

SUPPORTING INFORMATION
to
**“A Female Policy Premium?
Agency Context and Women’s Leadership in the U.S. Federal Bureaucracy”**

A. Coding Agencies

- Table A1: Coding of Agencies, by Policy Area, Women’s Issue Area, and Type

B. Description of Agency Leader Data Collection Process and Missing Data

C. Description of Data Elements and Principal Components Analysis for *Supportive Environment Measure*

D. Robustness Checks

- Table D1: Effects of Female Leadership on Rulemaking in Women’s Issue Areas
- Table D2: Effects of Female Leadership on Rulemaking in Supportive Work Environments
- Table D3: Effects of Female Leadership on Rulemaking on Women’s Issues Only (Krook and O’Brien Coding)
- Table D4: Effects of Female Leadership on Rulemaking on Women’s and Neutral Issues (Broad Krook and O’Brien Coding)
- Table D5: Effects of Female Leadership on Rulemaking on Women’s Issues Broadly Defined
- Table D6: Supportive Environment Results Focusing on Proportion Women Leaders
- Table D7: Supportive Environment Results Focusing on Proportion Women in Workforce
- Table D8: Supportive Environment Results Focusing on Grade Differential
- Table D9: Women’s Issue Models by Presidential Party
- Table D10: Supportive Work Environment Models by Presidential Party
- Table D11: Women’s Issue Models with President-Agency Difference Controls
- Table D12: Supportive Work Environment Models with President-Agency Difference Controls
- Table D13: Women’s Issue Results by Senate-Confirmed Political Appointees (PAS) and Non-PAS
- Table D14: Supportive Work Environment Results by Senate-Confirmed Political Appointees (PAS) and Non-PAS
- Table D15: Models of Rule Importance using Priority Measure
- Table D16: Execution Models with Alternate Rule Execution Assumptions
- Table D17: Logit Models of Rule Execution

- Table D18: Multilevel Models of Women's Issues Models
- Table D19: Multilevel Models of Supportive Work Environments
- Table D20: Women's Issue Models with Additional Bureau-Level Controls
- Table D21: Supportive Work Environment Models with Additional Bureau-Level Controls
- Table D22: Female Leadership Effects within Lowi's Four Agency Types

A. Coding Agencies

Coding Women's Issue Agencies

As explained in the paper, to code agencies according to whether they focus on “women’s issues,” we followed an approach pioneered by Volden, Wiseman, and Wittmer (2018). Those authors identify women’s issues inductively by looking at the areas in which women self-select into being more active legislators. Specifically, they look at policy areas—determined by each bill’s Policy Agendas Project code (Baumgartner and Jones 2016)—where women in Congress tend to be more active than men. Of the 19 Policy Agendas Project issue areas, they identify six where women’s effort significantly exceeds men’s and deem these to be “women’s issues.” The six areas are: civil rights & liberties; education; health; housing & community development; labor, employment, and immigration; and law, crime, and family. They identify an additional two areas—the environment and social welfare issues—that might also be considered women’s issues based on their review of the literature on women’s policy issues.

To apply this approach to our data, we first code each agency according to one of the 19 Policy Agendas Project topic that best matches the policy area it focuses on. For example, the Agency for International Development is matched to “Topic 19: International Affairs and Foreign Aid,” while the Agricultural Marketing Service is matched to “Topic 4: Agriculture.” We then code women’s issues agencies as those six areas (and later eight) that Volden, Wiseman, and Wittmer (2018) identify as women’s priorities. Table B1 shows how each agency was coded according to its Policy Agenda topic area and women’s issue status following this approach.

As a secondary approach, we also consider Krook and O'Brien's (2012) deductive coding. These scholars survey the literature and consider traditional characterizations of men's and women's roles to exogenously determine the gender orientation of agencies. They identify three distinct orientations agencies: feminine, masculine, and neutral. Masculine issues focus on "concerns tied to the public sphere of politics and the economy," while feminine issues are tied to "the private sphere of home and the family, including care and education" (844). They explain that "portfolios coded as 'masculine' were ministries like agriculture, defense, finance, foreign affairs, and labor. Those that were categorized as 'feminine' comprised of topics like children, education, health, and women's affairs. Ministries [agencies] that addressed a public or private dimension—like transportation or housing—but were not linked symbolically to one sex were classified as 'neutral'" (844).

We extend Krook and O'Brien's coding scheme and apply it to the agencies in our dataset. One caveat is that their coding is based on the department level—and not the bureau level—meaning that there is not within-department variation under this coding scheme. Table B1 shows how each agency was coded according to Krook and O'Brien's approach.

Coding Types of Agencies

Lowi identifies four types of agencies: constituent, distributive, redistributive, and regulatory. *Constituent* agencies are those where the agencies' missions "come closest to maintenance of sovereignty... There is minimal responsibility for making or implementing rules that pertain directly to citizen conduct or status" (Lowi 1985, 94). *Distributive* agencies are those that "are responsible for policies that work directly on or through

individuals, the relationship is one of patron and client rather than controller and controlled” (Lowi 1985, 87). *Redistributive* agencies are those whose “rules or the rules for which they are responsible affect society on a larger scale than any others” (Lowi 1985, 93). Finally, *regulatory* agencies are those that “are responsible for implementing the classic control policies of government, formulating or implementing rules imposing obligations on individuals, and providing punishment for nonconformance” (Lowi 1985, 85).

To code agencies according to Lowi’s typology, one author and one research assistant independently coded the agencies according to Lowi’s definitions. Where discrepancies emerged in coding, they were resolved through further discussion. Additionally, where possible, we followed the agency coding decisions of prior scholars, including: Dolan (2004), Newman (1994), and Sabharwal (2015). Table B1 shows how each agency was coded according to the Lowi’s typology.

Table A1: Coding of Agencies, by Policy Area, Women's Issue Area, and Type

Bureau Name	Dept Name	Policy Agendas Major Topic Code	Women's Issue?		Agency Type Coding ^c
			Our Coding ^a	Krook & O'Brien Coding ^b	
Administration For Children and Families	HHS	Health (3)	Yes	F	RD
Administration on Aging	HHS	Social Welfare (13)	Yes*	F	RD
Agency for International Development	IND	International Affairs and Foreign Aid (19)	No	M	C
Agricultural Marketing Service	USDA	Agriculture (4)	No	M	RG
Agricultural Research Service	USDA	Agriculture (4)	No	M	D
Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Trade Bureau	TREAS	Macroeconomics (1)	No	M	RG
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	USDA	Agriculture (4)	No	M	RG
Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management And Budget	DOI	Public Lands and Water Management (21)	No	N	C
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, And Explosives	DOJ	Law, Crime, and Family Issues (12)	Yes	M	RG
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, And Explosives	TREAS	Macroeconomics (1)	No	M	RG
Bureau of Economic Analysis	DOC	Banking, Finance, and Domestic Commerce (15)	No	M	D
Bureau of Indian Affairs	DOI	Public Lands and Water Management (21)	No	N	D
Bureau of Industry and Security	DOC	Banking, Finance, and Domestic Commerce (15)	No	M	D
Bureau of Land Management	DOI	Public Lands and Water Management (21)	No	N	D

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management	DOI	Public Lands and Water Management (21)	No	N	D
Bureau of Prisons	DOJ	Law, Crime, and Family Issues (12)	Yes	M	RG
Bureau of Reclamation	DOI	Public Lands and Water Management (21)	No	N	D
Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement	DOI	Energy (8)	No	N	RG
Bureau of the Public Debt	TREAS	Macroeconomics (1)	No	M	C
Census Bureau	DOC	Banking, Finance, and Domestic Commerce (15)	No	M	C
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention	HHS	Health (3)	Yes	F	RD
Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services	HHS	Health (3)	Yes	F	RD
Civil Rights Division	DOJ	Law, Crime, and Family Issues (12)	Yes	N	RG
Comptroller of the Currency	TREAS	Macroeconomics (1)	No	M	C
Corporation for National and Community Service	IND	Social Welfare (13)	Yes*	N	D
Customs Revenue Function	TREAS	Macroeconomics (1)	No	M	D
Defense Acquisition Regulations Council	DOD	Defense (16)	No	M	C
Department of State	STATE	International Affairs and Foreign Aid (19)	No	M	C
Department of the Air Force	DOD	Defense (16)	No	M	C
Department of the Army	DOD	Defense (16)	No	M	C
Department of the Navy	DOD	Defense (16)	No	M	C
Department of Veterans Affairs	VA	Defense (16)	No	F	RD
Drug Enforcement Administration	DOJ	Law, Crime, and Family Issues (12)	Yes	M	RG
Economic Development Administration	DOC	Banking, Finance, and Domestic Commerce (15)	No	N	D

Employee Benefits Security Administration	DOL	Labor and Employment (5)	Yes	M	D
Employment and Training Administration	DOL	Labor and Employment (5)	Yes	M	RD
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	DOE	Energy (8)	No	N	D
Environmental Protection Agency	IND	Environment (7)	Yes*	N	RG
Executive Office for Immigration Review	DOJ	Law, Crime, and Family Issues (12)	Yes	N	RG
Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation	IND	Agriculture (4)	No	M	RD
Farm Service Agency	USDA	Agriculture (4)	No	M	RD
Federal Aviation Administration	DOT	Transportation (10)	No	M	RG
Federal Bureau of Investigation	DOJ	Law, Crime, and Family Issues (12)	Yes	M	RG
Federal Emergency Management Agency	DHS	Banking, Finance, and Domestic Commerce (15)	No	M	D
Federal Emergency Management Agency	IND	Banking, Finance, and Domestic Commerce (15)	No	M	D
Federal Highway Administration	DOT	Transportation (10)	No	M	D
Federal Housing Finance Authority	HUD	Community Development and Housing Issues (14)	Yes	N	RG
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration	DOT	Transportation (10)	No	M	RG
Federal Railroad Administration	DOT	Transportation (10)	No	M	RG
Federal Transit Administration	DOT	Transportation (10)	No	M	D
Financial Crimes Enforcement Network	TREAS	Macroeconomics (1)	No	M	RG
Financial Management Service	TREAS	Macroeconomics (1)	No	M	C
Food and Drug Administration	HHS	Health (3)	Yes	F	RG
Food and Nutrition Service	USDA	Agriculture (4)	No	M	RD
Food Safety and Inspection Service	USDA	Agriculture (4)	No	M	RG

Foreign Agricultural Service	USDA	Agriculture (4)	No	M	D
Forest Service	USDA	Agriculture (4)	No	M	D
General Services Administration	IND	Government Operations (20)	No	M	C
Government National Mortgage Association	HUD	Community Development and Housing Issues (14)	Yes	N	RD
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration	USDA	Agriculture (4)	No	M	D
Health Resources and Services Administration	HHS	Health (3)	Yes	F	RD
Immigration and Naturalization Service	DOJ	Law, Crime, and Family Issues (12)	Yes	N	RG
Internal Revenue Service	TREAS	Macroeconomics (1)	No	M	C
International Trade Administration	DOC	Banking, Finance, and Domestic Commerce (15)	No	M	D
Maritime Administration	DOT	Transportation (10)	No	M	D
Mine Safety and Health Administration	DOL	Labor and Employment (5)	Yes	M	RG
National Archives and Records Administration	IND	Government Operations (20)	No	F	D
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration	DOT	Transportation (10)	No	M	RG
National Institute of Standards and Technology	DOC	Banking, Finance, and Domestic Commerce (15)	No	M	D
National Institutes of Health	HHS	Health (3)	Yes	F	D
National Nuclear Security Administration	DOE	Energy (8)	No	N	C
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	DOC	Banking, Finance, and Domestic Commerce (15)	No	M	D
National Park Service	DOI	Public Lands and Water Management (21)	No	N	D
National Science Foundation	IND	Space, Science, Technology, and	No	M	D

		Communications (17)			
National Telecommunications and Information Administration	DOC	Banking, Finance, and Domestic Commerce (15)	No	M	D
Natural Resources Conservation Service	USDA	Agriculture (4)	No	M	D
Occupational Safety and Health Administration	DOL	Labor and Employment (5)	Yes	M	RG
Office for Civil Rights	ED	Education (6)	Yes	F	RG
Office for Civil Rights	HHS	Health (3)	Yes	F	RG
Office of Administration	HUD	Community Development and Housing Issues (14)	Yes	N	C
Office of Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs	DOD	Defense (16)	No	F	RD
Office of Community Planning and Development	HUD	Community Development and Housing Issues (14)	Yes	N	RD
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education	ED	Education (6)	Yes	F	RD
Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity	HUD	Community Development and Housing Issues (14)	Yes	N	RD
Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs	DOL	Government Operations (20)	No	M	C
Office of Federal Student Aid	ED	Education (6)	Yes	F	RD
Office of General Counsel	DOE	Energy (8)	No	N	C
Office of Government Ethics	IND	Government Operations (20)	No	M	C
Office of Housing	HUD	Community Development and Housing Issues (14)	Yes	N	RD
Office of Innovation and Improvement	ED	Education (6)	Yes	F	RD
Office of Inspector General	HHS	Health (3)	Yes	F	C
Office of Justice Programs	DOJ	Law, Crime, and Family Issues (12)	Yes	N	D

Office of Management	ED	Education (6)	Yes	F	C
Office of Natural Resources Revenue	DOI	Public Lands and Water Management (21)	No	N	RG
Office of Personnel Management	IND	Government Operations (20)	No	N	C
Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development	ED	Education (6)	Yes	F	RD
Office of Policy Development and Research	HUD	Community Development and Housing Issues (14)	Yes	N	RD
Office of Postsecondary Education	ED	Education (6)	Yes	F	RD
Office of Procurement and Property Management	USDA	Agriculture (4)	No	M	C
Office of Public and Indian Housing	HUD	Community Development and Housing Issues (14)	Yes	N	RD
Office of Public Health and Science	HHS	Health (3)	Yes	F	RD
Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools	ED	Education (6)	Yes	F	RD
Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services	ED	Education (6)	Yes	F	RD
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	DOI	Public Lands and Water Management (21)	No	N	RG
Office of the American Workplace	DOL	Labor and Employment (5)	Yes	M	RG
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management	DOL	Labor and Employment (5)	Yes	M	RD
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health	HHS	Health (3)	Yes	F	RD
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Veterans' Employment and Training	DOL	Labor and Employment (5)	Yes	M	RD
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	ED	Education (6)	Yes	F	C
Office of the Secretary	USDA	Agriculture (4)	No	M	D

Office of the Secretary	DOC	Banking, Finance, and Domestic Commerce (15)	No	M	D
Office of the Secretary	DOD	Defense (16)	No	M	C
Office of the Secretary	ED	Education (6)	Yes	F	RD
Office of the Secretary	HHS	Health (3)	Yes	N	RD
Office of the Secretary	DHS	Defense (16)	No	M	C
Office of the Secretary	HUD	Community Development and Housing Issues (14)	Yes	N	RD
Office of the Secretary	DOL	Labor and Employment (5)	Yes	M	RD
Office of the Secretary	DOI	Public Lands and Water Management (21)	No	N	D
Office of the Secretary	DOT	Transportation (10)	No	M	D
Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians	DOI	Public Lands and Water Management (21)	No	N	D
Office of Thrift Supervision	TREAS	Macroeconomics (1)	No	M	C
Parole Commission	DOJ	Law, Crime, and Family Issues (12)	Yes	M	RG
Patent and Trademark Office	DOC	Banking, Finance, and Domestic Commerce (15)	No	M	D
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration	DOT	Transportation (10)	No	M	RG
Public Health Service	HHS	Health (3)	Yes	F	RD
Research and Innovative Technologies Administration	DOT	Transportation (10)	No	M	D
Rural Business-Cooperative Service	USDA	Agriculture (4)	No	N	D
Rural Housing Service	USDA	Agriculture (4)	No	N	D
Rural Utilities Service	USDA	Agriculture (4)	No	N	D
Small Business Administration	IND	Banking, Finance, and Domestic Commerce (15)	No	M	D
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration	HHS	Health (3)	Yes	F	D

Technology Administration	DOC	Banking, Finance, and Domestic Commerce (15)	No	M	D
Transportation Security Administration	DHS	Defense (16)	No	M	C
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	DOD	Defense (16)	No	M	D
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services	DHS	Defense (16)	No	N	RG
U.S. Coast Guard	DHS	Defense (16)	No	M	D
U.S. Coast Guard	DOT	Transportation (10)	No	M	D
U.S. Customs and Border Protection	DHS	Defense (16)	No	M	RG
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement	DHS	Defense (16)	No	M	RG
United States Fish and Wildlife Service	DOI	Public Lands and Water Management (21)	No	M	RG
Wage and Hour Division	DOL	Labor and Employment (5)	Yes	M	RG

a: Agencies marked with an asterisk are those considered women's issues only under the broader characterization of the term (8 policy areas) rather than the narrower area (6 policy areas).

b: Krook and O'Brien agency coding: F = Feminine agency; M = Masculine agency; and N = Neutral agency.

c: Lowi's agency coding: C = Constituent agency; D = Distributive agency; RD = Redistributive agency; RG = Regulatory agency.

B. Description of Agency Leader Data Collection Process and Missing Data

To compile a dataset to test our hypotheses, we began with a list of all proposed rules from executive branch agencies for 1995-2014 according to the *Unified Agenda of Regulatory and Deregulatory Actions* (UA). We rely on Potter's (2019) coding of the UA. From this list of proposed rules, we then used the first four digits of each proposed rule's Regulatory Identification Number (RIN) to create a list of every office, bureau, or department that sponsored a proposed rule.

For every entity on that list, we then sought to identify the set of leaders who headed those organizations during the time period under study. For Senate-confirmed positions (which account for nearly 90% of our positions), we were able to use the Library of Congress's website (www.congress.gov) to identify a list of confirmed agency leaders. In other cases, we relied on archived versions of the agency's website (www.archive.org) to identify the agency head at different points in time. Once we had a name, we coded for the individual's biographical information (i.e., age, race, gender, education, prior work history, and tenure in position). We used a variety of sources to get this information, including biographies posted on archived agency sites, the résumé site LinkedIn, the website www.allgov.com, and newspaper and trade press coverage of the industry.

For instance, the race of the agency's leader is coded as white or non-white; finer-grained categorizations were not possible in many cases. Sometimes an individual was directly identified in their biography as being part of a particular minority group (e.g., a statement that the leader was the first African American woman to lead the post) or inferred from other information that arose in our searches (e.g., a press release announcing that the leader won an award from a minority professional association). When neither of

these avenues yielded information about the leader's race, we coded race from a visual inspection of a photo of the leader.

While we were able to ascertain the gender of each of the leaders in our dataset, we were not able to collect reliable biographical information for all of the covariates for every leader.

Vacant Positions and Missing Data

We were not able to systematically identify acting officials (i.e., those persons who temporarily filled a vacancy in an agency leadership position), so proposed rules sponsored by an acting official are excluded from our dataset.

Additionally, in some cases, the sponsoring entity was a relatively obscure administrative unit and we could not identify all of the agency leaders who headed the organization. For instance, despite our best efforts, we were unable to identify the leader of the Defense Acquisition Regulations Council (i.e., the Deputy Assistant Director for Defense Acquisition Regulations System) prior to February 2007. In cases like this, since we had no information on the agency leader, we could not include proposed rules issued during the missing leader's tenure in our analyses. These missing data are disproportionately concentrated among smaller, less prominent bureaus and offices. To the extent that such missing observations affect our analysis, we may be under-accounting for the effect of women, who are more likely to serve in lower-level offices.

One additional caveat is that, for privacy reasons, OPM does not report data on small groups of employees. This restriction reduces the sample size for models including the *Women Leaders*, *Women Workforce*, and *Grade Differential* variables. Additionally, it was

not possible to map personnel data to some of the smaller agencies included in the dataset, which again reduces the sample size for models relying on such data.

C. Description of Data Elements and Principal Components Analysis for *Supportive Environment Measure*

Principal Components Analysis (PCA) is a widely used technique to reduce a set of variables into a smaller number of uncorrelated latent dimensions. In the paper, PCA is used to uncover a *Supportive Environment* score for each agency and each year.

The information underlying this analysis is presented in Table D1 below, which provides a description of each of the three input variables. All data are from the Office of Personnel Management’s FedScope database. In conducting PCA, the researcher must evaluate how many dimensions are present in the data. The convention is to discard any component with an eigenvalue less than one; *Supportive Environment* has an eigenvalue of 2.05. This dimension addresses 68.4% of the underlying variance in the data, suggesting it does a good job of capturing the latent concept.

Table D1 also reports the component loadings for each of the data points. As expected, each of the input variables loads positively and meaningfully as components into the overall metric.

Table C1: PCA Input Data and Component Loadings

Variable Name	Variable Description	Loading
Proportion Women Leaders	The proportion of all “leaders” and “team leaders” (according to OPM’s FedScope database) that are women.	0.647
Proportion Women in the Workforce	The proportion of the agency’s total workforce that is made up of women.	0.578
Grade Differential	The mean General Schedule (GS) grade for women working in an agency minus the mean GS grade for men working in the agency.	0.498

D. Robustness Checks

Table D1: Effects of Female Leadership on Rulemaking in Women's Issue Areas

	(D1.1) Ambition	(D1.2) Execution	(D1.3) Ambitious Execution
Female Leader	-0.007 (0.136)	-0.050 (0.266)	-0.006 (0.270)
Women's Issue	-0.013 (0.324)	-0.057 (0.273)	-0.012 (0.411)
<i>Female Leader × Women's Issue</i>	<i>0.030</i> <i>(0.021)</i>	<i>0.198</i> <i>(0.005)</i>	<i>0.025</i> <i>(0.104)</i>
Age	-0.000 (0.955)	-0.000 (0.994)	0.000 (0.523)
Minority	-0.007 (0.284)	-0.031 (0.290)	-0.002 (0.781)
Bachelors	0.024 (0.374)	-0.218 (0.006)	0.002 (0.927)
Masters	0.023 (0.413)	-0.098 (0.189)	0.018 (0.494)
PhD	0.031 (0.263)	-0.123 (0.111)	0.023 (0.365)
Worked in Another Department	0.012 (0.265)	0.027 (0.670)	0.024 (0.101)
Bureau Experience	-0.004 (0.575)	0.071 (0.268)	0.011 (0.325)
Previous Public Mgmt Experience	-0.015 (0.094)	-0.063 (0.334)	-0.035 (0.009)
Leader Tenure	-0.000 (0.950)	-0.099 (0.000)	0.001 (0.586)
Leader Tenure ²	-0.000 (0.675)	0.006 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.076)
Senate-Confirmed Position	0.005 (0.606)	-0.088 (0.058)	-0.004 (0.728)
Rule Ambition		-0.033 (0.728)	
Constant	0.130 (0.000)	1.169 (0.000)	0.119 (0.002)
Observations	8,541	8,338	4,964
Agency RE	YES	YES	YES
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from ordinary least squares models with *p*-values in parentheses. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance. All models include robust standard errors clustered on the agency.

Table D2: Effects of Female Leadership on Rulemaking in Supportive Work Environments

	(D2.1) Ambition	(D2.2) Execution	(D2.3) Ambitious Execution
Female Leader	-0.049 (0.018)	-0.285 (0.086)	-0.044 (0.052)
Supportive Environment	0.004 (0.906)	-0.190 (0.372)	0.033 (0.458)
<i>Female Leader × Supportive Environment</i>	<i>0.085</i> <i>(0.033)</i>	<i>0.529</i> <i>(0.066)</i>	<i>0.079</i> <i>(0.049)</i>
Age	0.000 (0.659)	-0.001 (0.706)	0.001 (0.271)
Minority	-0.016 (0.230)	-0.091 (0.137)	-0.004 (0.795)
Bachelors	0.068 (0.141)	-0.284 (0.163)	0.039 (0.303)
Masters	0.069 (0.133)	-0.098 (0.588)	0.059 (0.117)
PhD	0.074 (0.099)	-0.143 (0.424)	0.062 (0.086)
Worked in Another Department	0.025 (0.217)	-0.081 (0.229)	0.041 (0.063)
Bureau Experience	0.006 (0.711)	-0.034 (0.519)	0.029 (0.028)
Previous Public Mgmt Experience	-0.031 (0.053)	0.055 (0.310)	-0.056 (0.001)
Leader Tenure	-0.003 (0.413)	-0.103 (0.002)	-0.004 (0.313)
Leader Tenure ²	0.000 (0.383)	0.004 (0.283)	0.000 (0.568)
Senate-Confirmed Position	0.014 (0.440)	-0.039 (0.597)	-0.009 (0.662)
Rule Ambition		0.039 (0.730)	
Constant	0.094 (0.142)	1.256 (0.000)	0.064 (0.263)
Observations	4,754	4,652	2,759
Agency RE	YES	YES	YES
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from ordinary least squares models with *p*-values in parentheses. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance. All models include robust standard errors clustered on the agency.

**Table D3: Effects of Female Leadership on Rulemaking on Women's Issues Only
(Krook and O'Brien Coding)**

	(D3.1) Ambition	(D3.2) Execution	(D3.3) Ambitious Execution
Female Leader	-0.004 (0.363)	-0.023 (0.610)	-0.003 (0.621)
Women's Issue (KOB)	-0.006 (0.688)	0.022 (0.788)	0.009 (0.648)
<i>Female Leader × Women's Issue (KOB)</i>	<i>0.021</i> <i>(0.321)</i>	<i>0.075</i> <i>(0.340)</i>	<i>0.007</i> <i>(0.777)</i>
Age	0.000 (0.968)	0.000 (0.869)	0.000 (0.476)
Minority	-0.007 (0.264)	-0.032 (0.227)	-0.003 (0.730)
Bachelors	0.031 (0.302)	-0.200 (0.046)	0.006 (0.838)
Masters	0.029 (0.335)	-0.083 (0.407)	0.022 (0.444)
PhD	0.037 (0.219)	-0.107 (0.289)	0.027 (0.340)
Worked in Another Department	0.013 (0.214)	0.039 (0.538)	0.025 (0.084)
Bureau Experience	-0.003 (0.710)	0.081 (0.197)	0.012 (0.267)
Previous Public Mgmt Experience	-0.016 (0.068)	-0.066 (0.312)	-0.036 (0.008)
Leader Tenure	-0.000 (1.000)	-0.099 (0.000)	0.001 (0.540)
Leader Tenure ²	-0.000 (0.703)	0.006 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.076)
Senate-Confirmed Position	0.005 (0.585)	-0.083 (0.070)	-0.004 (0.723)
Rule Ambition		-0.026 (0.783)	
Constant	0.119 (0.002)	1.107 (0.000)	0.111 (0.005)
Observations	8,541	8,338	4,964
Agency RE	YES	YES	YES
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from ordinary least squares models with *p*-values in parentheses. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance. All models include robust standard errors clustered on the agency.

**Table D4: Effects of Female Leadership on Rulemaking on Women’s and Neutral Issues
(Broad Krook and O’Brien Coding)^a**

	(D4.1) Ambition	(D4.2) Execution	(D4.3) Ambitious Execution
Female Leader	-0.010 (0.100)	-0.054 (0.359)	-0.006 (0.303)
Women’s Issue (KOB broad)	-0.018 (0.068)	-0.074 (0.117)	-0.009 (0.399)
<i>Female Leader × Women’s Issue (KOB broad)</i>	<i>0.020 (0.036)</i>	<i>0.101 (0.187)</i>	<i>0.013 (0.195)</i>
Age	0.000 (0.927)	0.000 (0.858)	0.000 (0.427)
Minority	-0.009 (0.188)	-0.040 (0.116)	-0.004 (0.602)
Bachelors	0.034 (0.264)	-0.166 (0.122)	0.008 (0.768)
Masters	0.032 (0.304)	-0.051 (0.633)	0.024 (0.405)
PhD	0.040 (0.193)	-0.073 (0.500)	0.029 (0.306)
Worked in Another Department	0.013 (0.196)	0.042 (0.500)	0.026 (0.066)
Bureau Experience	-0.003 (0.727)	0.085 (0.169)	0.013 (0.254)
Previous Public Mgmt Experience	-0.014 (0.097)	-0.063 (0.319)	-0.035 (0.010)
Leader Tenure	-0.000 (0.929)	-0.100 (0.000)	0.001 (0.608)
Leader Tenure ²	-0.000 (0.634)	0.006 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.069)
Senate-Confirmed Position	0.008 (0.455)	-0.073 (0.114)	-0.003 (0.814)
Rule Ambition		-0.029 (0.761)	
Constant	0.117 (0.002)	1.079 (0.000)	0.108 (0.006)
Observations	8,541	8,338	4,964
Agency RE	YES	YES	YES
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from ordinary least squares models with *p*-values in parentheses. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance. All models include robust standard errors clustered on the agency.

a: In this table, we expand the definition of women’s issues to include both feminine areas and neutral areas, as coded by Krook and O’Brien (2012). This sets the baseline policy areas/agencies as those that are explicitly masculine.

**Table D5: Effects of Female Leadership on Rulemaking on Women’s Issues;
Broadly Defined^a**

	(D5.1) Ambition	(D5.2) Execution	(D5.3) Ambitious Execution
Female Leader	-0.010 (0.058)	-0.079 (0.095)	-0.009 (0.100)
Women's Issue (Broad)	-0.009 (0.466)	-0.040 (0.421)	-0.010 (0.465)
<i>Female Leader × Women’s Issue (Broad)</i>	<i>0.028 (0.009)</i>	<i>0.217 (0.001)</i>	<i>0.026 (0.022)</i>
Age	0.000 (0.896)	0.000 (0.857)	0.000 (0.411)
Minority	-0.009 (0.171)	-0.046 (0.105)	-0.005 (0.520)
Bachelors	0.025 (0.365)	-0.218 (0.007)	0.002 (0.942)
Masters	0.025 (0.379)	-0.090 (0.249)	0.019 (0.470)
PhD	0.032 (0.262)	-0.124 (0.116)	0.023 (0.377)
Worked in Another Department	0.009 (0.381)	0.006 (0.927)	0.021 (0.147)
Bureau Experience	-0.005 (0.563)	0.068 (0.275)	0.011 (0.321)
Previous Public Mgmt Experience	-0.013 (0.154)	-0.046 (0.470)	-0.033 (0.015)
Leader Tenure	-0.001 (0.806)	-0.102 (0.000)	0.000 (0.811)
Leader Tenure ²	-0.000 (0.685)	0.006 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.095)
Senate-Confirmed Position	0.005 (0.600)	-0.089 (0.054)	-0.004 (0.741)
Rule Ambition		-0.038 (0.689)	
Constant	0.126 (0.000)	1.154 (0.000)	0.116 (0.002)
Observations	8,541	8,338	4,964
Agency RE	YES	YES	YES
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from ordinary least squares models with *p*-values in parentheses. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance. All models include robust standard errors clustered on the agency.

a: In the main body of the paper, we take a conservative approach and code the six primary issues that Volden, Wiseman, and Wittmer (2018) identify as women’s issues. In this table we add two issues—social welfare and the environment—that those authors suggest might also be considered women’s issues. This makes for eight total areas that are women’s issues in this table.

Table D6: Supportive Environment Results Focusing on Proportion Women Leaders

	(D6.1) Ambition	(D6.2) Execution	(D6.3) Ambitious Execution
Female Leader	-0.050 (0.003)	-0.258 (0.070)	-0.046 (0.008)
Proportion Women Leaders	-0.064 (0.022)	-0.198 (0.178)	-0.055 (0.047)
<i>Female Leader × Proportion Women Leaders</i>	<i>0.110</i> <i>(0.008)</i>	<i>0.588</i> <i>(0.048)</i>	<i>0.103</i> <i>(0.006)</i>
Age	0.000 (0.795)	-0.001 (0.612)	0.001 (0.119)
Minority	-0.016 (0.214)	-0.072 (0.252)	-0.002 (0.882)
Bachelors	0.068 (0.134)	-0.266 (0.185)	0.047 (0.292)
Masters	0.071 (0.115)	-0.087 (0.633)	0.069 (0.108)
PhD	0.077 (0.082)	-0.146 (0.416)	0.074 (0.070)
Worked in Another Department	0.027 (0.180)	-0.016 (0.824)	0.040 (0.061)
Bureau Experience	0.008 (0.591)	0.013 (0.814)	0.028 (0.022)
Previous Public Mgmt Experience	-0.027 (0.077)	0.011 (0.867)	-0.051 (0.002)
Leader Tenure	-0.003 (0.414)	-0.094 (0.005)	-0.003 (0.434)
Leader Tenure ²	0.000 (0.363)	0.004 (0.321)	0.000 (0.542)
Senate-Confirmed Position	0.014 (0.357)	-0.067 (0.344)	-0.014 (0.473)
Rule Ambition		0.047 (0.692)	
Constant	0.136 (0.017)	1.270 (0.000)	0.117 (0.035)
Observations	4,869	4,761	2,816
Agency RE	YES	YES	YES
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from ordinary least squares models with *p*-values in parentheses. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance. All models include robust standard errors clustered on the agency.

Table D7: Supportive Environment Results Focusing on Proportion Women in Workforce

	(D7.1) Ambition	(D7.2) Execution	(D7.3) Ambitious Execution
Female Leader	-0.047 (0.014)	-0.203 (0.322)	-0.035 (0.084)
Women Workforce	0.079 (0.093)	-0.093 (0.674)	0.125 (0.020)
<i>Female Leader × Women Workforce</i>	<i>0.094</i> <i>(0.025)</i>	<i>0.372</i> <i>(0.350)</i>	<i>0.070</i> <i>(0.103)</i>
Age	-0.000 (0.805)	-0.001 (0.623)	0.000 (0.740)
Minority	-0.009 (0.159)	-0.039 (0.186)	-0.006 (0.458)
Bachelors	0.017 (0.723)	-0.226 (0.077)	0.007 (0.866)
Masters	0.017 (0.714)	-0.105 (0.386)	0.024 (0.553)
PhD	0.023 (0.627)	-0.139 (0.248)	0.026 (0.512)
Worked in Another Department	0.011 (0.310)	0.055 (0.392)	0.019 (0.174)
Bureau Experience	-0.007 (0.402)	0.093 (0.149)	0.007 (0.565)
Previous Public Mgmt Experience	-0.013 (0.168)	-0.078 (0.243)	-0.031 (0.036)
Leader Tenure	-0.000 (0.906)	-0.104 (0.000)	0.001 (0.632)
Leader Tenure ²	-0.000 (0.735)	0.006 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.096)
Senate-Confirmed Position	0.020 (0.068)	-0.081 (0.135)	0.010 (0.456)
Rule Ambition		-0.018 (0.852)	
Constant	0.077 (0.216)	1.248 (0.000)	0.037 (0.537)
Observations	8,236	8,044	4,782
Agency RE	YES	YES	YES
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from ordinary least squares models with *p*-values in parentheses. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance. All models include robust standard errors clustered on the agency.

Table D8: Supportive Environment Results Focusing on Grade Differential

	(D8.1) Ambition	(D8.2) Execution	(D8.3) Ambitious Execution
Female Leader	0.017 (0.100)	0.049 (0.329)	0.016 (0.152)
Grade Differential	-0.010 (0.396)	0.015 (0.789)	-0.006 (0.689)
<i>Female Leader × Grade Differential</i>	<i>0.033 (0.016)</i>	<i>0.094 (0.343)</i>	<i>0.029 (0.064)</i>
Age	-0.000 (0.725)	0.001 (0.525)	0.000 (0.635)
Minority	-0.011 (0.182)	-0.029 (0.473)	-0.006 (0.572)
Bachelors	0.013 (0.793)	-0.240 (0.137)	0.002 (0.960)
Masters	0.014 (0.778)	-0.115 (0.458)	0.022 (0.624)
PhD	0.022 (0.651)	-0.158 (0.313)	0.023 (0.612)
Worked in Another Department	0.009 (0.537)	-0.053 (0.413)	0.004 (0.817)
Bureau Experience	-0.006 (0.649)	0.003 (0.951)	-0.002 (0.923)
Previous Public Mgmt Experience	-0.014 (0.280)	0.021 (0.700)	-0.022 (0.185)
Leader Tenure	-0.004 (0.121)	-0.100 (0.000)	-0.002 (0.400)
Leader Tenure ²	0.000 (0.258)	0.006 (0.033)	0.000 (0.763)
Senate-Confirmed Position	0.017 (0.136)	-0.050 (0.323)	0.010 (0.512)
Rule Ambition		0.032 (0.752)	
Constant	0.162 (0.004)	1.050 (0.000)	0.133 (0.018)
Observations	6,484	6,333	3,733
Agency RE	YES	YES	YES
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from ordinary least squares models with *p*-values in parentheses. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance. All models include robust standard errors clustered on the agency.

Table D9: Women's Issue Models by Presidential Party

	Republican administrations			Democratic administrations		
	(D9.1) Ambition	(D9.2) Execution	(D9.3) Ambitious Execution	(D9.4) Ambition	(D9.5) Execution	(D9.6) Ambitious Execution
Female Leader	-0.015 (0.056)	-0.027 (0.625)	-0.018 (0.102)	-0.003 (0.770)	-0.123 (0.001)	0.001 (0.892)
Women's Issue	-0.009 (0.542)	-0.042 (0.561)	-0.011 (0.512)	-0.010 (0.557)	-0.090 (0.182)	-0.007 (0.758)
<i>Female Leader × Women's Issue</i>	<i>0.036 (0.074)</i>	<i>0.206 (0.066)</i>	<i>0.032 (0.210)</i>	<i>0.033 (0.183)</i>	<i>0.269 (0.005)</i>	<i>0.029 (0.375)</i>
Observations	3,201	3,122	1,857	5,340	5,216	3,107
Controls	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Agency RE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from ordinary least squares models with *p*-values in parentheses. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance. All models include robust standard errors clustered on the agency. All control variables from the paper's main models are included here.

Table D10: Supportive Work Environment Models by Presidential Party

	Republican administrations			Democratic administrations		
	(D10.1) Ambition	(D10.2) Execution	(D10.3) Ambitious Execution	(D10.4) Ambition	(D10.5) Execution	(D10.6) Ambitious Execution
Female Leader	-0.089 (0.018)	0.215 (0.184)	-0.078 (0.085)	-0.055 (0.104)	-0.358 (0.017)	-0.029 (0.414)
Women's Issue	-0.019 (0.636)	-0.124 (0.676)	0.036 (0.508)	0.052 (0.341)	0.197 (0.287)	0.046 (0.425)
<i>Female Leader × Supportive Environment</i>	<i>0.132 (0.035)</i>	<i>-0.266 (0.364)</i>	<i>0.115 (0.114)</i>	<i>0.091 (0.120)</i>	<i>0.370 (0.188)</i>	<i>0.075 (0.209)</i>
Observations	2,097	2,063	1,227	2,657	2,589	1,532
Controls	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Agency RE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from ordinary least squares models with *p*-values in parentheses. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance. All models include robust standard errors clustered on the agency. All control variables from the paper's main models are included here.

Table D11: Women’s Issue Models with President-Agency Difference Controls^a

	Agency in agreement with president			Agency <i>not</i> in agreement with president		
	(D11.1) Ambition	(D11.2) Execution	(D11.3) Ambitious Execution	(D11.4) Ambition	(D11.5) Execution	(D11.6) Ambitious Execution
Female Leader	-0.008 (0.507)	0.045 (0.388)	0.004 (0.791)	-0.000 (0.992)	-0.123 (0.003)	-0.002 (0.831)
Women's Issue	-0.012 (0.462)	-0.048 (0.598)	0.008 (0.691)	-0.013 (0.413)	-0.064 (0.449)	-0.019 (0.310)
<i>Female Leader × Women’s Issue</i>	<i>0.043 (0.046)</i>	<i>0.116 (0.257)</i>	<i>0.029 (0.303)</i>	<i>0.025 (0.170)</i>	<i>0.375 (0.000)</i>	<i>0.018 (0.445)</i>
Observations	3,692	3,590	2,158	4,739	4,638	2,748
Controls	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Agency RE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from ordinary least squares models with *p*-values in parentheses. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance. All models include robust standard errors clustered on the agency. All control variables from the paper’s main models are included here.

a: In these models, we determine whether or not an agency is ideologically aligned with the current president through a two-step process. First, we identify whether an agency is considered liberal or conservative using agency-level ideology estimates developed by Clinton and Lewis (2008). Liberal agencies are those with a Clinton-Lewis score of less than 0 and conservative agencies are those with a score greater than 0. Second, we assign a value of “agreement” with the president if the agency is conservative (liberal) and the current president is a Republican (Democrat); all other pairings are considered to be “disagreement.”

Table D12: Supportive Work Environment Models with President-Agency Difference Controls^a

	Agency in agreement with president			Agency <i>not</i> in agreement with president		
	(D12.1) Ambition	(D12.2) Execution	(D12.3) Ambitious Execution	(D12.4) Ambition	(D12.5) Execution	(D12.6) Ambitious Execution
Female Leader	-0.101 (0.019)	-0.022 (0.898)	-0.077 (0.103)	-0.029 (0.161)	-0.173 (0.279)	0.012 (0.670)
Women's Issue	-0.058 (0.204)	-0.450 (0.079)	0.003 (0.958)	0.078 (0.040)	0.178 (0.331)	0.111 (0.019)
<i>Female Leader × Supportive Environment</i>	<i>0.176 (0.016)</i>	<i>0.180 (0.492)</i>	<i>0.176 (0.022)</i>	<i>0.044 (0.191)</i>	<i>0.191 (0.508)</i>	<i>-0.037 (0.423)</i>
Observations	2,188	2,134	1,285	2,549	2,501	1,460
Controls	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Agency RE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from ordinary least squares models with p -values in parentheses. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance. All models include robust standard errors clustered on the agency. All control variables from the paper's main models are included here.

a: In these models, we determine whether or not an agency is ideologically aligned with the current president through a two-step process. First, we identify whether an agency is considered liberal or conservative using agency-level ideology estimates developed by Clinton and Lewis (2008). Liberal agencies are those with a Clinton-Lewis score of less than 0 and conservative agencies are those with a score greater than 0. Second, we assign a value of “agreement” with the president if the agency is conservative (liberal) and the current president is a Republican (Democrat); all other pairings are considered to be in “disagreement.”

Table D13: Women's Issue Results by Senate-Confirmed Political Appointees (PAS) and Non-PAS

	PAS only			Non-PAS only		
	(D13.1) Ambition	(D13.2) Execution	(D13.3) Ambitious Execution	(D13.4) Ambition	(D13.5) Execution	(D13.6) Ambitious Execution
Female Leader	-0.008 (0.132)	-0.063 (0.167)	-0.006 (0.303)	-0.003 (0.858)	0.078 (0.297)	-0.017 (0.257)
Women's Issue	-0.014 (0.357)	-0.062 (0.288)	-0.008 (0.622)	-0.013 (0.547)	-0.028 (0.728)	-0.008 (0.742)
<i>Female Leader × Women's Issue</i>	<i>0.030 (0.028)</i>	<i>0.213 (0.006)</i>	<i>0.026 (0.129)</i>	<i>0.021 (0.327)</i>	<i>-0.165 (0.176)</i>	<i>0.031 (0.317)</i>
Observations	7,568	7,395	4,370	973	943	594
Controls	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Agency RE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from ordinary least squares models with *p*-values in parentheses. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance. All models include robust standard errors clustered on the agency. All control variables from the paper's main models are included here.

Table D14: Supportive Work Environment Results by Senate-Confirmed Political Appointees (PAS) and Non-PAS

	PAS only			Non-PAS only		
	(D14.1) Ambition	(D14.2) Execution	(D14.3) Ambitious Execution	(D14.4) Ambition	(D14.5) Execution	(D14.6) Ambitious Execution
Female Leader	-0.051 (0.018)	-0.159 (0.325)	-0.060 (0.002)	0.034 (0.844)	-1.764 (0.008)	-0.125 (0.661)
Women's Issue	-0.004 (0.904)	-0.316 (0.105)	-0.009 (0.861)	-0.029 (0.846)	-1.747 (0.079)	-0.167 (0.272)
<i>Female Leader × Supportive Environment</i>	<i>0.092 (0.035)</i>	<i>0.379 (0.147)</i>	<i>0.112 (0.004)</i>	<i>-0.037 (0.892)</i>	<i>2.228 (0.013)</i>	<i>0.247 (0.548)</i>
Observations	4,480	4,386	2,613	274	266	146
Controls	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Agency RE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from ordinary least squares models with p -values in parentheses. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance. All models include robust standard errors clustered on the agency. All control variables from the paper's main models are included here.

Table D15: Models of Rule Importance using Priority Measure^a

	(D15.1) Priority	(D15.2) Priority	(D15.3) Priority
Female Leader	-0.026 (0.743)	-0.013 (0.892)	0.463 (0.069)
Women's Issue		-0.428 (0.001)	
<i>Female Leader × Women's Issue</i>		-0.061 (0.660)	
Supportive Environment			-0.023 (0.965)
<i>Female Leader × Supportive Environment</i>			-0.713 (0.081)
<i>Cut 1</i>	-3.011	-2.960	-2.551
<i>Cut 2</i>	-1.524	-1.473	-1.106
Observations	8,541	8,541	4,754
Controls	YES	YES	YES
Agency RE	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES
χ^2	220.1	235.5	465.8

Notes: Ordered probit analyses with *p*-values in parentheses. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance. All models include robust standard errors clustered on the agency. All control variables from the paper's main models are included here.

a: Priority is self-reported by agencies in the *Unified Agenda*. It is reverse coded so that higher values suggest a lower priority. Therefore, the expected effect is *negative*. It is coded as follows: 10 = economically significant rule; 20 = significant rule; 30 = nonsignificant rule, routine rule, or administrative rule.

Table D16: Execution Models with Alternate Rule Execution Assumptions^a

	(D16.1) Execution	(D16.2) Execution	(D16.3) Execution
Female Leader	-0.028 (0.539)	-0.058 (0.256)	-0.311 (0.038)
Women's Issue		-0.042 (0.495)	
<i>Female Leader × Women's Issues</i>		0.177 (0.032)	
Supportive Environment			-0.121 (0.597)
<i>Female Leader × Supportive Environment</i>			0.569 (0.042)
Age	-0.000 (0.895)	-0.001 (0.769)	-0.004 (0.215)
Minority	-0.022 (0.450)	-0.022 (0.459)	-0.126 (0.024)
Bachelors	-0.260 (0.030)	-0.279 (0.005)	-0.382 (0.067)
Masters	-0.136 (0.245)	-0.154 (0.109)	-0.172 (0.310)
PhD	-0.136 (0.259)	-0.156 (0.122)	-0.161 (0.331)
Worked in Another Department	0.018 (0.776)	0.000 (0.995)	-0.157 (0.046)
Bureau Experience	0.080 (0.222)	0.069 (0.296)	-0.054 (0.364)
Previous Public Mgmt Experience	-0.041 (0.542)	-0.040 (0.550)	0.136 (0.040)
Leader Tenure	-0.116 (0.000)	-0.115 (0.000)	-0.133 (0.000)
Leader Tenure ²	0.006 (0.000)	0.006 (0.000)	0.006 (0.128)
Senate-Confirmed Position	-0.094 (0.038)	-0.099 (0.027)	-0.066 (0.409)
Rule Ambition	-0.066 (0.406)	-0.077 (0.311)	-0.024 (0.815)
Constant	1.321 (0.000)	1.387 (0.000)	1.612 (0.000)
Observations	6,851	6,851	3,784
Agency RE	YES	YES	YES
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from ordinary least squares models with *p*-values in parentheses. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance. All models include robust standard errors clustered on the agency.

a: This operationalization of *Execution* focuses exclusively on rules that had a definitive outcome during the period under study (i.e., finalized or withdrawn). This reduces our sample size.

Table D17: Logit Models of Rule Execution

	(D17.1) Execution	(D17.2) Execution	(D17.3) Execution
Female Leader	-0.001 (0.994)	-0.173 (0.477)	-2.060 (0.098)
Women's Issue		-0.140 (0.614)	
<i>Female Leader × Women's Issue</i>		1.021 (0.012)	
Supportive Environment			-0.848 (0.542)
<i>Female Leader × Supportive Environment</i>			3.889 (0.063)
Age	0.001 (0.935)	-0.002 (0.848)	-0.019 (0.212)
Minority	-0.161 (0.224)	-0.171 (0.247)	-0.640 (0.056)
Bachelors	-0.565 (0.320)	-0.803 (0.047)	-1.624 (0.167)
Masters	0.081 (0.884)	-0.142 (0.702)	-0.338 (0.761)
PhD	-0.056 (0.921)	-0.291 (0.447)	-0.393 (0.725)
Worked in Another Department	0.253 (0.444)	0.159 (0.632)	-0.293 (0.451)
Bureau Experience	0.455 (0.170)	0.394 (0.244)	-0.054 (0.906)
Previous Public Mgmt Experience	-0.393 (0.249)	-0.377 (0.277)	0.266 (0.525)
Leader Tenure	-0.528 (0.000)	-0.525 (0.000)	-0.513 (0.000)
Leader Tenure ²	0.028 (0.009)	0.027 (0.013)	0.004 (0.871)
Senate-Confirmed Position	-0.466 (0.092)	-0.516 (0.068)	-0.135 (0.772)
Rule Ambition	-0.092 (0.860)	-0.135 (0.795)	0.309 (0.644)
Constant	2.708 (0.003)	3.284 (0.000)	4.230 (0.007)
Observations	8,338	8,338	4,652
Agency RE	YES	YES	YES
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from logit models with *p*-values in parentheses. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance. All models include robust standard errors clustered on the agency.

Table D18: Multilevel Models of Women's Issues Models

	(D18.1) Ambition	(D18.2) Execution	(D18.3) Ambitious Execution
Female Leader	-0.008 (0.026)	-0.052 (0.280)	-0.007 (0.292)
Women's Issue	-0.017 (0.392)	-0.053 (0.370)	-0.017 (0.426)
<i>Female Leader × Women's Issue</i>	<i>0.029</i> <i>(0.000)</i>	<i>0.213</i> <i>(0.005)</i>	<i>0.023</i> <i>(0.142)</i>
Age	-0.000 (0.967)	-0.000 (0.816)	0.000 (0.520)
Minority	-0.006 (0.268)	-0.029 (0.310)	-0.001 (0.838)
Bachelors	0.029 (0.000)	-0.165 (0.021)	0.005 (0.507)
Masters	0.027 (0.000)	-0.041 (0.536)	0.020 (0.043)
PhD	0.035 (0.000)	-0.066 (0.331)	0.026 (0.019)
Worked in Another Department	0.011 (0.315)	0.028 (0.674)	0.024 (0.095)
Bureau Experience	-0.005 (0.246)	0.075 (0.186)	0.010 (0.211)
Previous Public Mgmt Experience	-0.014 (0.034)	-0.065 (0.259)	-0.034 (0.000)
Leader Tenure	-0.000 (0.848)	-0.098 (0.000)	0.001 (0.602)
Leader Tenure ²	-0.000 (0.518)	0.005 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.024)
Senate-Confirmed Position	0.009 (0.423)	-0.108 (0.047)	-0.000 (0.980)
Rule Ambition		-0.016 (0.878)	
Constant	0.125 (0.000)	1.154 (0.000)	0.115 (0.000)
Department-level Random Effects	0.022 (0.004)	0.076 (.029)	0.023 (0.007)
Bureau-level Random Effects	0.040 (0.003)	0.146 (0.016)	0.045 (0.006)
Observations	8,541	8,338	4,964
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from hierarchical linear models with random effects at the agency and department level. *P*-values are in parentheses; models include robust standard errors clustered on the department. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance.

Table D19: Multilevel Models of Supportive Work Environments

	(D19.1)	(D19.2)	(D19.3)
	Ambition	Execution	Ambitious Execution
Female Leader	-0.049 (0.011)	-0.363 (0.030)	-0.037 (0.121)
Supportive Environment	-0.001 (0.967)	-0.107 (0.642)	0.043 (0.251)
<i>Female Leader × Supportive Environment</i>	<i>0.086</i> <i>(0.014)</i>	<i>0.663</i> <i>(0.034)</i>	<i>0.068</i> <i>(0.106)</i>
Age	0.000 (0.661)	-0.004 (0.245)	0.001 (0.009)
Minority	-0.016 (0.157)	-0.098 (0.178)	-0.000 (0.978)
Bachelors	0.064 (0.172)	-0.289 (0.186)	0.058 (0.280)
Masters	0.065 (0.173)	-0.071 (0.722)	0.080 (0.128)
PhD	0.070 (0.120)	-0.103 (0.625)	0.087 (0.088)
Worked in Another Department	0.025 (0.235)	-0.057 (0.420)	0.034 (0.111)
Bureau Experience	0.005 (0.721)	-0.016 (0.758)	0.024 (0.155)
Previous Public Mgmt Experience	-0.030 (0.034)	0.060 (0.378)	-0.052 (0.002)
Leader Tenure	-0.004 (0.353)	-0.103 (0.000)	-0.002 (0.603)
Leader Tenure^2	0.000 (0.365)	0.003 (0.381)	0.000 (0.730)
Senate-Confirmed Position	0.015 (0.439)	-0.025 (0.643)	-0.009 (0.726)
Constant	0.092 (0.136)	1.268 (0.000)	0.010 (0.889)
Department-level Random Effects	0.016 (0.016)	2.48e-06 (0.0001)	2.51e-06 (0.0002)
Bureau-level Random Effects	0.039 (0.006)	0.191 (0.065)	0.052 (0.008)
Observations	4,754	4,652	2,759
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from hierarchical linear models with random effects at the agency and department level. *P*-values are in parentheses; models include robust standard errors clustered on the department. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance.

Table D20: Women's Issue Models with Additional Bureau-Level Controls^a

	(D20.1) Ambition	(D20.2) Execution	(D20.3) Ambitious Execution
Female Leader	-0.008 (0.201)	-0.068 (0.132)	0.010 (0.261)
Women's Issue	-0.004 (0.827)	-0.245 (0.008)	-0.002 (0.899)
<i>Female Leader × Women's Issue</i>	<i>0.009 (0.578)</i>	<i>0.287 (0.005)</i>	<i>0.012 (0.593)</i>
Fixed Term	0.003 (0.913)	0.059 (0.299)	-0.055 (0.007)
Divided at Creation	-0.014 (0.426)	-0.105 (0.219)	-0.020 (0.058)
Democrat President at Creation	-0.033 (0.103)	-0.072 (0.428)	-0.024 (0.062)
Constant	0.096 (0.102)	1.162 (0.000)	0.088 (0.061)
Observations	4,630	4,560	2,932
Controls	YES	YES	YES
Agency RE	YES	YES	YES
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from ordinary least squares models with *p*-values in parentheses. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance. All models include robust standard errors clustered on the agency.

a. Additional control variables are included here, following those in the analyses of Lewis (2007). Due to missing data, the sample size is diminished considerably.

Table D21: Supportive Work Environment Models with Additional Bureau-Level Controls^a

	(D21.1) Ambition	(D21.2) Execution	(D21.3) Ambitious Execution
Female Leader	-0.026 (0.158)	-0.195 (0.092)	-0.013 (0.506)
Supportive Environment	-0.088 (0.003)	-0.046 (0.793)	-0.089 (0.008)
<i>Female Leader × Supportive Environment</i>	<i>0.038</i> (0.301)	<i>0.289</i> (0.211)	<i>0.025</i> (0.549)
Fixed Term	-0.105 (0.000)	0.206 (0.018)	-0.115 (0.000)
Divided at Creation	-0.017 (0.436)	-0.142 (0.370)	-0.026 (0.164)
Dem President at Creation	-0.009 (0.679)	-0.274 (0.076)	-0.013 (0.370)
Constant	0.144 (0.035)	1.411 (0.000)	0.131 (0.031)
Observations	3,156	3,112	1,985
Controls	YES	YES	YES
Agency RE	YES	YES	YES
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from ordinary least squares models with *p*-values in parentheses. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance. All models include robust standard errors clustered on the agency.

a. Additional control variables are included here, following those in the analyses of Lewis (2007). Due to missing data, the sample size is diminished considerably.

Table D22: Female Leadership Effects within Lowi's Four Agency Types^a

	(D22.1) Ambition	(D22.2) Execution	(D22.3) Ambitious Execution
Female Leader	0.027 (0.068)	0.069 (0.143)	0.028 (0.017)
Constituent Agency	0.010 (0.552)	0.049 (0.246)	-0.002 (0.940)
Distributive Agency	0.004 (0.737)	0.074 (0.199)	-0.005 (0.743)
Regulatory Agency	0.012 (0.399)	-0.068 (0.177)	0.008 (0.654)
<i>Female Leader x Constituent Agency</i>	<i>-0.024 (0.132)</i>	<i>-0.058 (0.455)</i>	<i>-0.030 (0.065)</i>
<i>Female Leader x Distributive Agency</i>	<i>-0.030 (0.104)</i>	<i>-0.202 (0.046)</i>	<i>-0.032 (0.067)</i>
<i>Female Leader x Regulatory Agency</i>	<i>-0.038 (0.010)</i>	<i>-0.027 (0.662)</i>	<i>-0.038 (0.008)</i>
Constant	0.117 (0.000)	1.022 (0.000)	0.121 (0.001)
Observations	8,541	8,338	4,964
Controls	YES	YES	YES
Agency RE	YES	YES	YES
Agency Type FE	YES	YES	YES
Year FE	YES	YES	YES

Notes: Coefficients from ordinary least squares models with *p*-values in parentheses. Standard two-tailed cutoff levels establish statistical significance. All models include robust standard errors clustered on the agency.

a. Lowi's (1985) agency type codings are presented in Table B1. The omitted case is redistributive agencies.

SI References

- Baumgartner, Frank R., and Bryan D. Jones. 2016. "Policy Agendas Project." NSF #SBR 9320922, #0111611. Austin, TX: University of Texas.
- Clinton, Joshua D., & Lewis, David E. 2008. "Expert Opinion, Agency Characteristics, and Agency Preferences." *Political Analysis* 16(1): 3-20.
- Dolan, Julie. 2004. "Gender Equity: Illusion or Reality for Women in the Federal Executive Service?" *Public Administration Review* 64(3): 299-308.
- Krook, Mona Lena, & O'Brien, Diana Z. 2012. "The President's Men? The Appointment of Female Cabinet Ministers Worldwide." *Journal of Politics* 74(3): 840-855.
- Lewis, David E. 2007. "Testing Pendleton's Premise: Do Political Appointees Make Worse Bureaucrats?" *Journal of Politics* 69(4): 1073-1088.
- Lowi, Theodore J. 1985. "The State in Politics: The Relation between Policy and Administration." In *Regulatory Policy and the Social Sciences*, edited by Roger G. Noll. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 67-105.
- Newman, Meredith Ann. 1994. "Gender and Lowi's Thesis: Implications for Career Advancement." *Public Administration Review* 54(3): 277-284.
- Sabharwal, Meghna. 2015. "From Glass Ceiling to Glass Cliff: Women in Senior Executive Service." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 25(2): 399-426.
- Volden, Craig, Alan E. Wiseman, and Dana E. Wittmer. 2018. "Women's Issues and Their Fates in the U.S. Congress." *Political Science Research and Methods* 6(4): 679-96.