(2.63) | -1.7(4.34) | -1.57(6.6) |
| Party Competition (Ranney Index) | -.357(1.7) | 1.17(1.94) | 1.77(1.95) | 2.21(2.49) |
| Percentage of Women State Legislators\*Democratic Control of State Legislature | .029(.028) | .026(.031) | .053(.052) | .176\*\*(.074) |
| Duration Dependency | 11.8(15.6) | 9.38(16) | .417(23.5) | -10.6(30.3) |
| Constant | -3.73\*(2.01) | -4.35(2.93) | -4.25(4.66) | -19.2\*\*\*(6.62) |
| Number of Observations | 1038 | 732 | 513 | 343 |
| Log Pseudolikelihood | -210.04 | -167.92 | -125.17 | -81.2 |
| Pseudo R-Squared | .061 | .066 | .093 | .183 |

Note: Table entries are estimated coefficients of a logistic regression model. Robust standard errors are in parentheses and are clustered by state.

\*p≤.10, \*\* p≤.05. and \*\*\* p≤.01

**Figure 1 The Creation of Women’s Caucuses for States Where Women Hold at Least 20 Percent of Seats, Varying Democratic Control**
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Caption for Figure 1

Note: The results come from the logit model in Table 5 in the online appendix.