

Strategies for Improving Gender Diversity in the Methods Community: Insights from Political Methodologists and Social Science Research

Tiffany D. Barnes, *University of Kentucky*

Today, women earn slightly less than half of all PhDs in political science (National Science Foundation, National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics 2017) and more than 30% of PhDs in statistics (Esarey 2018). Despite their sizable numbers in political science and statistics, women are less likely than their male counterparts to identify as political methodologists or to actively engage as members of the political-methods community. For instance, in any given year, women comprise fewer than 20% of participants at the Society of Political Methodology (POLMETH) annual meeting, and they comprise an even smaller share of the authors presenting research at that event (Barnes and Beaulieu 2017; Esarey 2018). Similarly, women comprise only 21% of the American Political Science Association (APSA) political methodology section (Roberts 2018).

The underrepresentation of women in the methods community is potentially quite costly. That is, if political methodologists are drawn from only half of the talent pool within political science, the subfield misses out on some of the discipline's brightest, most creative, and hardworking scholars, and it is limited in the diversity of experience, thought, and ideas that scholars leverage to solve problems and advance science. For this reason, it is not surprising that research finds that increasing the proportion of women can improve the overall quality and competence of organizations (Besley et al. 2017) and that diverse organizations outperform homogenous ones across a range of criteria (Erhardt, Werbel, and Shrader 2003; Hong and Page 2004; Lückerkath-Rovers 2013).

The benefits of gender diversity, combined with women's underrepresentation in the political-methods subfield, raise this question: How can we increase gender diversity in political methodology? Myriad cultural, social, and institutional factors contribute to women's underrepresentation in political methodology. Some of these systemic factors are beyond the scope and control of the political-methods community. However, institutional and structural changes can improve gender diversity in male-dominated organizations and are critical for eliminating any differences in structural opportunity that contribute to gender inequities (Baird 2018). Thus, to improve gender diversity in the political-methods subfield, it is important

to examine the political-methodology community. Political methodologists should consider how they can improve their organization—their community—to be more diverse. Toward this goal, at the 2016 APSA Annual Meeting, panelists¹ participated in a roundtable discussion to consider the challenges associated with improving gender diversity and the strategies for addressing the gender gap in the political-methods subfield.

Drawing from this discussion and findings from social science research, in this article I explain that the gender gap is attributed to several factors. These range from lower rates of recruitment and retention of female graduate students and lower levels of confidence in their ability to succeed in the field to too few role models from underrepresented groups and limited access to influential networks and mentorships. To address these challenges, panelists indicated that it is important to actively recruit female students as undergraduates and early during graduate school. They recommended strategies for presenting students with assignments and research opportunities designed to cultivate interest in methods, build confidence in their ability to solve methods problems, and help them foster their methods skills. To retain women in the field, panelists explained that it is necessary to connect them to influential networks, encourage them to attend methods conferences, introduce them to senior and junior scholars, and help them identify appropriate mentors. Methodologists can offset the small number of female role models by incorporating women who are in the subfield in leadership roles in the classroom (e.g., as teaching assistants and invited lecturers) and by including female scholars on syllabi, as guest speakers, and on methods panels.

This article discusses the main challenges identified at the roundtable and the advice of panelists for those who want to improve diversity in political methodology. The discussion that follows is organized around several key challenges. Each section briefly introduces the challenge, expands on the panelists' advice for improving diversity in political methodology in light of the challenge, and situates their advice into the broader research on gender diversity in male dominated disciplines and careers.

IDENTIFY, RECRUIT, AND RETAIN FEMALE STUDENTS

The recruitment and retention of women in math-based fields presents a major challenge for diversity. This challenge is not

unique to political science. Indeed, copious research indicates that early-childhood socialization and gender beliefs lead women and men to develop different interests and to have different opportunities, often resulting in gendered career choices (Baird 2012; Su, Rounds, and Armstrong 2009; Wood and Eagly 2012).² The long-standing stereotype that women are not adept in mathematics (Cvencek, Meltzoff, and Greenwald 2011) hinders women's performance and diminishes their interest in math-intensive fields (Galdi, Cadinu, and Tomasetto 2014; Murphy, Steele, and Gross 2007). Gender biases also structure the recruitment process. When choosing between equally qualified men and women for a laboratory manager position, for instance, research from a randomized experiment finds university professors are biased towards male candidates—viewing men as more competent and deserving of faculty mentoring (Moss-Racusin 2012).

Consistent with this research, panelists participating in the 2016 APSA roundtable on mentoring and diversity observed that women are less likely to select or be recruited into political methodology. As a result, if the political-methodology community does not intentionally recruit women into the field and instead relies primarily on student self-selection, women will continue to be underrepresented. Because interests along with other social and cultural factors explain women's career choices, the subfield may never be equally populated with men and women (Baird 2008; Su, Rounds, and Armstrong 2009). Indeed, women already are less likely than men to be interested in math-intensive fields when they begin college. However, we can attempt to eliminate gender differences in structural opportunities and to counteract differences that result from gendered socialization and opportunity structures earlier in women's education. To address these challenges, it is necessary to proactively identify, recruit, and retain female students. Panelists offered several strategies for recruiting and retaining more women in political methodology.

However, we can attempt to eliminate gender differences in structural opportunities and to counteract differences that result from gendered socialization and opportunity structures earlier in women's education. To address these challenges, it is necessary to proactively identify, recruit, and retain female students.

To address this challenge, panelists noted that it is important to recognize that different strategies may be more appropriate or effective for scholars at different stages of their career. Although we know that the gender gap begins at a young age (Galdi, Cadinu, and Tomasetto 2014)—and that by the time students enter college they have already begun sorting themselves into gender-segregated fields—later-in-lifecycle interventions targeted at women in undergraduate and graduate school can be effective for improving diversity in political methodology. Recognizing this, Roberts stated that it is necessary to begin laying the foundation for the recruitment of women into political methodology early in their undergraduate career.

She advocated for encouraging undergraduate students to take additional statistics and/or math courses before enrolling in graduate programs. This would ensure that women begin graduate school on an equal footing and help them establish a foundation on which they can build their skills, confidence, and comfort with the methods material in graduate school.

Panelists observed that upon arrival to graduate school, men already tend to express a higher interest in methods. Yet, they suggested that the gender gap in initial levels of interest can be narrowed through intentional recruitment efforts. Ensuring diversity on recruiting committees and incorporating female graduate students and faculty in statistics boot camps and first-year seminars can generate initial interest among new female students. Roberts emphasized that these interventions must begin early in a woman's career. She explained that we must target undergraduate and first-year graduate students to get women interested and involved in political methods and to sustain these efforts through their early career to maintain involvement.

Panelists also explained that instructors can change the way they design assignments and course lectures to increase women's interest in political methodology. Female students respond more positively to applied assignments and interactive, hands-on projects (Lorenzo, Crouch, and Mazur 2006) and assignments that they think will have a substantive impact or find personally interesting (Cassese et al. 2015). Thus, to further improve female students' initial exposure to methods and cultivate their interests from an early stage in their career, Nordyke suggested designing methods assignments that are tied to substantively important questions. Rather than focusing exclusively on the skill, assignments should expose students to important applications of the skills they are learning. She observed that female students appear to be more enthusiastic about solving methods challenges when they are motivated by a substantive question of interest to them. Women are least represented in the APSA

political methodology section and are most drastically overrepresented in the women and politics research section (see Roberts 2018 for a complete list). Therefore, the incorporation of women and politics applications particularly in the methods curriculum may be an opportunity for attracting more women into the field.³ In addition to sparking women's interests in political methodology, incorporating gender-related applications into methods curriculum can reduce stereotype threat—which reduces women's performance in math-related fields (Galdi, Cadinu, and Tomasetto 2014; Spencer, Steele, and Quinn 1999)—and improve their learning outcomes in methods classes (Cassese et al. 2015). Cassese et al. (2015)

designed several in-class activities and resources to encourage and facilitate the incorporation of gender into methods courses.

Additionally, Mitchell and Nordyke recommended assigning gender-balanced study groups and taking a lab approach to encourage students to develop both substantive and methodological interests and to decrease the likelihood that they select out of the subfield when they encounter more difficult material. When a student works alone, she may assume that she is the only one who finds the methods material and assignments challenging—causing her to conclude that methods is not for her. However, if students are required to work with other peers with various skills and backgrounds, they are more likely to realize that they are not unique in the challenges and difficulties they face in the class. If they understand that other students are challenged as well, they are less likely to attribute the difficulties they face to their own shortcomings and, therefore, are less likely to be discouraged from studying political methodology.

When a student works alone, she may assume that she is the only one who finds the methods material and assignments challenging—causing her to conclude that methods is not for her.

Regarding the lab approach, faculty can create research labs wherein multiple students at different stages of their career work together with faculty members to advance their research. This may involve everyone working on the same research project or a series of related research projects, or meeting regularly to discuss progress on their individual projects and working through problems together. This approach allows students to gain exposure to various stages of the research process from an early point in their career and to learn about the challenges and obstacles that others are confronting. When students are aware of the challenges that other scholars face throughout the research process, they are less likely to be deterred when they confront challenges in their own research. Nordyke explained that if students observe only the final research product before they start working on their own research, they are more likely to think that the obstacles they face are unique and then are deterred from continuing when confronted with difficult challenges. Thus, by dispelling these myths and exposing students to a range of challenges that most scholars confront during the research process, the lab approach can improve student retention.

Mitchell suggested that faculty who are interested in recruiting and retaining female students could cultivate students' interest and establish lasting mentoring relationships by working with them on research projects. Faculty can identify a project in which they are interested and invite a student to work on it for their class research assignment. The student can write the first draft of the manuscript under faculty supervision. When the course is complete, the faculty member can work with the student to revise the manuscript and develop it for publication. By coauthoring with faculty members,

students have the opportunity to see the entire research (and publishing) process and to learn how to conduct their own research.

In addition to recruiting women for involvement in political methods within our universities, it is important to explicitly recruit them to be part of the methods community and to attend POLMETH summer meetings. Mitchell recommended using regional meetings such as SLAMM or topical-methods conferences to identify and recruit women to attend POLMETH. She also pointed out that Visions in Methodology (VIM)—a conference designed to support women who study political methodology (Dion 2014)—is popular and well attended, yet few women who attend VIM also attend POLMETH. Thus, she recommended greater emphasis on converting VIM participants to POLMETH participants. Mitchell also highlighted the fact that the timing of the meeting may impose additional obstacles for parents who do not have childcare in the summer. It often is easier for parents to attend conferences when their children are in

school or when they have full-time childcare. The timing of the summer meeting may disproportionately limit women's attendance because they are more likely than men to be responsible for childcare.

Finally, it is important to retain women in the field throughout their career. Some panelists observed that female-retention rates in the political-methods community are lower than male-retention rates. For example, although there have been efforts to recruit more women to attend POLMETH, panelists indicated that not many women return to the meeting every year. Mitchell suggested that POLMETH hosts should make an effort to attract repeat attendees, especially among the tenured-women population. This could be as intentional as calling or emailing previous attendees to encourage them to reapply in advance of the next summer meeting. Moreover, these efforts also may have downstream effects because retaining women in POLMETH today will make it easier to recruit additional women in the future. As discussed in a subsequent section of this article, having more women in visible positions can improve the recruitment and retention of female methodologists.

Several panelists also observed that the tone and manner of providing feedback at POLMETH can feel more competitive or even hostile than in other settings. The same observation was made regarding panels hosted by methods sections at larger political science meetings. Panelists' and other anecdotal evidence suggest that some women select out of the methods subfield and decline opportunities to attend POLMETH because they view the community and subfield as unnecessarily critical rather than constructive (Shames and Wise 2017). Consistent with these observations,

research shows that women are more likely than men to avoid interpersonal conflict and competition (Miller, Danaher, and Forbes 1986; Schneider et al. 2016). Given their tendency toward conflict avoidance, one strategy for retaining women in the community over the course of their career is to cultivate a less hostile and more supportive environment. Toward this goal, panelists reminded us to provide useful and critical feedback without being antagonistic or personal. Indeed, Esarey and Roberts observed that in recent years, the environment at POLMETH has become more welcoming. The change in the tone and culture may be beneficial in retaining women in the community throughout their career.

IMPROVE WOMEN'S CONFIDENCE IN THEIR METHODS ABILITIES

Another major obstacle for women and minorities in political methodology concerns well-documented issues with a confidence gap and imposter syndrome. For example, when women and men possess the same skills and training, women are less likely than men to perceive themselves as qualified to serve in certain positions (Lawless and Fox 2005). Furthermore, girls and women are less likely than boys and men to perceive themselves as brilliant or genius (Bian, Leslie, and Cimpian 2017). This gender gap in perceived levels of cognitive ability maps onto gender gaps in prestigious careers and fields of study (Cimpian and Leslie 2015; Leslie et al. 2015). Although the gender confidence gap is not unique to political methodology, it is exacerbated in stereotypically male-dominated fields (Spencer, Steele, and Quinn 1999; Steele 1997) and in “fields whose members cherish brilliance (e.g., physics and philosophy)” (Bian, Leslie, and Cimpian 2017, 389). As a result, even women who are interested in political methodology may be less likely than similarly trained or experienced men to believe that they can excel in this subfield and therefore may be less likely to pursue their interest. This gender confidence gap is a product of deep-rooted cultural norms and early-childhood socialization; however, instructors can adopt specific practices to overcome it in the classroom. Although this discussion is focused on improving women's confidence in their methods abilities, these suggested pedagogical practices have the additional benefit of helping both male and female students more generally.

This gender confidence gap is a product of deep-rooted cultural norms and early-childhood socialization; however, instructors can adopt specific practices to overcome it in the classroom.

To address the gender confidence gap, panelists recommended three tactics. First, faculty can practice providing positive feedback to students. Nordyke explained that our feedback often is intended to be constructive to help students improve. As a result, instructors have a tendency to focus exclusively on students' weaknesses and shortcomings.

Although some students may readily recognize (or assume) that they are performing well when they are not criticized, other students—particularly those who have less confidence that they belong—may not know they are excelling unless they are explicitly informed.

Second, panelists recommended providing opportunities for students to realize that they can conduct an analysis in the early stages of their career so that they can develop confidence in their own abilities. Nordyke recommended that instructors begin by assigning homework problems or questions that are easy to answer. By doing so, students can practice approaching new problems and using new skills without becoming discouraged. In the more challenging stages of the assignment, they will be more confident in their ability to work through difficult problems. This gradual approach builds self-assurance and makes it less likely that students will be discouraged when assignments become more difficult.

Third, Nordyke explained that it is important for mentors and instructors to model ignorance and failure. She elaborated that part of being a successful political methodologist is recognizing that even trained methodologists do not always know the appropriate method or how to use it. Instead, the goal is to obtain enough tools and familiarity with the foundational methods in order to figure out how to appropriately use the correct method. It is important to convey this to students so that they do not feel unqualified or inadequate when they encounter unfamiliar topics or do not immediately know how to address problems. Nordyke advised instructors to practice saying “I don't know the answer to that” when they do not know. They should admit to students that no one immediately knows all of the answers when they are using something they do not use on a regular basis or when they encounter a new challenge with data. This recommendation is consistent with research from psychology demonstrating that individuals who have a growth mindset—that is, they believe that skills are learned rather than a reflection of their natural talent or fixed intelligence—are more likely to excel in a given area and reach their potential (Dweck 2006). If students realize that instructors are not political scientists who are simply good at methods or math but rather have worked diligently to develop their methodological skills, they will be more likely to believe that they also can develop these skills.

INCORPORATE WOMEN IN INFLUENTIAL NETWORKS AND IMPROVE MENTORSHIP

Integration in academic and professional communities is critical for student retention and success (Herzig 2004; Tinto 1993). Yet, homophily dominates the structure of networks both inside and outside of the workplace (McPherson, Smith-Lovin,

and Cook 2001). That is, people are more inclined to meet and develop both social and professional relationships with those like themselves. This often results in gender-segregated social and professional networks, even within professional environments. This tendency presents a challenge for integrating women in influential professional networks and developing mentorships. Indeed, given that women are underrepresented in senior and leadership positions within the methods community, this natural social division means that it may be more difficult for women to meet other scholars, find mentors, and integrate into existing networks.

To address this issue, Roberts stated that we should seek out mentees that look different than we do. This may be outside of our comfort zone, but it is necessary if we are interested in addressing the gender gap. Similarly, Esarey observed that if homophily influences our academic networks, then self-selection of students into mentoring relationships will perpetuate the existing distribution of characteristics in the community. It therefore is important to actively reach out to and encourage the involvement of talented students who are not likely to self-select into the subfield.

Faculty can diversify the methods community by helping women integrate into important networks. Mitchell explained that if students attend conferences and workshops only to find that they do not know anyone and feel out of place, then they are less likely to participate in the future. To address this challenge, faculty can make introductions for students at conferences. As a young scholar or as someone new to a community, meeting new people can be intimidating. Faculty can facilitate networking and mentorships by making introductions to both senior and junior scholars.⁴

Furthermore, faculty can actively encourage students and young scholars to attend smaller conferences (e.g., VIM, POLMETH, and New Faces), where it is easier to meet people and become involved in the methods community. Most women who attended VIM reported, for instance, that attendance helped them to develop networks among both junior and senior women (Barnes and Beaulieu 2017). This is not surprising because these conferences are explicitly designed to facilitate networking through a number of organized events, including lunches, dinners, receptions, and poster sessions.

We should not assume that women are not interested because they do not self-promote. Instead, Roberts recommended identifying women who are good candidates for methods TA positions, telling them that they would be a good methods TA, and asking them to serve in this capacity.

It may be easier to meet new people, receive feedback on research, and engage in meaningful conversations in these settings than at larger conferences, where most informal interactions occur during the intermissions between research panels.

Encouragement is key, however, because women typically are less willing to self-promote or apply to conferences if the selection process is viewed as competitive. In 2016, for

example, Esarey reported that although not everyone who wanted to present a paper was invited to do so, everyone who applied to attend the POLMETH conference was accepted.⁵ Thus, the gender gap in attendance was driven entirely by self-selection. Yet, research suggests that we can narrow this gender gap by encouraging more women to apply. Indeed, the majority of women who attended VIM reported being encouraged to apply by someone else (Barnes and Beaulieu 2017), and women are more likely to apply to POLMETH when they are explicitly encouraged to do so (Unkovic, Sen, and Quinn 2016).⁶

MAXIMIZE WOMEN'S VISIBILITY IN THE FIELD

A growing body of research demonstrates that female role models improve the likelihood that other women will enter into and succeed in male-dominated fields (Campbell and Wolbrecht 2006; Ladam, Harden, and Windett 2018). Of particular interest to the political-methodology community, research on women in math-based and STEM fields demonstrates that exposure to same-sex role models is important in academic environments. This helps women overcome negative stereotypes about their competence in math-based fields, buffers their self-appraisal and performance against stereotype threat, improves their attitude about math and STEM, and motivates them to pursue a career in these fields (Dasgupta 2011; Levine et al. 2015; Marx and Roman 2002). Yet, the few women in the political-methods subfield means that there are a limited number of female role models, which can make it difficult to promote women in the field or to help new female scholars feel like they belong. Although there is no short-run solution for increasing the number of senior women in the field, we can emphasize the diversity that exists. Including women in leadership roles in the classroom, on the syllabus, and on the list of invited speakers, for example, can dispel stereotypes that women do not belong in the subfield and help female graduate students feel like they belong.

To diversify leadership in the classroom, Roberts pointed out that it helps to recruit and select more women as teaching assistants (TAs). Because TA assignments often result from informal norms and rules, increasing diversity in this capacity requires an intentional effort. Whereas men may be more

willing to self-nominate for these positions, women are socialized not to self-promote and are socially punished for doing so (Rudman 1998). We should not assume that women are not interested because they do not self-promote. Instead, Roberts recommended identifying women who are good candidates for methods TA positions, telling them that they would be a good methods TA, and asking them to serve in this capacity.

We also should strive to establish formal and transparent rules for determining how TA and other privileged positions are assigned. When there are no written guidelines establishing clear rules, outsiders—for example, women—are disadvantaged and are less likely to gain access to coveted positions and resources in organizations (Czudnowski 1975; Reskin and McBrier 2000; Uhlmann and Cohen 2005). Thus, the more institutionalized the process is, the easier it is to understand how selection works and to navigate the process. Clear guidelines and transparency increase the likelihood that everyone has an equal opportunity to participate. That is, although it may be the norm among some subsets of students to advocate for the TA positions they want, women are less likely to be aware of this norm. Moreover, research indicates that women are more likely than men to follow guidelines when deciding if they should apply for positions (Mohr 2014). Thus, if there are no written rules stating that students should advocate their preferences for TA placements, then women will be less likely to apply.

Mitchell recommended another way to improve the number of female role models to which students are exposed: increase the number of women on course syllabi and cite women in peer-reviewed research. Although we cannot easily or immediately increase the number of women faculty, we can improve women's visibility in the classroom via course material. It is important to be intentional about our efforts to increase women's visibility because research on citation patterns in other male-dominated political science subfields indicate that scholars are systematically less likely to cite women than men in peer-reviewed research (Mitchell, Lange, and Brus 2013). Sumner (2018) developed a software tool to help scholars easily determine the gender breakdown on their course syllabi and bibliographies. This way, they can assess how well they are representing women scholars in their course material and research (see also Dion, Sumner, and Mitchell forthcoming).⁷ Furthermore, #WomenAlsoKnowStuff developed a list of female experts that scholars can reference to identify women that they may have inadvertently excluded from their syllabi, bibliographies, or even lists of guest speakers and panelists (Beaulieu et al. 2017).⁸

Faculty can draw more attention to successful female scholars by ensuring diversity among guest speakers, workshops, conferences, and panels. Women are underrepresented in events ranging from speaker series to formal conference settings (e.g., POLMETH). Intentionally recruiting more women to serve in this capacity will erode the stereotype that political methodology is a subfield for men. When more women are represented in these capacities, we are demonstrating to female students that they can be successful in the methods community and subfield as well.

CONCLUSION

Often, our approach to increasing women's involvement in underrepresented domains is to think about strategies we can pass on to them. We teach women to understand the challenges they will face in male-dominated organizations and give them tactics for successfully navigating the scene.

It is essential that women have information and tools at their disposal for accomplishing their career goals; however, at best, this strategy addresses only part of the problem. Perhaps more important, we must ask how we can change our organizations to improve diversity because changes to institutions have more wide-ranging effects and bring about lasting change (Baird 2018). If the political-methodology community is perceived as inhospitable, uninspiring, or unattractive to almost half of the scholars in political science, then the community will lose a large pool of talent. If misnomers are perpetuated that one must be innately brilliant or good at math to be successful at methods rather than willing to work hard to develop the necessary skills, the political-methodology subfield will be restricted to students who are socialized to believe that they (and members of their gender) are inherently good at math—that is, men (Dweck 2006). Recruiting, retaining, and integrating more women in the subfield thus requires political methodologists to evaluate the norms and culture of the methods community and to adopt new practices that will attract the most talented and creative scholars in the field.

Toward this goal, scholars at the 2016 APSA Annual Meeting met to discuss challenges associated with increasing diversity in the political-methods field and strategies for improving diversity. Drawing on the experiences and expertise shared during the APSA panel, this article identifies several strategies for recruiting women and improving diversity in the political-methodology community. First and foremost, panelists indicated that scholars interested in improving diversity in the political-methodology community should aim to recruit women early in their career—as undergraduates and during their first years of graduate school—and to provide assignments and research opportunities that cultivate interest and confidence in the subfield and help students develop their skill sets. Once women express interest in political methodology, it is important to incorporate them into influential networks by encouraging them to attend methods-focused conferences, making introductions to both senior and junior scholars, and mentoring or helping them to identify mentors. The methods community can further assist women to feel like they belong by maximizing the visibility of women who are already in the subfield. Specifically, panelists recommended incorporating women in leadership roles in the classroom via TA assignments and by ensuring that female scholars are represented on syllabi, slates of invited speakers, and methods panels.

Although the recommendations identified by scholars at the 2016 APSA Annual Meeting require scholars to evaluate and adapt the culture and norms within the political-methods community, it is important that they do not challenge ideas about what it means to be a political methodologist. The strategies outlined in this article do not suggest that political methodologists should change their mission or lower their standards to incorporate more women. Rather, as the APSA panelists made clear, there are many women who have the talent and interest to be successful political methodologists. If the political-methods community wants to improve its diversity and recruit the most talented scholars, it is necessary

to develop a culture and adopt institutional practices that attract the best scholars in the discipline.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to Justin Esarey, Jesse Johnson, Molly Roberts, Katie Searles and anonymous reviewers for comments on earlier drafts. Ideas in this article were influenced by numerous conversations with colleagues such as Chardie Baird, Emily Beaulieu, Becky Bromley-Trujillo, Erin Cassese, and Mirya Holman. Thanks to Justin Esarey, Sara Mitchell, Shane Nordyke, and Molly Roberts for participating in the APSA panel on diversity and mentoring in political methodology. ■

NOTES

1. Panelists include Justin Esarey (associate professor, Rice University); Sara Mitchell (professor, University of Iowa); Shane Nordyke (associate professor, University of South Dakota); Molly Roberts (assistant professor, University of California, San Diego); and myself.
2. Although still present, gender differences are decreasing in many traditionally masculine fields (Wood and Eagly 2012).
3. See Stauffer and O'Brien (2018) for a discussion of quantitative methods in gender and politics research.
4. See Cassese and Holman (2018) for a discussion of the importance of peer mentoring.
5. There was an exception to this in 2016: one graduate student who did not receive a letter of recommendation from their adviser was not accepted to the conference. The acceptance rate in 2016 was the exception rather than the rule. Many people are rejected from the annual meetings.
6. However, many of the female graduate students who applied did not receive letters of recommendation from their advisers to attend.
7. Available at <https://jsumner.shinyapps.io/syllabustool>.
8. Available at <http://womenalsoknowstuff.com>.

REFERENCES

Baird, Chardie L. 2008. "The Importance of Community Context for Young Women's Occupational Aspirations." *Sex Roles* 58 (3-4): 208–221.

—. 2012. "Going Against the Flow: A Longitudinal Study of the Effects of Cognitive Skills and Gender Beliefs on Occupational Aspirations and Outcomes." *Sociological Forum* 27 (4): 986–1009.

—. 2018. "Women and STEM." *Instrumentation and Measurement Society Magazine*. Available at <http://iee-ims.org/publications/im-magazine>.

Barnes, Tiffany D., and Emily Beaulieu. 2017. "Engaging Women: Addressing the Gender Gap in Women's Networking and Productivity." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50 (2): 461–6.

Beaulieu, Emily, Amber Boydston, Nadia Brown, Kim Yi Dionne, Andra Gillespie, Samara Klar, Yanna Krupnikov, Melissa R. Michelson, Kathleen Searles, and Christina Wolbrecht. Forthcoming. 2017. "Women Also Know Stuff: Meta-Level Mentoring to Battle Gender Bias in Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50 (3): 779–83.

Besley, Timothy, Olle Folke, Torsten Persson, and Johanna Rickne. 2017. "Gender Quotas and the Crisis of the Mediocre Man." *American Economic Review* 107 (8): 2204–42.

Bian, Lin, Sarah-Jane Leslie, and Andrei Cimpian. 2017. "Gender Stereotypes about Intellectual Ability Emerge Early and Influence Children's Interests." *Science* 355: 389–91.

Campbell, David E., and Christina Wolbrecht. 2006. "See Jane Run: Women Politicians as Role Models for Adolescents." *Journal of Politics* 68 (2): 233–47.

Cassese, Erin, and Mirya R. Holman. 2018. "Writing as Community: Peer-to-Peer Mentoring as a Mechanism for Productivity and Support among Junior Scholars." *PS: Political Science & Politics*. Online First. DOI: 10.1017/S1049096517002049.

Cassese, Erin, Mirya R. Holman, Monica C. Schneider, and Angela L. Bos. 2015. "Building a Gender and Methodology Curriculum: Integrated Skills, Exercises, and Practices." *Journal of Political Science Education* 11 (1): 61–77.

Cimpian, Andrei, and Sarah-Jane Leslie. 2015. "Response to Comment on 'Expectations of Brilliance Underlie Gender Distributions across Academic Disciplines.'" *Science* 349 (6246): 391.

Cvencek, Dario, Andrew N. Meltzoff, and Anthony G. Greenwald. 2011. "Math-Gender Stereotypes in Elementary School Children." *Child Development* 82 (3): 766–79.

Czudnowski, Moshe M. 1975. "Political Recruitment." In *Handbook of Political Science: Micropolitical Theory*, ed. Fred I. Greenstein and W. Polsby Nelson, vol. 2. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Dasgupta, Nilanjana. 2011. "In-Group Experts and Peers as Social Vaccines Who Inoculate the Self-Concept: The Stereotype-Inoculation Model." *Psychological Inquiry* 22 (4): 231–46.

Dion, Michelle. 2014. "An Effort to Increase Women's Participation: The Visions in Methodology Initiative." *The Political Methodologist* 21 (2): 6.

Dion, Michelle, Jane Lawrence Sumner, and Sara McLaughlin Mitchell. Forthcoming. "Gendered Citation Patterns across Political Science and Social Science Methodology Fields." *Political Analysis*.

Dweck, Carol S. 2006. *Mindset: The New Psychology of Success*. New York: Random House.

Erhardt, Niclas L., James D. Werbel, and Charles B. Shrader. 2003. "Board of Director Diversity and Firm Financial Performance." *Corporate Governance: An International Review* 11 (2): 102–11.

Esarey, Justin. 2018. "What Makes Someone a Political Methodologist?" *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51 (3): this issue.

Galdi, Silvia, Mara Cadinu, and Carlo Tomasetto. 2014. "The Roots of Stereotype Threat: When Automatic Associations Disrupt Girls' Math Performance." *Child Development* 85 (1): 250–63.

Herzig, Abbe H. 2004. "Becoming Mathematicians: Women and Students of Color Choosing and Leaving Doctoral Mathematics." *Review of Educational Research* 74 (2): 171–214.

Hong, Lu, and Scott E. Page. 2004. "Groups of Diverse Problem Solvers Can Outperform Groups of High-Ability Problem Solvers." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 101 (24): 16385–9.

Ladam, Christina, Jeffery J. Harden, and Jason H. Windett. 2018. "Prominent Role Models: High-Profile Female Politicians and the Emergence of Women as Candidates for Public Office." *American Journal of Political Science*. DOI: 10.1111/ajps.12351.

Lawless, Jennifer L., and Richard L. Fox. 2005. *It Takes a Candidate: Why Women Don't Run for Office*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Leslie, Sarah-Jane, Andrei Cimpian, Meredith Meyer, and Edward Freeland. 2015. "Expectations of Brilliance Underlie Gender Distributions across Academic Disciplines." *Science* 34 (6219): 262–5.

Levine, Mindy, Nicole Serio, Bhasker Radaram, Sauradip Chaudhuri, and William Talbert. 2015. "Addressing the STEM Gender Gap by Designing and Implementing an Educational Outreach Chemistry Camp for Middle-School Girls." *Journal of Chemical Education* 92 (10): 1639–44.

Lorenzo, Mercedes, Catherine H. Crouch, and Eric Mazur. 2006. "Reducing the Gender Gap in the Physics Classroom." *American Journal of Physics* 74 (2): 118–22.

Lückerath-Rovers, Mijntje. 2013. "Women on Boards and Firm Performance." *Journal of Management & Governance* 17 (2): 491–509.

Marx, David M., and Jasmin S. Roman. 2002. "Female Role Models: Protecting Women's Math Test Performance." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 28 (9): 1183–93.

McPherson, Miller, Lynn Smith-Lovin, and James Cook. 2001. "Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27 (1): 415–44.

Miller, Patrice M., Dorothy L. Danaher, and David Forbes. 1986. "Sex-Related Strategies for Coping with Interpersonal Conflict in Children Aged Five and Seven." *Developmental Psychology* 22 (4): 543–8.

Mitchell, Sara McLaughlin, Samantha Lange, and Holly Brus. 2013. "Gendered Citation Patterns in International Relations Journals." *International Studies Perspectives* 14 (4): 485–92.

Mohr, Tara Sophia. 2014. "Why Women Don't Apply for Jobs Unless They're 100% Qualified." *Harvard Business Review*, August 25. <https://hbr.org/2014/08/why-women-dont-apply-for-jobs-unless-theyre-100-qualified>.

Moss-Racusin, Corinne A., John F. Dovidio, Victoria L. Brescoll, Mark J. Graham, and Jo Handelsman. 2012. "Science Faculty's Subtle Gender Biases Favor Male Students." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109 (41): 16474–9.

Murphy, Mary C., Claude M. Steele, and James J. Gross. 2007. "Signaling Threat: How Situational Cues Affect Women in Math, Science, and Engineering Settings." *Psychological Science* 18 (10): 879–85.

- National Science Foundation, National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics. 2017. "Women, Minorities, and Persons with Disabilities in Science and Engineering: 2017." Arlington, VA: Special Report NSF 17-310. Available at www.nsf.gov/statistics/wmpd.
- Reskin, Barbara F., and Debra Branch McBrier. 2000. "Why Not Ascription? Organizations' Employment of Male and Female Managers." *American Sociological Review* 65 (2): 210–33.
- Roberts, Margaret. 2018. "Political Methodology and Comparative Politics." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51 (3): this issue.
- Rudman, Laurie A. 1998. "Self-Promotion as a Risk Factor for Women: The Costs and Benefits of Counter-Stereotypical Impression Management." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74 (3): 629.
- Schneider, Monica C., Mirya R. Holman, Amanda B. Diekmann, and Thomas McAndrew. 2016. "Power, Conflict, and Community: How Gendered Views of Political Power Influence Women's Political Ambition." *Political Psychology* 37 (4): 515–31.
- Shames, Shauna L., and Tess Wise. 2017. "Gender, Diversity, and Methods in Political Science: A Theory of Selection and Survival Biases." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50 (3): 811–23.
- Spencer, Steven J., Claude M. Steele, and Diane M. Quinn. 1999. "Stereotype Threat and Women's Math Performance." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 35 (1): 4–28.
- Stauffer, Katelyn E., and Diana Z. O'Brien. 2018. "Fast Friends or Strange Bedfellows: Quantitative Methods and Gender and Politics Research." Indiana University: Working Paper.
- Steele, Claude M. 1997. "A Threat in the Air: How Stereotypes Shape Intellectual Identity and Performance." *American Psychologist* 52 (6): 613.
- Su, Rong, James Rounds, and Patrick Ian Armstrong. 2009. "Men and Things, Women and People: A Meta-Analysis of Sex Differences in Interests." *Psychological Bulletin* 135 (6): 859–84.
- Sumner, Jane Lawrence. 2018. "The GBAT: A Web-Based Tool for Estimating Gender Balance in Syllabi and Bibliographies." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51 (2): 396–400.
- Tinto, Vincent. 1993. *Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Uhlmann, Eric Luis, and Geoffrey L. Cohen. 2005. "Constructed Criteria: Redefining Merit to Justify Discrimination." *Psychological Science* 16 (6): 474–80.
- Unkovic, Cait, Maya Sen, and Kevin M. Quinn. 2016. "Does Encouragement Matter in Improving Gender Imbalances in Technical Fields? Evidence from a Randomized Controlled Trial." *PLoS ONE* 11 (4): e0151714. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0151714.
- Wood, Wendy, and Alice H. Eagly. 2012. "Biosocial Construction of Sex Differences and Similarities in Behavior." *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 46 (1): 55–123.