

The Legislative Scholar

The Newsletter of the Legislative Studies Section of the American Political Science Association

Editors: Laurel Harbridge-Yong (l-harbridge@northwestern.edu), Gisela Sin (gsin@illinois.edu)

Editorial Assistant: Collin Paschall

Editorial Board: Stefanie Bailer, Jennifer Hayes Clark, Michael Crespin, Mark P. Jones, Kristin Kanthak, Carol Mershon, Michael Minta, Chris Mooney, Sophia Jordán Wallace (<http://www.legislativestudies.org/legislativescholar/editorial-board/>)

Contents

Message from the Editors

Women in Legislative Studies by <i>Laurel Harbridge-Yong and Gisela Sin</i>	2
---	---

Interviews, Reflections, and Advice from Women in Legislative Studies

Challenges and Strategies: Interview with Carol Mershon by <i>Dana Moyer</i>	3
Gender Bias in Legislative Studies? by <i>Lynda Powell</i>	6
Welcoming and Mentoring Women in Legislative Studies by <i>Cindy Simon Rosenthal</i>	7
Does the Legislative Studies Section Have a “Woman” Problem? by <i>Linda Fowler</i>	9
How Do We Get More Women to Study Legislative Politics? by <i>Michele Swers</i>	10
An Interdisciplinary and International Perspective: An Interview with Liza Mügge by <i>Sanne van Oosten</i>	12
One Woman’s Career Path - with Advice for Young Women Scholars by <i>Patricia A. Hurley</i>	14
Advice for Women and for Their Colleagues and Mentors: An Interview with Frances E. Lee by <i>SoRelle Wyckoff</i>	15
Self as Community: An Interview with Dr. Nadia Brown by <i>Guillermo Caballero and Jasmine Jackson</i>	17
Where Do We Go From Here? by <i>Tracy Sulkin</i>	19
Navigating Political Science as a Woman by <i>Diana Z. O’Brien</i>	20
Walking in Large Footprints and Forging New Paths by <i>Wendy Schiller</i>	23

MESSAGE FROM THE EDITORS

[Laurel Harbridge-Yong](#)
 Northwestern University
[Gisela Sin](#)
 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

This issue marks our final issue as co-editors of *The Legislative Scholar*. Thanks to the efforts of Brian Crisp, the Legislative Studies Section newsletter was revamped in 2016. Thank you Brian and the members of the Legislative Studies section for trusting us with this endeavor.

In the three years since, we've published newsletters on the Past, Present, and Future of the Legislative Studies Section; Teaching, Mentoring, and Training Graduate and Undergraduate Students; Advice on Sabbaticals, Grants, and Research Opportunities; a retrospective on the Contributions of Keith Poole; and insights on Legislative Gridlock. We've also highlighted the visions of legislative scholars on contemporary political events and multiple data sets that have been developed by scholars in our field.

We're thankful to all of the section members who helped us in this process. The members of the two Editorial Boards were always ready to provide feedback on ideas, or suggestions for article writers. The 114 contributors to the 6 issues in these three years were amazing, graciously agreeing to contribute to the newsletter and sending their contributions on time. This included faculty as well as graduate students, and several contributors who generously wrote for multiple issues. We are especially thankful to Collin Paschall, who was a graduate student when we started with the newsletter, and now, with a PhD in hand, is an APSA Congressional Fellow. Collin did a lot of the work behind the scenes and made our work much more pleasant and easy.

Our final issue of the newsletter focuses on women in the Legislative Studies Section. It is not news that women are underrepresented in the field. In a paper reporting the percentage of women at the 43 different APSA sections, LSS was the third lowest (22% female), only above Political Methodology (21%) and Presidents and Executive Politics (also 22%) (see Roberts 2018). This gender breakdown was also evident at the last LSS business meeting where there were about 15 women present, out of a total of about 60 people in the room. There are also gender gaps in publication in *Legislative Studies Quarterly* (as there are in most of the top journals) though we have no evidence that this gap is any different in publications than in submissions.

Recognizing that there are likely many reasons for this gender breakdown – both in the pipeline leading scholars to various fields and in the climate and opportunities within a section – we were encouraged by section President Wendy Schiller to raise these issues in the newsletter. This newsletter is the result of these efforts, as we sought the insights of senior women in the field. We asked them to reflect on the

challenges they may have encountered, how the field has changed over time, and to provide advice for more junior women navigating the field.

We are incredibly grateful for the contributions to this issue. Combined, this issue is both a chance for the section to take notice of the gender disparity, why it may exist, and how it may affect the career paths of junior women, and to provide an opportunity to explore suggestions for ways to improve both the pipeline and climate.

It is clear from our contributors that there is no single reason for the low proportion of women in the section. One possibility is that the section is losing younger scholars altogether, and since younger cohorts are more evenly balanced on gender, the section loses women this way (Powell). Another possibility is that the section is losing junior women more often than junior men and that women who identify as “legislatures plus something else” have opted to align with the “something else” section (Powell). A third is that the problem begins in the pipeline, as graduate students select fields and find advisors (Fowler; Sulkin). A fourth is potential differences in male and female employment in liberal arts versus R1 institutions, which may affect the likelihood of regular conference attendance (Fowler). We encourage the section leadership to continue research into these explanations, perhaps via a survey of section members and those doing work in related fields. There is also much more that can be done to consider other underrepresented groups, including racial and ethnic minorities.

In terms of suggestions, the contributors emphasize several things that women can do. This includes the importance of promoting one's own work – whether through self-citation or proposing an “author meets critics” panel (to which we'd add that this may be easier at MPSA than APSA) (Mershon and Moyer). Women should also seek opportunities to be seen and to network, whether by attending conference panels other than your own (and introducing yourself to other scholars) or attending section business meetings (Hurley). And women can do more to build mentoring relationships, whether by taking advantage of growing mentoring opportunities through APSA and other organizations (Mershon and Moyer) or by strategically seeking both vertical (senior) and horizontal (peer) mentorships (O'Brien).

However, addressing the challenges that come with being in an underrepresented group extend to advisers and colleagues as well. This includes greater awareness about the challenges women may face in a male dominated field, whether in opportunities for informal mentoring or double burdens (Mershon and Moyer). Like women in other male-dominated fields, female legislative scholars may face challenges to “prove it again”, walk a “tight-rope” between femininity and masculinity, and address the “maternal wall” (Mügge and van Oosten). Having colleagues who are alert to these challenges can help lessen these challenges and help female scholars navigate the field when they arise. There is also more we as a field can do to help our advisees and colleagues identify good mentors (something that is true for

both men and women). Junior scholars may not know what a good mentor looks like or what to look for (Lee and Wyckoff), or how to think strategically about co-authorship networks (Schiller). Using resources like Women Also Know Stuff and People of Color Also Know Stuff can help all of us increase the diversity of our speaker series and syllabi. Making our syllabi more representative is a small step toward making the field (and each of us as advisors and mentors) approachable for both men and women (Lee and Wyckoff).

Finally, there may be things the section can do to foster greater community for both women and men. This includes recruitment, mentoring, and fostering a wider range of “legislative” research questions (Swers). Although the Congress and History Conference has been an avenue to bring a subset of Congressional legislative scholars together, it does not include state or comparative legislative scholars, and there is no legislatures-wide annual conference with an open call for papers (something other subfields like state politics do) (Powell). More broadly, the field may be able to foster greater inclusion of research on state legislatures and comparative legislatures (where there may be more women and where new research questions may arise) (Powell; Rosenthal), research linking legislatures and representation (Sulkin), or research at the intersection of legislatures and gender or race (Mügge; Brown, Caballero and Jackson; Rosenthal; Schiller). The field may also benefit from greater openness to new questions and approaches, even if they push against the established approaches (Fowler). One possibility may be to consider more co-sponsored panels with Race, Ethnicity, and Politics or Women and Politics. While panels sponsored by Legislative Studies tend to be male dominated, panels sponsored by Women and Politics tend to be female dominated (Swers). Greater integration would improve the currently gendered networks and also provide cross-fertilization of research agendas.

We thank all of the contributors to this issue for their thoughtful reflections and their efforts to help promote greater inclusiveness and community within the Legislative Studies Section.

Laurel and Gisela

References

Roberts, Margaret E. 2018. “What is Political Methodology?” *PS: Political Science & Politics* July: 597-601.

INTERVIEWS, REFLECTIONS, AND ADVICE FROM WOMEN IN LEGISLATIVE STUDIES

Challenges and Strategies: An Interview with Carol Mershon

Dana Moyer
with Carol Mershon
University of Virginia

1. Changes in the field

I have seen multiple changes in the field of legislative studies since I started as an assistant professor in the mid-1980s. Rational choice scholarship now more thoroughly dominates the field, and theoretical arguments have acquired greater rigor, in part through wider use of formal theory. The methods we use have become more diverse. For instance, legislative scholars now incorporate experiments into their research (e.g., Harbridge et al. 2014; McClendon 2016). Moreover, our research questions have become more varied. For example, we now have abundant research on how members of underrepresented groups win legislative representation and how they exercise power once in office (e.g., Baldez 2004; Barnes 2016; Htun 2004; Kanthak and Krause 2012; Krook 2010; Lawless 2015; Orey et al. 2007; Smooth 2011). Last, the study of legislatures beyond the U.S. has blossomed. As a result, scholars probe the impact of elected legislatures (Gandhi 2008) and of increased legislative transparency (Malesky et al. 2012) under authoritarianism. In addition, we are more aware of the importance for legislative politics of variation in, e.g., the number of parties represented, the dimensionality of the policy space, the electoral system, and the executive’s legislative prerogatives. With the accumulated comparative work, we can better appreciate commonalities across legislatures in presidential and parliamentary democracies (e.g., Cox 2006) and distinctions within the set of presidential systems (e.g., Palanza and Sin 2014). All told, given the field’s evolution, we have enhanced understanding of legislative politics since the mid-1980s.

2. Experience entering a male-dominated field

I entered legislative studies with my second, not first, major project (on the second, e.g., Mershon 1996; 2001; 2002). When I entered the discipline and the legislative studies subfield, I recognized both as dominated by white men. In my first fifteen or so years in the profession, many times I walked into panel rooms at APSA or MPSA Meetings as

the second—or the sole—woman in the room. In my first job, I was the second woman ever hired in the history of the department.

For me, moreover, the personal and the professional were intertwined at the outset of the career. As a not-quite-minted Ph.D. on the job market, a dean suggestively put his hand on my knee. Although my memory is spotty (as is typical in cases of sexual harassment), I quickly exited that particular interview. Details aside, I am also the survivor of a rape linked to research on the dissertation.

Given the difficulties I have encountered, I send two messages to colleagues. First, to those who are underrepresented: you are not alone, and find strength in that fact. (For more, see Strategies below.) Second, to all colleagues: never underestimate the resilience and grit that members of underrepresented groups have had to muster just to keep on keeping on in their careers.

“To those who are underrepresented: you are not alone.”

Yet in two chief ways, my entry into legislative studies was easy. I responded strongly to the elegance, beauty, and power of formal theory as a tool to structure research on legislative parties and parliamentary politics. Internalizing the theory, I could readily observe real-world phenomena that puzzled me.

3. Disadvantages faced by women in a male-dominated field

Early in my career, I made do with relatively little mentoring. In graduate school, my committee members were all men, my department did not have a single senior tenured woman, and it had few women faculty members of any rank. I only learned after graduate school that I was excluded from informal mentoring relationships benefiting male graduate students. The “missed mentoring” disadvantage appeared most clearly in retrospect: five to eight years after receipt of the Ph.D., a conversation with one of the few women from my graduate program led us to realize that we had learned the hard way, on our own, by trial and error, such basic professional practices as how to move a manuscript through the journal pipeline or to navigate the probationary period.

There is also a double burden that even white women face in a field dominated by white men (on the “double bind” of black women in science, Malcom et al. 1976). Anyone in academe performs many roles (teacher, researcher, writer, advisor, and more), and the combination can be daunting. But there is more. A double burden is borne, for instance, when a member of a woman’s dissertation committee states, upon hearing that she is engaged to be married, that he assumes she will not complete the Ph.D. The double burden arises when, on a semester’s first day, someone walks to the front of a classroom at the class’s start, and students ask, “where’s the professor?” They do not see the answer: the woman in front of you. The double burden appears when a

senior male colleague tells a junior colleague that she should have a child. The double burden contains repeated lumps of microaggression, implicit bias, and overt bias, which all add up to a disadvantage that can threaten to drag us down. Especially towards the start of the career, carrying this weight creates uncertainty and saps psychic and intellectual energy. Even so, we have ways to lighten the load, as suggested in Strategies below.

I also count myself fortunate. In graduate school, I benefited from excellent preparation for fieldwork. Over the last several decades, I have sought and found superb mentors in women and men, within and outside political science, and indeed outside academe. As I have mentored others, I have learned that mentors receive as much as they give.

4. Strategies for the next generation of women

This discussion leads to the strategies I emphasize: mentor, network, and push. First, cultivate multiple mentoring relationships. Do not rely only on senior women political scientists as mentors: after all, the people who fill that bill are still relatively few in number. Seek out peer mentors, mentors in other social sciences, and mentors who are men. Do all you can to mentor others. Join the mentoring programs sponsored by APSA, MPSA, and other professional organizations. Take advantage of the Wondering Woman blog at the APSA Committee on the Status of Women (<http://web.apsanet.org/cswp/welcome-to-the-wondering-woman/>).

Second, network with women and scholars of color in multiple arenas, starting from your home institution. Organize and benefit from a women’s caucus in your home department or, if you have a small department, across several cognate departments (e.g., Mershon and Walsh 2015). Beyond your home institution, take part in meetings and receptions of the APSA Women’s Caucus and the APSA Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession and those at the regional associations. Network by taking advantage of the abundant resources gathered at the APSA Diversity & Inclusion Programs site (<https://www.apsanet.org/diversityprograms/>), noting the multiple caucuses and status committees there, links to fellowships for members of underrepresented groups, an impressive set of diversity and inclusion resources, and much else.

Third, push yourself to investigate the products developed by the 2018 APSA Diversity Hackathon (<https://connect.apsanet.org/hackathon/products/>). Push your department to do so as well. In particular, push your department to complete the Hackathon’s Leadership in Academic Climate Excellence certification process. In addition, push your department and school to invite at least two underrepresented candidates per search; push the telling finding that, when the number of underrepresented candidates visiting campus rises from one to two in a group of four, the odds of hiring an underrepresented candidate increase from

zero to 50 percent (Johnson et al. 2016). Push your department to use the site, Women Also Know Stuff (WAKS, <https://womenalsoknowstuff.com/>), to diversify speaker series, roundtables, and syllabi, among other things. Push, too, the affiliated site, People of Color Also Know Stuff (<https://sites.google.com/view/pocexperts/home>). And advertise your own expertise at WAKS, POCalsoknow, or both.

I have so far discussed strategies as they pertain above all to professional practices, and less to intellectual agendas. We can also push ourselves to enter new subfields and pursue new research questions wherever they take us. For example, I was among the first political scientists to investigate systematically the phenomenon of legislative party switching, and this corner of the subfield has now grown and matured (e.g., Heller and Mershon 2005; 2008; Mershon 2014). Reflection on open questions in that area led me to develop a new theory of, and amass evidence on, degrees of change and stability in legislative party systems between elections (e.g., Mershon and Shvetsova 2013a; 2013b; 2014).

Push again as you cite research. Be sure to cite women and members of underrepresented groups working in a given area. Note that women are authors or co-authors on almost all of the research cited here. Cite yourself, which helps overcome the documented patterns of relatively low self-citation among women scholars (e.g., Maliniak et al. 2013).

In sum, the meta-strategy is to find support among the underrepresented and support those you find. Support yourself as well, whether through self-citation, blogging, presenting at other institutions, or proposing an “author meets critics” panel on your recent book. Supporting each other and ourselves, we amplify underrepresented voices in the field, and we all advance and thrive.

References

- Baldez, L. (2004). “Elected bodies: The gender quota law for legislative candidates in Mexico.” *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 29(2), 231-258.
- Barnes, T. D. (2016). *Gendering legislative behavior*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cox, G. W. (2006). “The organization of democratic legislatures.” *The Oxford Handbook of Political Economy*, 141-61.
- Gandhi, J. (2008). *Political institutions under dictatorship*. Cambridge University Press.
- Harbridge, L., Malhotra, N. and Harrison, B.F., 2014. “Public preferences for bipartisanship in the policymaking process.” *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 39(3), 327-355.
- Heller, W. B., & Mershon, C. (2005). “Party switching in the Italian Chamber of Deputies, 1996–2001.” *The Journal of Politics*, 67(2), 536-559.
- Heller, W. B., & Mershon, C. (2008). “Dealing in discipline: party switching and legislative voting in the Italian Chamber of Deputies, 1988–2000.” *American Journal of Political Science*, 52(4), 910-925.
- Htun, M. (2004). “Is gender like ethnicity? The political representation of identity groups.” *Perspectives on Politics*, 2(3), 439-458.
- Kanthak, K., & Krause, G. A. (2012). *The Diversity Paradox*. Oxford University Press.
- Krook, M. L. (2010). *Quotas for women in politics*. Oxford University Press.
- Lawless, J. L. (2015). “Female candidates and legislators.” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18, 349-366.
- McClendon, G. H. (2016). “Race and responsiveness: An experiment with South African politicians.” *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, 3(1), 60-74.
- Malcom, S. M., Hall, P. Q., & Brown, J. W. (1976, April). “The double bind: The price of being a minority woman in science.” Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- Malesky, E., Schuler, P., & Tran, A. (2012). “The adverse effects of sunshine: a field experiment on legislative transparency in an authoritarian assembly.” *American Political Science Review*, 106(4), 762-786.
- Mershon, C. (1996). “The Costs of Coalition: Coalition Theories and Italian Governments.” *American Political Science Review*, 90(3), 534-554.
- Mershon, C. (2001). “Contending Models of Portfolio Allocation and Office Payoffs to Party Factions: Italy, 1963-79.” *American Journal of Political Science*, 45(2), 277-293.
- Mershon, C. (2002). *The costs of coalition*. Stanford University Press.
- Mershon, C. (2014). “Legislative Party Switching” In Martin, S., Saalfeld, T., & Strøm, K. (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of legislative studies*. (pp. 418-435). Oxford University Press.
- Mershon, C., & Shvetsova, O. (2013a). “The microfoundations of party system stability in legislatures.” *The Journal of Politics*, 75(4), 865-878.
- Mershon, C., & Shvetsova, O. (2013b). *Party system change in legislatures worldwide: Moving outside the electoral arena*. Cambridge University Press.

Mershon, C., & Shvetsova, O. (2014). "Change in parliamentary party systems and policy outcomes: Hunting the core." *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 26(2), 331-351.

Mershon, C., & Walsh, D. (2015). "Organizing Women: Diversifying Leadership and Addressing Discrimination in Political Science Departments." *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 48(3), 459-463.

Orey, B. D. A., Smooth, W., Adams, K. S., & Harris-Clark, K. (2007). "Race and gender matter: Refining models of legislative policy making in state legislatures." *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy*, 28(3-4), 97-119.

Palanza, V., & Sin, G. (2014). "Veto Bargaining and the Legislative Process in Multiparty Presidential Systems." *Comparative Political Studies*, 47(5), 766-792.

Smooth, W. (2011). "Standing for women? Which women? The substantive representation of women's interests and the research imperative of intersectionality." *Politics & Gender*, 7(3), 436-441.

Gender Bias in Legislative Studies?

Lynda Powell
University of Rochester

I was very fortunate to begin my career as a PhD student at Rochester. (I was actually lucky that my first choice school sent me a letter offering to put me on their waiting list, saying I would be accepted if any of their admits were drafted and unable to attend.) Bill Riker was beginning to establish a serious graduate program at Rochester, and Bill looked for applicants that the top-ranked schools might overlook. Hence at Rochester, often underrepresented groups, such as women, were overrepresented. And Bill's merit-based attitudes were shared by the faculty—women and other underrepresented groups were not treated as second-class citizens. Consequently, Rochester produced a number of well-known women scholars. Dick Fenno's presence in the department ensured that some of them would be Congress scholars. These include Barbara Sinclair, Wendy Schiller, Linda Fowler, Diana Evans, and Christine DeGregorio, and in comparative legislatures, Gail McElroy and Tanya Bagashka.

The Rochester alumnae I mentioned all started their careers as legislative scholars and they generally continued to publish exclusively or primarily in that subfield. But many of us either have interests in more than one subfield or we started publishing in one subfield and moved to another. I went to Rochester to study game theory and was Dick McKelvey's first PhD student—we learned the dissertation process together; he received his PhD the year I was

writing mine. I became more deeply interested in substantive questions by coauthoring with colleagues in my first job. Although I wrote occasionally on Congress, it wasn't until 1995 that all of my work was on legislatures or legislators, and it has become increasingly institutional. As a Rochester graduate, the legislative field was a welcoming one to me; several of my cohort at Rochester were legislative scholars, and after I returned to teach at Rochester, many of my students became legislative scholars. I've served on paper, book and now career award committees for the section. It seems to me to be an exemplary section in terms of openness to women scholars, including in its leadership selection.

Thus, I was quite surprised when Gisela Sin and Laurel Harbridge told me that our section was the third lowest in female membership among the 43 APSA sections (Roberts, 2018). It would be interesting to break down female-male representation in the sections by PhD year cohorts, and to construct an individual level data set that would include variables to show the sections APSA members submitted papers to and presented in by year, along with their section memberships. That might allow us to distinguish among a variety of explanations for our relative gender imbalance. One possibility is that younger scholars are more likely to be female and that younger scholars are more likely to publish on topics that fall into more than one APSA section. If so, are legislative "plus" scholars disproportionately choosing to be involved in other sections over ours? That is are we losing the competition to attract younger scholars which is incidentally showing up in our overall male-female ratio? If so, this is important because young scholars, male as well as female, are the future of our section. Or are we losing young female scholars more than young male scholars? Or is the problem less about age cohorts altogether and more about gender? The answer to these and other questions may lead us to different solutions about addressing the problem.

I did ask several untenured female scholars whose work fits in our section and at least one other section about their perception of our section and the other(s). One said that the Congress field and hence the legislative section had more of a reputation as a "boys club" than the other. Another said that the other field had an open yearly conference to present papers and seemed an especially friendly and mentoring section. Congress and History has been a wonderful resource for Congress scholars, but our section itself doesn't have an annual legislative conference. And, of course, Congress and History doesn't include comparative legislatures and US state legislatures. I think the annual methods conference and the state politics conference have both been helpful in attracting and mentoring young scholars. The latter, in particular, seems to have more female participation. The opportunity to attend a section conference is a valuable selective benefit, while the other common selective benefit, receiving the section journal, has decreased in value because of the easy availability of articles online through university subscriptions.

Also, although the section has tried in terms of panels, officers, and generally awards to include comparative legisla-

tive scholars as well as state legislative scholars, researchers in those fields are still less likely to belong to our section than they should be. Both those groups, I suspect, contain a higher proportion of women. We, as a section would be enriched, I think, by their participation, male and female.

Gisela and Laurel also pointed out to me that in the last two years of *LSQ* articles, 18% were authored by women (solo or team), 59% by men, and 23% by mixed gender teams. I compared that with the report I received for the APSR editorial board—the APSR’s comparable percentages are 12%, 69% and 19%. So we don’t fare as badly as the APSR in women’s representation. Yet I think a better comparison would be to the other section journals. Of course, what is truly important is the equal *treatment* of identifiable subgroups such as women. And the publication percentages can’t speak directly to that. While our reviewing is blind, many of us can sometimes guess the authorship or have actually seen the manuscript given at a conference. And, I suspect, that if a reviewer googled the title, often the paper would come up as a previously presented conference paper. So it is an interesting question how “blind” our review process really is.

Identifying bias is typically hard. Gisela and Laurel asked me to comment on my early experiences in a male dominated field. Of course, bias is easily identifiable if it is overt—for example, I asked a colleague and good friend why a new hire had been assigned to teach a grad course while I had taught there (not Rochester) for several years but hadn’t been given a grad seminar to teach yet. He said they didn’t think that, as a women, you would be able to handle a grad course filled with male students. I did start teaching grad courses shortly. (Ask me privately for other anecdotes—these happily lessened when I was not the only woman in the department.) The problem is identifying bias that is not overt—did bias play a role in a journal rejection or not being invited to a conference. When I had a manuscript or other rejection, I assumed the fault was mine; that my actual work would be evaluated just for its content, not in relationship to my gender.

It is only recently that experiments have been used to identify the effects of gender bias in academia. It is especially worrisome to find notable gender bias in evaluating the quality of research, which in turn affects publication, and career prospects. Experimental research, for example, has found that randomizing the gender of the “author” on an abstract affects, negatively for women, a PhD student’s evaluation of the research and their interest in collaborating with the author. Knobloch-Westerwick, Glynn and Huye (2014) found this to be true for “masculine” topics (what we study, unless our research is on women, families and children) but not for “feminine” topics.) Two articles by economists both in the *American Economic Review* find that women are disadvantaged in attaining tenure in top rated economics departments because men are given significantly more credit than women for co-authorship on a mixed-gender team publication (Sarsons, 2017). Research has also found that women are about as likely as men to

manifest gender bias disadvantaging women—so the problem is “us” collectively. Addressing the problem is hard. One solution designed to take child bearing out of the equation did the opposite of what was intended. Gender-neutral tenure clock stopping increased the likelihood a man gained tenure while decreasing the likelihood a woman did so (Antecol, Bedard and Stearns, 2018). With regard to Heather Sarsons’ work on team authorship, it has been suggested that changing our authorship pattern from alphabetical last names to an ordering that reflects each author’s contribution to the work might be helpful. We need to think creatively about ways to reduce gender and other forms of bias in our profession. Top orchestras used to be overwhelmingly male, because, we were told, men were simply “better”. This changed when auditions using screens that concealed the gender of the player showed otherwise and created orchestras that now come close to gender parity.

References

Antecol, H., K. Bedard, and J. Stearns. 2018. “Equal but Inequitable: Who Benefits from Gender-Neutral Tenure Clock Stopping Policies?” *American Economic Review*.

Knobloch-Westerwick, Sylvia; Carroll Glynn and Michael Huye. 2014. “The Matilda Effect in Science Communication: An Experiment on Gender Bias in Publication Quality Perceptions and Collaborative Interest.” *Science Communications* 35(5) 603-625.

Sarsons, Heather. 2017. “Recognition for Group Work: Gender Differences in Academia.” *American Economic Review*

Welcoming and Mentoring Women in Legislative Studies

Cindy Simon Rosenthal
University of Oklahoma

The legislative studies field transformed over the period of my career, but unfortunately not enough to benefit fully from and provide professional mentoring to the growing number of women political scientists. As the paucity of women members in the Legislative Studies Section suggests, women political scientists turned to other venues for their professional networks and research outlets.

My own experience suggests two of the key realities for women scholars pursuing legislative and congressional

studies in the 1980s and 1990s. First, the legislative studies field has not been particularly welcoming to research on women and politics. In legislative studies long dominated by scholars of the U.S. Congress, American gender scholars typically turned to state legislatures or comparative legislatures to research interesting questions. So long as women were largely absent from the U.S. Congress, so too was the study of gender and legislatures an under-appreciated stepchild in legislative studies. Second, and as a consequence, many scholars of my generation turned to other professional networks, mentoring, and research outlets, particularly the Women and Politics Section of APSA.

“The legislative studies field has not been particularly welcoming to research on women and politics.”

Welcoming new scholars

Attending my first LSS business meeting as a graduate student, I saw few women in the room beyond the distinguished and formidable Barbara Sinclair. When the meeting adjourned to the most important business of the section – the reception – I found myself as a distinct minority feeling literally on the periphery and looking from the outside in. If a grad student was lucky enough to have a senior scholar to introduce her to colleagues, then the venue could be welcoming. If not, the cocktail hour event was a very isolating event. Of 43 different APSA sections, LSS still is largely a male domain with the third lowest percentage of women (22% female), followed closely by the Political Methodology Section and the Executive and Presidential Politics Section. By contrast, the sections with the highest percentages of women are Women & Politics (above 80%) and Migration & Citizenship (above 50%). Perhaps a more similar, large membership section is Comparative Politics, which is approximately 35% women.

The absence of a welcoming environment went well beyond the social side of the LSS business meeting. I presented my first paper as an assistant professor at an American Political Science Association Annual Meeting in 1995 in Chicago. I had previously presented research as a graduate student at the Western Political Science Association conferences in 1993 and 1994 with encouragement from the late Rita Mae Kelly who advised me that the WPSA was a friendly venue for women and politics research. My early career conference experience confirmed Rita’s advice and shaped my own career.

Our 1995 APSA panel had been assembled to reflect some of the best emerging research on women in legislatures and to pose a future research agenda on gender and politics. The Legislative Studies Section accepted the panel and then assigned a young male congress scholar who proceeded to rip into the papers, offer scathing critique of which statistical tests were being used, and essentially “showing off” his political science bona fides. His behavior derailed the panel’s

goal of framing future research questions and focused instead on dismissing research as inconsequential given the small N nature of the population being studied. The experience stuck with me for years, and the discussant’s behavior later became recognizable on other panels and in job talks as something one of my male colleagues referred to as “towelsnapping” one-upmanship – a locker room practice to display knowledge dominance.

Notably, a search of the Legislative Studies Quarterly revealed only nine articles between 1991-2000 identified with the terms “gender” or “women”, another eight between 2001-2010, and only eight more since 2011 to the present. That may reflect multiple factors including the establishment of Politics and Gender in 2005, but other journals have clearly been more welcoming of gender and politics research. For example, a search with the same terms of Political Research Quarterly over the same period returned 748 results. Yes, PRQ reflects a bigger outlet and a broader research scope, but the numbers are startling.

Searches of the APSA panels reveal a similar pattern. Looking at the titles for panels in last four APSA programs (2015-2018), LSS has sponsored only two panels which included the terms “gender” or “women.” Six panels were cosponsored with the Women & Politics Section and one with the Race, Ethnicity, and Politics Section. I acknowledge that the creation of panels is a complicated matter, but my point is that LSS would not be a scholar’s first choice to place a paper on gender and women in legislative studies.

The pattern is not for a lack of interesting and provocative research. When the Carl Albert Congressional Research and Studies Center hosted the Women Transforming Congress Conference in 1999, we welcomed an incredibly rich group of research projects by senior scholars and funded travel for emerging work of a talented group a dozen or so of graduate students who have gone on to distinguished research careers. (By the way, the resulting edited volume from the conference needs to be updated to reflect the impact of women in the U.S. Congress almost two decades later.)

Mentoring to the profession

Women scholars have often found mentors outside of the field of legislative studies, turning instead to senior scholars in the other sections supporting research efforts on gender and politics, in comparative politics, and on race, ethnicity and sexuality.

Clearly, the membership of the section has changed, and it numbers more women as senior scholars for more junior women scholars to follow. For many of us in the field, however, we turned elsewhere for professional mentoring and social connections. I will be forever grateful to Rita Mae Kelly for placing me on that first research panel at the Western Political Science Association meeting in 1993 in Pasadena.

In contrast to the typical LSS business meeting, I recall the many times spent in rooms of predominantly women and

politics scholars where graduate students and new assistant professors were routinely introduced during a reception or business meeting in order to jump start networking and connecting with potential mentors.

What the future holds?

Talent will go where it is most valued and nurtured. The Legislative Studies Section will thrive if it takes up the challenge of attracting and mentoring the rising generation of women scholars. In 2016, the Carl Albert Center hosted the annual Congress and History Conference at the University of Oklahoma. My colleague and successor, Mike Crespin, put together an excellent program, and one of the important takeaways for me was the presence of many young women in the audience. Nonetheless, the program was skewed toward senior male scholars and less populated with presentations by emerging scholars. To remedy this problem, I recommend the model which we used at the Women Transforming Congress conference which invested funding in graduate students who have returned that investment many times over.

Mentorship must be intentional and effective. We see the evidence of women's entrance into the field of political science in our graduate seminars. These promising scholars will gravitate to other professional networks, unless the section makes an effort to reach out to them.

"We see the evidence of women's entrance into the field of political science in our graduate seminars. These promising scholars will gravitate to other professional networks, unless the section makes an effort to reach out to them."

Does the Legislative Studies Section Have a "Woman" Problem?

Linda Fowler
Dartmouth College

Does the Legislative Studies Section have a "woman" problem? Some statistics suggest that women have not participated in section panels, attended LSS meetings, or published in *LSQ* at the rates one might expect in 2018. Other data indicate that women have served regularly as chairs of the section, as section program and panel chairs at major conferences, and as editors of the section journal and its newsletter. If women feel unwelcome in our subfield, it is not because they have been shut out of visible leadership roles.

Before assuming that the section is at fault for not being as inclusive as it could be, there are several things I would want to know. First, how many women have finished the PhD in legislative politics as a percentage of all PhDs in our field? It may be that the pool of female legislative scholars narrows during graduate school. Perhaps women have gravitated away from American politics toward other political science fields or other American politics subfields. Perhaps they have lacked mentors or have not forged bonds with their departmental peers that later developed into professional networks. This would be a recruitment problem for the section that shows up in lower rates of engagement compared to other sections in political science.

Second, how many of the female scholars who have entered the academy have joined departments with graduate programs or liberal arts colleges with high expectations for publication? Conference participation is expensive, and many institutions have experienced budget cuts from state legislatures or battered endowments after the Great Recession. I remember discussions when I was on the APSA Council several years ago about the rising cost of conference attendance, which has become an issue for scholars of both sexes. Perhaps women have tended to find work in departments with fewer resources for travel; or perhaps they have allocated fewer days for meetings to save money in their research budgets. Or perhaps, they belong to multiple sections and present multiple papers at a meeting, as men do, and have little time for anything else. This would be a resource problem that limits female participation in section activities.

Third, how many women submit papers to *Legislative Studies Quarterly*? The publication rate suggests that women are far less likely than men to gain acceptance to the journal: 18 percent solo female authors compared to 59 percent solo male authors and 23 percent authors of both sexes. Put another way, female authors are present in 41 percent of articles and male authors in 82 percent. It seems unlikely that the women who have served as recent editors of the journal have actively discriminated against female authors or that a blind review process has winnowed out women in favor of men. But I am guessing that the majority of reviewers for *LSQ* are male. If the acceptance rates for women is lower than for men, perhaps it arises from an epistemological problem in which the dominant group in our field applies criteria about scholarly merit that inadvertently disadvantages women.

Fourth, legislative studies cut across a variety of subfields in American politics, as well as comparative politics. As the number of APSA sections has proliferated, scholars who study congressional elections, for example, might see their intellectual home in organizations devoted to political campaigns or voting behavior, while those who examine policy outcomes might prefer to focus on parliamentary systems. Perhaps scholars who are interested in broad issues of representation and democratic accountability have found more fruitful terrain in other parts of the world. After all, the U.S. Congress, which is the focus of so many legislative scholars,

is highly unusual in the universe of legislative institutions. This would lead to an ethno-centric problem in which the dominance of congressional scholars in our subfield deters others from engaging in the section.

From my vantage point of forty-plus years as a section member, I would say that recruitment, resources, epistemology and the bias of our subfield towards Congress have been recurring problems. Moreover, legislative studies have never had the lure for budding political scientists that other subfields in American politics have enjoyed. And with public approval of Congress at an historically low ebb and the institution barely able to function, we should not be surprised that our section is having difficulty attracting active members. What remains perplexing to me is why any of the factors I have mentioned would disproportionately affect women and what the section might do to improve matters. Although the numbers at this point seem troubling, I would need more context before attempting to devise a strategy to deal with them.

Nevertheless, I had hoped that issues of gender equity in the profession would have faded by now. My personal experience in the profession differed greatly from what women experience today. I was, for example, the only female member of my graduate school class at Rochester (Barbara Sinclair had finished up and Lynda Powell was several years ahead of me); the first female tenure-track hire in my department and the first woman tenured in that department; the only female member of the founding editorial board for *LSQ*; and the first female chair of the section. I remember exhausting days in which I was the only woman in the elevator at APSA conventions, a lone female adrift in a sea of blue blazers and khaki trousers at the Palmer House, and a solitary individual eating supper in my room because I feared sending the wrong signal if I invited myself to dinner with the boys.

I also was incredibly fortunate. Dick Fenno, my mentor and friend, created a bond among his former students through their respect and affection for him. He also fostered an exceptional of community among legislative scholars: if you were interested in Congress or state legislatures, then you were in. Thanks to his example and others, such as Pat Patterson, Chuck Jones, Mac Jewell, and Jerry Loewenberg, the study of Congress was wide open to all sorts of methodologies from “soaking and poking,” to formal theories of legislative bodies, to the mining of historical data to test explanations of institutional development. I had found when I was employed at the newly formed EPA in 1970 that gender mattered less when there was work to be done on a brand-new agenda, and I think a similar ethos prevailed in earlier days of the Legislative Studies Section.

Perhaps the issue today is not gender bias *per se* but the fact that our subfield is too settled. Legislative studies, in my view, has become focused on increasingly narrow questions and guarded by rigid norms about what counts as evidence. The articles in our journal look remarkably alike with the primary difference being the labels on the X and Y axes. Established people have turf to protect, while good jobs in

the academy are generally scarce. Such a climate does not foster acceptance for newcomers. Indeed, I have had many conversations with young male scholars in recent years who find the section less than welcoming.

“Perhaps the issue today is not gender bias *per se* but the fact that our subfield is too settled.”

Moreover, anyone can see that women are present at conferences and hold positions of leadership in substantial numbers. Some observers might conclude, therefore, that the section is doing fine. Is there parity? No. Do I still feel like an interloper at meetings? Yes. Am I surprised that some male colleagues, who have professional wives or female partners and friends and presumably should know better, still seem as clueless as Bill Riker when he would query my game theory class by asking what value to ascribe to the certain option in a lottery between Miss Fowler and a light bulb? You bet.

Women in legislative studies today contend with different obstacles than the ones I encountered. Bias is more subtle and thus more difficult to call out. In addition, expectations among women entering our profession have changed, and rightly so. Barbara Sinclair and I sometimes joked that professional slights or outright hostility were less wounding for us than our younger colleagues because we never expected anything else. Yet comparatively speaking, I would say the glass still seems half full rather than half empty, and I believe she probably would agree.

How Do We Get More Women to Study Legislative Politics?

Michele Swers
Georgetown University

As a scholar who studies women and Congress, when I was invited to write for this issue, I was struck by the fact that the proportion of women in the Legislative Studies Section, 22%, closely mirrors the proportion of women in Congress. According to the Center for American Women and Politics (2018a), women constitute about 20% of the current Congress, and that number will bump up to 23% when the women elected in the 2018 version of the “Year of the Woman” are seated. Thus, women’s standing in the section is comparable to other high status fields from Congress to law firm partnerships that require advanced credentials, long hours, and reflect a set of institutional norms that were developed largely by men over a long period of time. Like other institutions, the advancement of more women into the

field will require openness to change and investment in mentoring and recruitment.

Studying descriptive representation, I occupy multiple fields working with both legislative scholars and women and politics scholars. As a result, I inhabit spaces that are predominately male and spaces that are female-dominated. Going to graduate school at Harvard in the late 1990s, I was the only woman studying American Politics in my entering cohort. There were a few women in the cohorts ahead of me and they were early mentors. When I started my job at Georgetown in 2002, I was again the only woman in the American Politics field and that remained true until relatively recently. However, in the Washington, D.C. area, there are several women who study legislative politics including Sarah Binder, Frances Lee, Jennifer Victor, Colleen Shogan, Molly Reynolds, Stella Rouse, Kris Miller, Anne Marie Cammisa, Marian Currinder, and many others. Thus, while I have generally been a minority in rooms of legislative scholars, I have never felt alone.

When I first started going to political science conferences there were very few women on the panels or roundtables. I particularly admired Barbara Sinclair. Her books on the Senate and the evolution of the parties in Congress strongly influenced my thinking about institutional norms, partisan polarization, and how gender might interact with partisanship and other incentives that shape legislative behavior. If she was listed as a presenter, I always tried to attend that panel. She was the rock star I most admired and when she spoke to me once in an elevator, I felt like I had met Barbra Streisand.

While there are many more women attending conferences and presenting on panels today, women remain a minority in the field. When I present on a legislative panel or attend a specialized conference or workshop there are usually more men than women in the room. By contrast, when I present on a panel sponsored or co-sponsored by the Women and Politics section or attend a specialized conference on descriptive representation or women candidates, the audience is almost exclusively women. Both fields could benefit from more gender balance.

To welcome more women into legislative studies, I think the field needs to focus more intentionally on recruitment and mentoring. With regard to recruitment, I encourage those who are organizing specialized conferences and the section chairs who select the papers for panels to focus on including more women as panelists, discussants, and chairs. Our networks tend to be small, developed in graduate school and from years of attending the same conferences and panels. By reaching out to who we know we perpetuate that insular cycle. I recently chaired several job search committees for my department and I realized that to recruit a more diverse pool of applicants, I needed to reach outside my usual networks and contact people I did not know in order to get a broader set of candidates. When organizing a conference or panel we need to move beyond what is comfortable and look to recruit a mix of younger and older scholars, men and women, racial and ethnic minorities. A conference with

more diverse perspectives will broaden our networks and make for a more interesting dialogue.

“Invite someone to coffee or for a brief meeting at APSA to discuss their work and how it connects to yours.”

Another area that we should focus on is mentoring. No one achieves success in political science without guidance from mentors along the way. I have benefitted from the advice of male and female mentors throughout my career. These mentors have connected me to other scholars and interview subjects for my research. They have read my work, shared data, and offered helpful comments and advice. They have invited me to conferences that sparked ideas and have asked me to contribute to edited volumes that brought my work to new audiences. As a young scholar, the scariest and most important thing one can do is ask. Invite someone to coffee or for a brief meeting at APSA to discuss their work and how it connects to yours. Attend the Legislative Studies Section business meeting and/or reception and strike up a conversation with a scholar whose work interests you. Approach the author of a conference paper after the panel ends. Make yourself known and send a thank you email to build the relationship. Established scholars need to be open to expanding their networks and building new relationships to foster young talent.

Finally, if we want to broaden the audience for our work, we need to expand the range of articles considered for publication in our journals. When submitting work or being asked to review, I am always struck by the question, will this work be of interest or suitable for readers of “X” journal. One thing that likely prevents more women from publishing in journals is the tendency to silo ourselves into specific outlets. Studies that focus on gender and legislatures should not be routinely funneled to specialized gender outlets such as *Politics & Gender* just as work on state legislatures should not be assumed to only be of interest to readers of *State Politics and Policy Quarterly*. Legislative scholars will benefit from reading more work on a variety of topics that utilizes a mix of methodologies.

By implementing these recommendations, the legislative field can increase the membership of women beyond the proportions in Congress and aspire to be more like Colorado and Oregon who will have more than 40% women in their state legislatures or the Nevada Assembly (the lower house) which will have an equal number of men and women in 2019, demonstrating that gender parity is within reach (Center for American Women and Politics 2018b; Gonzalez 2018).

References

Center for American Women and Politics. 2018a. “Results: Women Candidates in the 2018 Elections” Center for American Women in Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics,

Rutgers University.

Center for American Women and Politics. 2018b. "Results: Record Number of Women Elected to State Legislatures Nationwide" Center for American Women in Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University.

Gonzalez, Yvonne. 2018. "Democrats Solidify Their Majorities at the Legislature." *Las Vegas Sun* November 11.

An Interdisciplinary and International Perspective: An Interview with Liza Mügge

Sanne van Oosten
with Liza Mügge
University of Amsterdam

SvO: How has your career developed since the end of your PhD?

LM: My background is atypical because I am trained as an anthropologist and received a PhD in migration and ethnic studies. The red thread in my work is that I always studied politics but from a variety of disciplinary perspectives. Just before I completed my PhD-dissertation, I received a job offer at the University of Leiden to become an assistant professor in cultural anthropology.

During the three years at that department I learned two important lessons. The first lesson was the essence of being well informed about the informal and formal rules in the institution and department. I was the only young woman in the department with a child. I asked my head of department whether I could work fulltime but with flexible work hours. He replied: "You have a child and you have to take good care of it. It is best if you work part-time, that is what my daughters do." Later I realized that some of my male colleagues who also had children did have fulltime employment, but worked from home some days of the week. As I had to get my publications out fresh out of my PhD, I also worked fulltime, but received a part time salary. If I had known this before, I would have never accepted this. I think we see a similar pattern with the gender pay gap. Knowing how much you earn compared to your male colleagues is an important piece of information that you may use to address inequality.

The second lesson I learned was the importance of mentors. I took part in a training for newly hired female assistant professors facilitated by a well-known social psychologist, professor [Naomi Ellemers](#). She encouraged us to proactively ask advice and support from more advanced

academics. It was an eye-opener to me that there are many people (often women) are willing to offer support, even if they don't know you. I believe advice seeking to gain different perspectives on a problem remains crucial at all career levels.

SvO: To what extent did your transfer from Anthropology to Political Science entail a shift in working culture and/or environment?

LM: Anthropology has a very different way of doing research. Many anthropologists do fieldwork for longer periods of time, they usually write books, they write more single authored articles. They are no publication machines. This is very different from political science. In political science quantity matters and books don't count as much.

Anthropologists are generally closer to their research than political scientists. What I like about the anthropological way of doing research is that you really delve into a topic. I still do that. When I start a new research topic, I try to get as much information from novels, art exhibitions, podcasts, movies as possible. Closeness to research participants is also clearly reflected in anthropological methods. My work is influenced by ethnographic tools that I integrate in mixed method research designs.

SvO: Has the field changed since you finished your PhD? How?

LM: When I was about to finish my PhD-thesis, a male professor at a conference gave me the following advice to build a competitive CV. Investment in international research collaborations was key. But, he emphasized, I should select my research partners carefully: "Make sure you get along well. You know how I select my collaborators? I should be able to talk to them about soccer and bitches." This 'well-meant advice' is telling for the male domination and privilege at the time. And it is damaging too. It made me doubt whether I would ever be able to be involved international research project as a young woman with no interest in soccer. Today, among others thanks to #metoo, there is much more attention to sexism in academia which hopefully prevents such comments. And if not, there are more places to find support.

I only started working on political representation in legislative studies in 2013 when I received a grant to study the political representation of citizens with a migration background. So I cannot say much about how the field of legislative studies has changed. I overall do see more women in political science, but we are far from equal. Women are especially under represented among the rank of full professor.

Yet, in research on politics and gender women are over-represented. They are doing exceptionally well across the subfields of political science, including legislative studies. The challenge we face is that work on gender is not always considered political science. In Europe we founded the European Journal for Politics and Gender (EJPG) to address

this. At the same time, politics and gender scholars gain increasing visibility in generalist political science journals. That said, there is still a gender gap in the top journal and in citation patterns. There is still a lot of work to be done.

SvO: Have you also experienced sexual harassment while working in academia?

During my PhD project I experienced quite a bit of sexual harassment from high profile politicians that I interviewed. I started writing about these experiences much later, because many of my female students asked questions about harassment in the field (see Mügge 2012, 2013a, 2013b). At the time there was not really space to talk about it. It was not a topic of discussion as it is now in society and in academic circles. I am glad that has changed.

SvO: What about within academia? How was your experience trying to become part of a field dominated by male scholars? Was it easy? Difficult? Why?

LM: I came into legislative studies through the field of politics and gender. The politics and gender field is a very constructive crowd of people, very critical, brilliant women often with good sense of humor. Coming from the, at that time, male-dominated, subfield of migration studies it was a joy to work with this community.

Generally, gender equality now has gained momentum. This year, the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) accepted a plan to enhance gender-equality (ECPR, 2018). They aim for equal composition in all of its suborganizations, layers of the organization, among prize laureates and journal editors and so on. Only 23 percent of the full professors in Europe in the Social Sciences is women, so we still have a very long way to go.

SvO: In your view, what are the disadvantages women face for being part of a field that is predominantly male?

LM: The professor and lawyer Joan Williams and her daughter Rachel Dempsey wrote an amazing book about this: *What Works for Women at Work* (Williams & Dempsey, 2014). Williams and Dempsey interviewed 127 successful working women and signaled four main patterns that affect women at work.

The first pattern is called: "Prove it Again". This refers to the way women often have to prove themselves, time and again. "The Tight Rope" refers to the delicate, often impossible, balance women need to find between being feminine (and not being taken seriously) and masculine (and not being likable). The third pattern is called "The Maternal Wall" which refer to the negative competence and commitment assumptions upon becoming a mother. Even women without children are influenced by the Maternal Wall: they are expected to be available more than they should because of not having children. The last pattern is a combination of all the above: "Tug of War" refers to the

way gender bias against women creates conflicts among women. For instance, when an older woman applies harsher standards to a younger woman because that is what it takes to succeed as a woman. I think these four patterns are very important because we see them everywhere, definitely also in academia.

SvO: What can we do about it?

LM: We need male allies. Research shows that quality of work increases in more diverse organizations so this is in everyone's interest. We need to invest in structures and institutions to try to change the cultures. We need men on board to make that change. Additionally, academia should become more diverse in terms of race, religion and ethnicity. In the US, APSA has a very strong community of African American scholars, they are very visible. This is a challenge that European political science should take on.

References

- Ahrens, P., Celis, K., Childs, S., Engeli, I., Evans, E., & Mügge, L. (2018). "Editorial: Politics and gender: rocking political science and creating new horizons." *European Journal of Politics and Gender*, 1(1), 3–16. <http://doi.org/10.1332/251510818X15294172316891>
- ECPR. Gender Equality Plan, Targets and actions, 2018–2020 PUBLICATIONS (2017). ECPR. Retrieved from [https://ecpr.eu/Filestore/CustomContent/Membership/Gender Equality Plan_2018.pdf](https://ecpr.eu/Filestore/CustomContent/Membership/Gender%20Equality%20Plan_2018.pdf)
- Mügge, L. (2012). "De persoonlijke politiek van Meindert Fennema." Over de kracht van anekdotes en netwerken. In *Democratie en wetenschap, Essays voor Meindert Fennem*.
- Mügge, L. (2013a). *In the mud puddle: the research diary as a method. In Migration and integration research: Filling in Penninx's heuristic model* (pp. 193–220). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. <http://doi.org/http://hdl.handle.net/11245/1.394669>
- Mügge, L. (2013b). "Sexually harassed by gatekeepers: Reflections on fieldwork in Surinam and Turkey." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 16(6), 541–546. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2013.823279>
- Williams, J., & Dempsey, R. (2014). *What Works for Women at Work: Four Patterns Working Women Need to Know* (First edit). New York: New York University Press.

One Woman's Career Path - with Advice for Young Women Scholars

Patricia A. Hurley
Texas A&M University

Some context for this essay is necessary. I started my career being extremely naïve about gender discrimination in the world at large. My family never gave me any indication that I should have limited expectations for what I might accomplish because I am a woman. And parental expectations for me were high – and higher than they were for my brothers, at least from my perspective. After graduation from high school in 1968 (a date necessary for further context) I attended Newcomb College of Tulane University and graduated in 1972. Newcomb was a women's college at that time and all my classes (with only one or two exceptions) for my first two years were populated by female students only. Gender bias in the classroom did not exist.

My cohort in graduate school at Rice University included only five people, of whom I was the only woman. There were no women on the faculty in the political science department at that time, but it was a small department and this was not a matter I gave much thought. Although I was a quiet student it was not because I felt intimidated by men in my seminars (I'll confess to being intimidated by students in the class ahead of me, who all seemed to know so much more than the entering class did). Once I was far enough along in the program to have a dissertation committee (all male) I received support and encouragement for my work. Does this mean that the department was free of sexism? No. Certainly there were people (students and some faculty) who would tell an off-color joke, make the occasional comment that would be interpreted today as creating a hostile environment, or even once in a while say something outrageous directly to me. None of it was any worse than I had heard growing up with three brothers – this was just the way the world was in those days, so I never took particular offense. And if my fellow students were willing to tell that off-color joke in my presence it was just a sign that I was “one of the guys.” If a meeting with my committee reduced me to tears (it did once) it was not because they were harder on me than they were on the male students – it was because I was the one who cried. There were plenty of times I thought I would fail in those days, but it never occurred to me that I would fail *because I was a woman*.

After taking my first job in the summer of 1976 (a non-tenure track position at the University of Houston) I began to recognize the professional difficulties women faced because of their gender. There were tenure-track women on the faculty who seemed to be judged harshly because they were women. There were women on the faculty who found the environment intimidating because of the behavior of men. There were the conversations all about sports that seemed to leave women out. I got little, if any, mentoring from senior faculty, even while male colleagues also in non-tenure track positions did receive such support (I continued to re-

ceive mentoring from several dissertation committee members, who were in close geographic proximity). Add to that the male students who made inappropriate approaches to their female professors. Yes, there was gender bias in the academic world and I was just figuring it out.

The atmosphere was far more supportive when I moved to a tenure-track position at Texas A&M in 1987, where I was encouraged, given resources, and chosen for administrative leadership positions, including two terms as department head and appointment as associate dean of Liberal Arts. This is not to say there is no gender bias at that institution, but in my experience it was limited (and oddly, more pronounced when I was of more senior rank). And there were still those students with inappropriate behaviors.

Yet, I rarely felt disadvantaged in my subfield of legislative studies because of my sex. There were not many women in the subfield, but when I was just starting out there were scholars senior to me like Barbara Sinclair to consider as role models. It is also the case that the entire field was smaller at that time, and there were fewer graduate students vying for the limited space to present papers on panels. Conferences have expanded to meet the demand for participation, but this means that not all panels are made up of equally prominent scholars. In the 1980s and 1990s one had much higher odds of being placed on a panel with top scholars than one has today. And being on panels with top scholars meant that I got to meet them, and the folks who came to a panel to hear them also had to hear me. It was easier for any young scholar in the field, and therefore for a young female scholar, to get beneficial exposure in the 1980s than it is today. And exposure leads to opportunities that lead to more exposure. I served a term on the editorial board of *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, organized panels for the Legislative Politics section of the Midwest Political Science Association twice, did the same for the Southern Political Science Association once, and served as a member of the advisory panel for political science of the National Science Foundation. While some might see this as thankless service work, it is also an opportunity for professional networking and getting your name in front of people. I also participated in several specialized conferences on various aspects of the legislative process, sometimes through an application process and sometimes by invitation. Such conferences offer good opportunities for networking and making people aware of your work. Yet, at one of these conferences I had the only seriously negative experience that I can remember that I attribute to gender bias. The paper I presented (with a male co-author) critiqued on methodological grounds an earlier work on the same topic that was co-authored by a very senior scholar who was also at the conference. During a break he cornered me to question that critique and take me to task for it. It was notable to me that he did not question my co-author alone or the two of us together on the matter. And my subsequent relations with that individual (who I did encounter at panels and events) were rather chilly. But if this is the only unpleasant experience I had related to gender that is not so bad.

It is entirely possible that I was successful at being integrated into the field precisely because I am a woman. This is simply the serendipity of timing. The 1980s and 1990s were times when universities and professional associations were making some efforts to afford women more opportunities. If there is a demand to include women (say on the program committee of a professional association) and there are not many women around, then the odds of being asked to do something are greatly increased. At its worst, this is tokenism. But even tokenism gives one a seat at the table. The challenge is taking advantage of that seat.

The biggest change to the field since I was an assistant professor is that it is larger. There are more women, but there are more men too. Therefore the competition is stiffer than it used to be. It is harder to have work accepted in top journals, and the proliferation of panels and the sheer size of conferences dilute the opportunities for networking. Ironically, women may also currently be disadvantaged by an increase in their numbers in the field that makes them a visible minority but does not give them parity with men.

Despite this, the route to success today is no different than the one I took: show up, speak up, be competent, and be responsible. Attend the important conferences, go to panels other than your own, join the relevant subfield sections and attend their business meetings and social events. Present papers that are essentially finished products rather than works in progress. Be willing to serve as a panel chair or discussant and then do a good job of it. I've observed a remarkable decline in professionalism over the course of my career, with people presenting papers that are too rough for prime time, panel chairs who do nothing other than keep time, and discussants who offer no useful comments to an author. They are joined by those who refuse to review for journals, write sloppy reviews, or send them in late. One simple step toward success is to counter this trend by cultivating a strong sense of professionalism. No matter the role do your best work and always – *and only* – put your best work forward. Set high expectations for your career and recognize that you can control your achievements through your own efforts and abilities.

Some readers will conclude that I remain naïve about gender bias in the profession or lament that I have not addressed the repercussions of the #MeToo movement in the discipline. I acknowledge that both sexism and sexual harassment are problems in some departments and in parts of the discipline. But they are barriers that can be overcome by persistence and professionalism. Withdrawal in the face of bias is not an option. Success is the best revenge.

Advice for Women and for Their Colleagues and Mentors: An Interview with Frances E. Lee

SoRelle Wyckoff
with Frances Lee
University of Maryland

SW: When you first started graduate school or as a new professor, were you aware of a gender disparity in the field of legislative studies?

FL: I wasn't. And in fact, when I first started out there were particular women scholars who were very visible in the legislative politics field. Obviously, there was Barbara Sinclair. There was Linda Fowler and Diana Evans, as well. When I started my first job, a one-year research fellowship at Brookings right after grad school, Sarah Binder was on staff there and Wendy Schiller was a visiting scholar. I was well aware of work by all these scholars as I studied for comps and worked on my dissertation. So, there seemed to be quite a few women in the field. It was only later over time that I began to see that women are a distinct minority in legislative studies. It's not unusual today to go to panels where most—if not all—of the panelists are men and most everyone in the audience are men, too. But I wasn't cognizant of this at the start. That impression evolved over time.

SW: Do you see any reason for this gender imbalance? And what approach could legislative scholars take in addressing this gap?

FL: It seems to be true of the study of American institutions overall. The presidency subfield also is very male dominated, just like legislative studies. I can't say I have a good explanation of why this would be the case. Perhaps it has something to do with the fact that the object of one's study in these fields is mostly men. There's clearly some kind of self-selection dynamic in which female graduate students interested in American politics tend to gravitate towards other subjects rather than legislative studies.

Being cognizant of this imbalance can help legislative scholars be mindful of their choices so that they ensure that any woman who wants to study in this field feels welcome. They should ask themselves if they are equally approachable to male and female students. Certainly, they'd want to consider the syllabi they put together: Are they appropriately representative of good work by female scholars? Being self-aware about those imbalances can be helpful. But I think the cause of the gender disparity in the field owes more to patterns in graduate student interest and self-selection rather than any unfriendliness toward women.

SW: You mentioned prominent legislative scholars when you started out. What impact did this have on you, and what advice do you have for young scholars looking for mentors?

FL: As a young scholar, I certainly looked up to the trail-blazing women in the field. I especially admired Barbara Sinclair. When she would speak on panels, she always had great insights and was very clear—and she had such a fun, dynamic personality, too. At an early conference when I was still a graduate student and didn't know anybody there, Linda Fowler came up to me in the exhibit hall and introduced herself to me. She'd heard about me from Bruce Oppenheimer, who was my mentor at Vanderbilt, and just made the contact. I never forgot that she was welcoming to me. Just the friendly hello from a scholar I looked up to meant a lot to me at that juncture. The presence of female role models does make a difference for younger people coming into a field, and they were present for me. Even though it was a field in which women were a minority, role models were not absent.

As younger scholars seek mentors for themselves, I think it's unfair to put all the burden on them to know what they need to look for. People just starting out in graduate school typically don't know what they don't know—and aren't yet even in a position to know what to ask. Faculty in the field have to take responsibility for students in their program, because they are in a better position to know what's needed than the students themselves, at least initially. But one of the key things for young scholars to ask as they look for mentors: Is the faculty member responsive? Will they read your work and give you timely feedback? Are they available to meet or have a conversation? There are great scholars who don't take much interest in graduate students' work. In some cases, it might still pay off to be a student of such a person because of their fame, but if you want mentorship then you need to take stock of whether a scholar will engage with students in that way.

For those in a mentorship role, it's great to talk to female graduate students about the challenges that they face. To have frank conversations about practical things like, what to wear on job interviews, and what sort of subjects are appropriate to bring up, and how early in the interview process to initiate conversations about various subjects. Being willing to have those conversations is an important kind of mentorship.

SW: Have you ever experienced imposter syndrome? And if so, how do you get past it and what would you encourage other women to do.

FL: Yes, I have experienced it. It was a big part of my life, especially early on in my career. In graduate school, I felt very lucky to have the opportunity to earn a PhD, but I often did question whether I was going to succeed. It takes years to develop the amount of expertise that you think you need to have the title Professor. It takes a long time, even after successfully defending a dissertation, to feel ready to uphold others'—and your own—expectations about what it means to be an expert in a field. It's an ongoing challenge to live up to what you think you should be. And overcoming the imposter syndrome—which is always a work in a

progress for many of us—is a matter of lots of preparation. Preparation helps you develop confidence even if it doesn't come naturally.

SW: What are some disadvantages you see women facing in Legislative Studies? Advantages?

FL: One disadvantage, I think, is that co-authoring relationships are a little harder to develop for women. Oftentimes male scholars are friends, and then co-authoring projects grow out of a friendship. That kind of bonding is just easier among people of the same sex. Obviously working together with others is helpful, especially for people early in their careers. Given the gender imbalance in the field, I think it's a little harder for women to get to develop those collaborative relationships. Not to say it's impossible, but it's just harder.

I do think that as departments try to diversify, female candidates often get a closer look. Most departments don't want to have an overwhelmingly male-tilted faculty distribution and so being female can get you some scrutiny on the job market. This can open up opportunities given that there are so few women who study legislative politics. Female scholars in the legislative field also often get extra opportunities to serve on panels, or to participate in conferences as organizers try to ensure some gender balance.

One piece of advice to scholars working on these fraught issues around gender balance and representation: it can be a bit demoralizing to women scholars to feel that they have only been selected to fill a quota. When you ask a woman scholar to participate in a panel or conference or some other effort and they decline, it's a little off-putting to then ask them, "Can you name some other women?" That's not great for the self-esteem of your female colleagues.

SW: On a larger scale, how do you see the current political climate and movements like MeToo potentially shaping the field?

FL: MeToo presents some really thorny problems for the Academy. This is not a legislative studies problem, this is just a problem of how universities are organized. Many wonderful features of universities flow from the tenure system and the independence faculty have. The system allows faculty to work on what they're interested in, not to be subject to the fads that administrators can be very eager to embrace, to develop an expertise because they care about it and believe that it's important, and to keep at it even if maybe not everybody sees the value at any given time—these are great features of the system. The whole decentralized structure of universities, all of that grows out of the tenure system.

If you do away with that, then you introduce new accountability relationships that would have some good features in the form of being able to better police problem behavior. But it would have many downsides for academic freedom and university organization. This is a particularly troubling set of trade-offs for the MeToo era. Bad faculty behavior is not something universities are great at policing.

When these problems arise, it often results in horrible embarrassments for universities.

SW: What about citations? Do you cite someone with multiple, credible allegations? Obviously, there's not a right answer to any of this.

FL: That's an interesting question I'd never considered before. My thinking would be that you cite work that influenced you or that was foundational for your work, regardless of the source. If a piece of work was important to the development of your project or your paper, then you cite where citation is due. Personnel decisions are another matter. If you're trying to hire somebody for a job, then you'd want to take into account whether that person has a record of mistreating students or colleagues. But with regard to citation that ought to be just on the basis of the academic merits of the matter.

Self as Community: An Interview with Dr. Nadia Brown

Guillermo Caballero
Jasmine Jackson
with Nadia Brown
Purdue University

An interview between Professor Nadia E. Brown and her graduate students, Guillermo Caballero and Jasmine Jackson, was conducted on November 3rd, 2018 at the request of the editors of *The Legislative Scholar*. Given their small numbers in the section, the editors of the newsletter are interested in learning more about the experiences of women in the legislative studies subfield. Callabero and Jackson used the basis of the editors questions to guide the interview and added two more questions in hope of better capturing Dr. Brown's experience as an African American woman scholar navigating the field of political science. In what follows is the dialogue between Brown, Caballero, and Jackson regarding Brown's relationship with the legislative studies subfield.

1. What were your initial motivations to study Black women lawmakers? Furthermore, has your motivation to continue to study Black women changed since then.

"I went for Howard University for undergrad... a Historically Black College and University... it was Black politics all the time which was wonderful... I think I had a solid foundation even as an undergrad of what Black politics was, but there was little scholarly attention to gender. And when I got to Rutgers University for my Ph.D., my major field was Women in Politics. It was gender politics all the time

which was really illuminating... But it was White women all the time. What stuck out to me was the limited amount of scholarship on Black women, both the political elites and those in the mass citizenship and so that was an obvious place to conduct research. But this came from my own lived experiences of seeing Black women champion politics and policy often in the shadows and not being recognized and I knew that Black women had a distinct voice and how they thought about politics... so I knew that it was more than just no one has done this before, but there was some qualitative differences that needed to be explored."

2. Has the field changed since you started as an assistant professor? If so, how?

"I think it has changed, I'm really excited... enthusiastic about the next generation of scholars who do really solid racial, ethnic, and gender politics. I used to be only a handful of scholars that did this kind of work. Now I can point to a whole cohort of folks who do Women of Color studies. Sarah Allen Gershon and I published an edited volume (Routledge 2016) on minority women's politics that as an assistant professor, but even more so as a graduate student, I would never have had the opportunity to read or to think about, just because there was too few scholars that did this kind of research. Now, I think the field is just growing."

As Dr. Brown noted in her response there were not many scholars studying women of color in politics when she began her career. Although there is a growing number of scholars that study women of color in politics, the deficit of scholarship published this topic and others topics such as, identity politics, can be seen throughout the discipline. Caballero and Jackson collected demographics on authors that published in *Legislative Studies Quarterly* in issue 42 and 43 and the subjects of these publications. They obtained demographic information on a total of 101 individuals. No Black scholars of either gender were published in these issues. There were three scholars of Asian descent (two women and one male), seven Latinx scholars (five male and two Latinas), and two non-white (one male and one female). Lastly, they found that the majority of scholars published in these volumes were White men (71) and the second most published group was White women (15). In terms of the subject of the manuscripts that were published in these two volumes, they found that only two studies mention race and ethnicity, one mentions same-sex marriage, and four articles mention women. After hearing Dr. Brown's points about her experiences in the discipline and seeing the lack of scholarship on the subject of women of color in politics, one can see why it is important that scholars like Dr. Brown are present in political science to continue to conduct research that focuses on marginalized groups expanding our understanding of politics.

3. How was your experience trying to become a part of a field dominated by White male scholars? Was it easy? Difficult? Why?

“Yeah, I think I insulated myself out of that... I think I went to supportive spaces like the REP section or the gender and politics section and there are people in these sections that obviously do work on representation legislative studies... So, I was looking for my intellectual community that studied women of color, those that did intersectional work, but more so I was looking for support. I was looking friendly faces, I was looking for people who could be that auntie figure, or that cheerleader, or that supportive, you know, that kind of fictive kin throughout the discipline and that didn't lead me to legislative studies section business meeting or caucuses... I was intentionally looking for spaces to get both academic and personal affirmation.”

Navigating academia in the political science field can be a difficult task for most, but even more difficult when your network is not in close proximity. The nuance that Dr. Brown points out from her experience is that specific spaces signaled to her that they would not be the best places to thrive as a scholar. In order to maximize the most out of her time she looked for spaces that provided personal and academic affirmation. She chose these spaces strategically so that she could advance her intellectual development as a scholar studying women of color in politics. Dr. Brown recognizes that her practices may have been self-segregating. Furthermore, other less traditional legislative studies scholars may have done the same thing. This could contribute to the disparities in the number of women and other underrepresented groups who attend legislative studies section business meetings and caucuses. She expresses the importance of entering such spaces and believes that scholars should prioritize entering spaces where there are not many women or people of color so that these underrepresented groups can feel an increase in the sense of belonging in these spaces.

4. In your view, what are the disadvantages women face for being part of a predominately White male field? Do think that these disadvantages are the same, different, or parallel as compared to women scholars who have other intersecting identities. For example, women of color, queer women, and trans women, etc.

“I would always get asked how my research is this universal or how can you generalize from doing this research on Black women? These are gatekeeping kinds of question because other scholars who do work that are posited to be identity free don't get asked those kinds of questions... doing this narrow kind of identity politics work doesn't get you published in top journals something I think that I have probably internalized this, unfortunately. So that's a barrier... I know that is not the case for people that don't do work on marginalized groups. So, they never get the questions if their research is generalizable or broad enough or has applications outside of particular one thing. I would say this is universal for other intersecting identities too, research that is done on other intersecting identities not just Black women.”

The gatekeeping tactics described by Dr. Brown is a barrier that the discipline should be aware of. As the discipline becomes more diverse, it would be beneficial to suppress this type of behavior so that political science can continue to grow as a field and be a place where scholars can appreciate work that focuses on particular groups without forcing these scholars to make their generalizable.

5. What strategies might be beneficial for the next generation of women scholars? In your experience, what strategies have helped you in the different stages of your academic journey?

“I think good mentorship matters and I've been extremely fortunate to have two really exemplary mentors from my graduate school days. Jane Junn and Alvin Tillery have been consistently listened to me and helped me to figure out the next move that would be best for me. They give advice based on what is best for me as a holistic person, not just a scholar. Jane and Al are a constant source of encouragement when I had (have) imposter syndrome. They give tough love when I am thinking something outlandish... For the next generation, I think it's really important young scholars know that they cannot do it on their own. We all need to have these kinds of guides, these mentors that can help you to develop. There is a whole host of other folks that make up my community that I think so important to have... Doing good scholarship is a community activity, and that also means you have to be vulnerable and you have to be willing to seek community. But that means you have to be a good community member yourself... So its reciprocal...show up and be part of a community.”

The strategies that were beneficial to Dr. Brown which she suggests to the next generation were finding good mentors and being a community member. Good mentors provide a guide to navigate the political science discipline that help graduate students develop their own distinct scholarly voice not making carbon copies of themselves. In Caballero and Jackson's experiences with Dr. Brown, they would describe her mentorship approach as dynamic, supportive, yet firm. She is currently instilling in us the importance of mentoring and being part of an academic community for other undergraduate and graduate students.

6. Is there anything you thought of that you were speaking that you wanted to say before we end our meeting? Or anything that comes to the forefront after having this conversation and thinking about your experience as a scholar?

“I am pleasantly surprised for the invitation from LSS and I am energized by their awareness to do something to reach out to feminist scholars and women academics in particular. But I am also thinking about those that weren't asked and those that aren't here to tell their own stories...in my particular instance thinking about other women of color. What Native women were asked? What are Latinas sharing? Queer scholars? How are Asian American women or

first gen women, how are they responding to these kinds of questions? It's not enough to be the token women of color, but you have to do something to make space for others and to really expand the table... like there should be some stuff for you at the table, but for everyone. So I am grateful to LSS for offering this opportunity for me to be in the newsletter. But I also want to highlight the gaps in the margins. What other constituencies are also underrepresented? We need to include their scholarship and their voices."

As we closed our interview, Dr. Brown expressed a critical hope for the future of legislative studies. She mentions how "energized" she was when the Legislative Studies Section reached out to her to be featured in the newsletter. In bringing up "those that weren't asked," she is acknowledging that as exciting as it is to see steps being taken to share the experiences of women scholars that doing so in a manner that tokenizes particular individuals is not enough. She states "there should be some stuff for you at the table, but for everyone" indicating that more needs to be done to institutionalize the incorporation of all women intersectionally. This critical positivity can be seen in much of her responses throughout the interview along with responses that emphasize the importance of community. As a scholar and a member of various academic communities, Dr. Brown is calling for scholars to not only conduct intersectional research, but to also think intersectionally about who is or is not present in various spaces so that scholars can start a dialogue about what more can be done for marginalized voices in legislative studies. To implement these strategies in scholarship and in our academic interactions signals a critical hope for the future.

References

Brown, Nadia E., and Sarah Allen Gershon. *Distinct identities: minority women in US politics*. Routledge, 2016.

Where Do We Go From Here?

Tracy Sulkin

University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign

I consider it one of the great fortunes of my professional life to have stumbled upon the legislative studies community. I did not enter graduate school planning to study Congress. Instead, I knew I was interested in quantitative approaches and had some nascent interests in political behavior. And, in fact, I didn't really leave graduate school thinking of myself as a legislative studies scholar (at least not wholly). My dissertation, which later became my first book, *Issue Politics in Congress*, was motivated by a focus on agendas as a linkage between campaigns and governing and by a developing interest in representation and responsiveness. (On the job market, I had offers in both

Congress/institutions and in behavior, and my position here at Illinois was actually advertised as "media and politics," and, at the time, was joint between political science and communication.)

However, in my first year as an assistant professor, I happened to attend the LSS business meeting at APSA and was surprised to find that *everyone* was there, from the senior scholars whose work I greatly admired to the fellow junior faculty I was getting to know as we navigated our early years on the tenure track. It highlighted to me that the subfield was, perhaps more than some others, an actual community, bound by common interests and also a sense of common purpose. From that point on, I began to think of myself and my work as belonging to that group.

Of course, one only had to look around the room at that meeting to see that the community didn't include a lot of people like me.¹ Did this matter for my career? Yes and no. There were some times in the beginning that it felt a bit intimidating to be the only woman on a panel or at a talk or at the dinner table. Importantly, though, I have never perceived that I was at a disadvantage in the treatment I received or in the opportunities that came my way. In part, I think this is because this is a subfield that is very focused on the work and where no one gets a free pass. As a result, there's a high bar for everyone. I was lucky to find mentors early on who championed my work and pushed me to make it better.

However, I also owe a debt of gratitude to the women who came before me, some of whom are included in this symposium and some, perhaps most notably Barbara Sinclair, who are no longer with us. I know that, at least at times, their experiences were quite different than mine has been. They blazed a trail, and the opportunities for women of my generation are due in no small part to their efforts.

One of the questions we were asked to consider for this symposium was how being a part of a field that is predominantly male has affected our work. While it is impossible to assess the counterfactual, I do think that one effect is that it has led me to be bolder in my theoretical and empirical claims and to write and present in a more authoritative way. (However, I'll admit that I sometimes struggle with giving this advice to women graduate students and junior faculty that I mentor—for example, are claims with fewer qualifications objectively "better," or do we just think they are because that has been the approach that has felt natural to the majority of the field² across time? My sense is that it is probably some of both.) Second, I quickly learned to develop a thicker skin (we can be a tough crowd, especially behind the shield of anonymity!) and to get my work out there. At the same time, I have appreciated the efforts of the current and previous editors of *LSQ* to promote a culture of constructive criticism and feedback, and I aim to continue that approach during my own term as Congress editor.

We were also asked to identify any differences that have occurred in the field during our careers. I think perhaps the biggest one in my time is that it has become more geographically diffuse. In the late 1990s, when I started graduate school, most young legislative studies scholars were com-

ing out of a handful of “Congress shops,” but that is really no longer the case. This is the result of a variety of factors (e.g., likely some combination of a few moves by senior scholars, the fact that you no longer need to be down the hall from a collaborator to easily communicate with him or her on a regular basis, more homogeneity in the level of methods training across graduate programs in general, the broader availability of data and ease in sharing it). This has some downsides, as I know that there is the perception of less cohesiveness and momentum in our research agenda a subfield now than in the recent past. Overall, though, I think it has been a net positive, as it has opened up the field to a more heterogeneous set of questions and a more heterogeneous group of scholars. Where, then, do we go from here? If, as a field, we are interested in increasing the number of women who specialize in legislative studies and their integration into the community, there are a few areas we could target.

First, we might ask why so few women enter graduate school with interests in Congress in particular (and institutions in general). In my years as Director of Graduate Studies at Illinois in the early 2010s, I don’t think we had a single female prospective student apply with an intent to study legislative politics (even though, for much of that time, we had three women faculty in the department who studied Congress), and, as a result, none of the four women Ph.D. advisees I have had who have written dissertations about Congress had interests in the area before they came to the department. From talking to colleagues at other institutions, this seems to be a general pattern.

The exceptions I know in the field all have something in common—they worked as an undergraduate with a scholar who involved them in research and data collection and explicitly encouraged them to consider pursuing a research career in legislative politics. Research on paths to academic careers suggests that this is true generally of all students, regardless of gender, race, or other characteristics, but that sort of mentoring is likely to be particularly important for female students and students of color.

Second, it is useful to consider the dynamics of coauthorship, including how coauthor relationships arise and how we advise graduate students and junior faculty about such collaborations. One of the advantages of the subfield for scholars at all ranks is that both books and articles are seen as equally legitimate paths to tenure, promotion, and influence in the field. Based on purely anecdotal evidence, of the women of my generation, reputations have largely been built around solo-authored books, but there seems to be more variation in the paths of men, with some taking this route, but others disseminating their work via articles, often as part of small teams of coauthors. Throughout the discipline, coauthorship has become more of a standard path and now enjoys (close to) full acceptance as a venue for developing one’s scholarly reputation. Accordingly, it is important to ensure that men and women have equal opportunity to access networks that lead to coauthorship relationships (especially those that extend beyond advisor-advisee collabora-

tions) and to mentoring about the place of coauthored work.

Third, we might make efforts to broaden the scope of what is considered “legislative studies,” or, at least, in greater outreach to those in cognate areas. For faculty and graduate students doing fairly mainstream work about Congress, the fit between their research and the section generally appears obvious, but there are also many political scientists doing work about legislatures or representation who consider themselves first and foremost scholars of state politics, public policy, women and politics, or racial and ethnic politics. That self-identification shapes the APSA sections to which they belong, the journals in which they publish, and the networks that they build. As such, a bigger umbrella can potentially help to diversify the section on a number of different fronts.

My association with legislative studies has been a productive and positive one, and I owe much to the mentors and friends, both men and women alike, who have made it such. I look forward to seeing the direction our subfield takes, and to being a part of it for many years to come.

References

Sulkin, Tracy. 2005. *Issue Politics in Congress*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Notes

1. And, the evidence indicates that this hasn’t changed greatly in the intervening 15 years. As part of the invitation to write this piece, Gisela Sin and Laurel Harbridge Yong shared some statistics, including that about one-quarter of the attendees at the 2018 business meeting were women, which is largely in line with their percentage in the section overall (at 22%). This puts LSS as tied with the Presidents and Executive Politics section (also at 22%) and just ahead of Political Methodology (the lowest percentage of women in all of APSA’s sections, at 21%).

2. I should note that I do not see these stylistic differences as determined by gender; just that they are generally unevenly distributed among men and women.

Navigating Political Science as a Woman

Diana Z. O’Brien
Texas A&M University

How do you succeed in academia? Since taking a faculty position I have thought a lot about this question. And, since earning tenure, I’ve had the opportunity to participate in workshops and discussions with women graduate students

that focus on the unique experiences of women political scientists. To prepare for these workshops, I have collected advice based on both research and also insights from successful women academics. Below I summarize some of the best advice on building support structures, producing research, and navigating service obligations. A complete and evolving list of suggestions on these issues and related topics—including teaching, mental health concerns, and confronting harassment—can be found [here](#).

Building a Support Structure

My first and most important piece of advice is to be compassionate with others and with yourself. This is a rewarding job, but not always an easy one. The ability to evaluate work critically is integral to our profession. But it is often tempting to focus that critical eye too much on ourselves.

Academia can be very isolating, and there is a lot of excellent advice on building friendships and finding support structures in your personal life to aid with loneliness. But, it's also important to build a support structure within the discipline. Strong networks contribute to your professional success. They lead to invitations to give talks, contribute to special issues, etc. Perhaps more importantly, having friends in the discipline makes this job much more fun.

Networks matter and don't appear out of thin air. You have to build and tend to them. Ideally you should build your networks vertically (with senior scholars) and horizontally (with peers). Social media, particularly Twitter, is a good way to start building your networks. You should also try to meet one new person per conference. Reach out to scholars (both men and women) whom you admire for their particular strengths and request a meeting where you can ask specific questions. Senior colleagues are often happy to meet with you, but make sure you respect their time. Keep the first meeting brief and have a clear agenda. And, while more experienced scholars are important for your professional advancement, remember that in hard times support from peers may be at least as valuable as support from senior allies.

As you build your network, keep an eye out for mentors. Mentorship matters at all career stages, and you should seek out advocates both within and outside of your department. You also don't have to rely on a single mentor. Instead, have several mentors who help you with different parts of the job.

Just as it is important to seek out mentorship at all career stages, it is also important to provide support to others. You're never too young to be a mentor, and at all career stages you should reach out to more junior women. In your research, read and cite women's work. In the classroom, teach the work of women scholars. Encourage others (men and women) to read, cite, and teach women. More generally, look out for women in the academy, especially women from less-privileged backgrounds, or in less-privileged positions. It is especially important to be an ally to women of color, who face a unique set of challenges related to race (and the intersection of race and gender).

Finally, mentoring others is not simply an obligation. Instead, it is an opportunity to make friends with other women in political science (and in academia more generally). Helping others brings me intrinsic joy. My job—and my life—has been enriched by my female friends in political science.

Research

A key reason to build a support structure is to put yourself in a position where you have the skills, resources, and confidence necessary to publish research that makes you proud. If you can, give yourself the time to work on ambitious projects and submit to top journals. Women in political science are less likely to submit to the “Top 3” outlets (Koenig et. al 2018). Of course, there are other venues for important and ambitious work, but the gender gap in submissions suggests some systemic issues affecting women in the discipline. There are at least two factors that likely contribute to this gap: first, women's confidence in their work; and second, women's greater time constraints.

Gender and politics literature finds that even highly qualified women are less confident in their abilities than men (Fox and Lawless 2005), and I believe that this holds among political scientists as well. I do not think that this is irrational, as women may have to be especially talented to be viewed as “brilliant” and may face higher costs for producing sloppy and ill-conceived work. Of course, you should not submit premature or more minor projects to the APSR. But, you should develop the intellectual confidence to pursue ambitious projects and to think of yourself as a scholar who can publish in top outlets. Most importantly, you must become self-assured enough to ask for comments on your work at many points along the way. Share early drafts and get feedback from lots of people (including, and especially, peers). You don't need to take all of the advice given, but all of the articles I have published in highly competitive journals have been vetted by smart and sympathetic colleagues.

Once you've circulated a draft, submit it for publication. And, once it is rejected—which is almost inevitable—revise based on reviewer comments and submit again as soon as possible. Women are less likely than men to resubmit after rejection, which leads to decreased publication rates. Finally, when you have a reasonable paper draft, look out for awards for which you are a plausible candidate (best paper, best dissertation, etc.) and make sure you are nominated. Not only is there a chance that you'll win, but simply being nominated is good, free publicity for your work among award committee members.

Beyond a confidence gap, the reality is that women academics often have less time to write than men. Women are asked to do more service than men (Guarino and Borden 2017). And female academics do more second-shift domestic labor than their male counterparts (Mason, Wolfinger, Goulden 2014). On any given day, it is easy to focus your time and energy on more pressing demands—like teaching and service—at the expense of research. As often as you

can, “pay yourself first.” That is, make time every day to invest in the professional activities that will pay the greatest long-term dividends. For many academics, this is finding time to write every day (even if for only 25 minutes). Before you go to bed each work night, decide exactly what you will work on in the morning/tomorrow that lets you pay yourself.

Teaching and Service

Women have less time for research in part because they are dedicating more time to teaching than men. This gap, moreover, cannot be fully explained by women’s preferences or educational and institutional attributes (Winslow 2010). Rather, it likely reflects the greater expectations placed on women faculty by both departments and students. Students, for example, request more special favors and friendship behaviors from female professors than from men (El-Alayli, Hansen-Brown, and Ceynar 2018).

Unfortunately, this extra time committed is not always rewarded. Indeed, there is evidence of gender bias in course evaluations (Boring 2017; MacNell, Driscoll, and Hunt 2015). Remember, particularly when you first start teaching, that you are an expert and introduce yourself as such. Explain that you are a Ph.D. (or in a Ph.D. program) and what that means. Describe your area of expertise to your students. And, when it comes to evaluations, remember that bias exists. Importantly, make this bias known to your department and seek out allies who will make this point for you when it comes to annual evaluations and promotion.

With respect to service, I have been in the privileged position of working at institutions that required relatively little from junior professors. Many scholars have never enjoyed these privileges, and even professors at research-intensive universities often face high service burdens after promotion to associate professor. This is especially true for women, as there are fewer of us to sit on department and university committees. Now that I have tenure, I accept that I am in a place in my career where service is rightly expected. But it is important to make sure that your service work also works for you.

To make service more useful and enjoyable, you should try to proactively seek out service opportunities that are meaningful to you, rather than just sporadically saying yes to requests that cross your desk. With each new exciting opportunity, you should also try to remind yourself that every “yes” is a “no” to something else.

In order to gauge whether your teaching and service load is reasonable, you should have in mind a male benchmark. You can find a male colleague who is at the same career stage and compare your service and teaching obligations—as well as your compensation and support—to ensure that you are not being unfairly burdened. Ideally, if this is a colleague you trust, you can enlist him as an ally. If you’re not sure if requests, situations, or problems are gendered, run them by a trusted male colleague and ask “is this happening to you?” to ascertain if requests are “normal.” More generally, if you’re worried about saying no

to a service request, negotiating with your chair, or giving an interview ask yourself: what would my favorite male colleagues do?

Finding Your Own Way

Some of this advice may not be useful for you. Well-intentioned scholars and friends, who truly want the best for you, will sometimes give you unhelpful and contradictory suggestions. Use the strategies that work for you and feel no shame about disregarding the rest.

References

- Boring, Anne. 2017. “Gender biases in student evaluations of teaching.” *Journal of Public Economics* 145: 27-41.
- El-Alayli, Amani, Ashley A. Hansen-Brown, and Michelle Ceynar. 2018. “Dancing Backwards in High Heels: Female Professors Experience More Work Demands and Special Favor Requests, Particularly From Academically Entitled Students.” *Sex Roles*: 1-15.
- Koenig, Thomas, Kenneth Benoit, Thomas Bräuninger, Sabine Carey, Leigh Jenco, Benjamin Lauderdale, and Ingo Rohlfing. 2018. “American Political Science Review Editors’ Report 2016–17.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51(2): 478-484.
- Lawless, Jennifer L., and Richard L. Fox. 2005. *It Takes a Candidate: Why Women Don’t Run for Office*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Guarino, Cassandra M., and Victor MH Borden. 2017. “Faculty Service Loads and Gender: Are Women Taking Care of the Academic Family?” *Research in Higher Education* 58(6): 672-694.
- MacNell, Lillian, Adam Driscoll, and Andrea N. Hunt. 2015. “What’s in a Name: Exposing Gender Bias in Student Ratings of Teaching.” *Innovative Higher Education* 40(4): 291-303.
- Mason, Mary Ann, Nicholas H. Wolfinger, and Marc Goulden. 2014. *Do Babies Matter? Gender and Family in the Ivory Tower*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Winslow, Sarah. 2010. “Gender Inequality and Time Allocations Among Academic Faculty.” *Gender & Society* 24(6): 769-793.

Walking in Large Footprints and Forging New Paths

Wendy Schiller
Brown University

I entered graduate school in political science at the University of Rochester in 1989, having spent several years working in the United States Senate and lobbying for the Office of the State of New York. I was originally hoping to study voting behavior but then I took one class with Linda Powell on legislative behavior and I was hooked on Congress. Late in the spring of my first year at Rochester, Linda told me that Richard (Dick) Fenno was looking for a research assistant starting that summer, and would I be interested. As my best friend Fiona McGillivray remarked that day, “Well that’s a career maker.” And she was right.

But I often think about what might have happened if Linda Powell had not taught that class my first year; that she was a senior female professor studying public opinion, legislative politics, and campaign finance, who was impressive to me both for her research, and because she was (and still is) a successful female academic. And what if she had not passed on the job opportunity with one of the most famous Congress scholars in the past 50 years? Would I have sought out that opportunity on my own? Probably not. Would I today? Absolutely.

In addition to Linda Powell, Rochester had already produced a number of female PhDs who made their mark in the field of legislative studies including Christine DeGregorio, Diana Evans, Linda Fowler, and Barbara Decker Sinclair, among others. Later, at Princeton on a postdoc, I met Carol Swain who had just won the Woodrow Wilson APSA award for *Black Faces, Black Interests: The Representation of African Americans in Congress*. Because of the encouragement and success of women who had come before me in the field, I did not see barriers to entry to the field of legislative studies. When I published my first article in 1995 on bill sponsorship in the Senate in the *American Journal of Political Science*, it seemed as if the sky would be the limit for publishing more quantitative work on the Senate in other journals. In that era, most of the peer reviewed articles that were published on Congress featured the House of Representatives which had the advantage of a more formal rules structure and a much larger N than the Senate did. But throughout the 1990s and early 2000s, work on the Senate became more quantitative, and technology allowed for a broader analysis of individual legislative behavior of the sort that dominated Senate life more so than the House.

In general, I sought to publish other articles associated with my dissertation and projects on the Senate but I encountered more rejection than success. What I did not do was persevere and seek a wider range of outlets for my published work. Facing rejection at the “top” journals, I shelved manuscripts instead of revising them and sending them out again. Years later, I realize that for most people reading a CV, especially university administrators, a longer list of

published articles always ranks above a shorter list of articles in more prestigious journals. This is a key lesson for younger colleagues, female and male alike.

I also found that co-authorship networks tended to be male dominated but that could very well have been a function of the ratio of male to female graduate students in the area of legislative studies, rather than a purposeful exclusionary practice. These types of networks were also evident in the “circuit” of presenting papers in departmental seminars which were a key way of getting work recognized and improving it for potential reviewers who could be chosen from these seminars. Women coming up in the field should not hesitate to ask their colleagues in other departments to invite them for talks to present their work; and when the opportunity in their own department arises to run a seminar series, make sure to reciprocate. Parallel to this would be to try to secure invitations to the smaller conferences that are increasingly becoming important incubators for published work. There were fewer of these sorts of conferences twenty years ago, but now they frequently produce opportunities to vet articles and book ideas.

Women scholars in legislative studies should also be encouraged to apply for grants, ranging from the Dirksen Center research grants to National Science Foundation (NSF) grants, to fund their work. Grants are not just important for securing the resources to conduct research; they are also key to establishing the external validity of work and forging a distinct reputation among department colleagues and administrators. In my case, as a tenured associate professor I worked with Charles Stewart (MIT) who was senior to me in rank and reputation in the area of congressional history to secure an NSF grant to study the indirect elections of U.S. Senators. He and I had separately been pursuing parallel tracks on the question of indirect Senate elections and it seemed to me to be a good opportunity to work together. Some observers would argue that is exactly the wrong strategy for a woman in choosing research partnerships because men frequently receive more credit for joint projects than their female colleagues. But that was not my experience at all. We worked together successfully, presenting papers and publishing an article and a book from the project. Although gendered asymmetry in rank is not always an advisable feature on co-authorship partnerships, doing so to pursue major grants and publications can further one’s career.

For legislative scholars today, as in prior years, publishing a book, rather than a series of journal articles, may still be the gold standard for staking out intellectual property rights. The year I started graduate school, Barbara Sinclair published *The Transformation of the U.S. Senate*, and Steve Smith published *Call to Order: Floor Politics in the House and Senate*, which were foundational in their push to study the Senate on par with the House. It would be 7 to 10 more years until Sarah Binder and Steve Smith would publish *Politics or Principle? Filibustering in the United States Senate*, Frances Lee and Bruce Oppenheimer would publish *Sizing up the Senate: The Unequal Consequences of Equal Representation*, and I would publish *Partners and*

Rivals: Representation in U.S. Senate Delegations. And it would be another 10 years after that when one could argue the Senate would reach almost parity with the House as the subject of exploration in the legislative studies sub-field as demonstrated by an increase in peer review journal articles, and books including *Party Polarization in Congress* by Sean Theriault, and Frances Lee's *Beyond Ideology: Politics, Principles, and Partisanship in the U.S. Senate*.

In addition to Sinclair, Binder, and Lee, women scholars in legislative studies have made their mark on the field with important books ranging from Michele Swers work on women in Congress in *The Difference Women Make: The Policy Impact of Women in Congress*, to Katherine Tate's work on black representation in *Black Faces in the Mirror: African Americans and Their Representatives in the U.S. Congress*, to Tracy Sulkin's work on the impact of campaigns on agenda setting in *Issue Politics in Congress*, to Laurel Harbridge's work on bipartisan lawmaking in *Is Bipartisanship Dead? Policy Agreement and Agenda-Setting in the House of Representatives*, to Gisela Sin's work on structural distribution of power in *Separation of Powers and Legislative Organization*, to Kathryn Pearson's work on party leadership in *Party Discipline in the U.S. House of Representatives*. This more recent cohort of female scholars in legislative politics is both carrying on the tradition of their predecessors, and pushing the boundaries of legislative scholarship much further. What marks these women as fundamentally different and strategically savvy is that they also published articles in a range of journals on their book topics, as well as other subjects.

Given the expansion of the discipline of political science, women have a lot more choice in their areas of specialization. However, on the face of it, the landscape for legislative scholars is more constrained than in prior decades. The degree of polarization and centralized party control in both chambers has produced gridlock and a smaller space for individual entrepreneurship, and less overall legislating. There have to be stories to tell and puzzles to explain and Congress has not been cooperative in this regard. But the beauty of studying the American Congress is that every 2 years the cast of characters can change, and sometimes, party control changes with them. In 2018, the shift in leadership control of the House, as well as the election of more Black and Latino legislators, creates the potential for renewed research on legislative agenda setting and intersectionality in representation. This presents an opportunity to increase the number and success of women in legislative studies, starting with encouraging female students at the undergraduate level to pursue a PhD in political science, and thereafter making sure that they climb every rung of the proverbial ladder with as much confidence, ambition, and strategic self-promotion as their male colleagues.

References

Binder, Sarah and Steven Smith. 1996 *Politics or Principle? Filibustering in the United States Senate*. Brooking

Institution Press.

Lee, Frances. 2009. *Beyond Ideology: Politics, Principles, and Partisanship in the U.S. Senate*. University of Chicago Press.

Lee, Frances and Bruce Oppenheimer. 1999. *Sizing up the Senate: The Unequal Consequences of Equal Representation*. University of Chicago Press.

Pearson, Kathryn. 2015. *Party Discipline in the U.S. House of Representatives*. University of Michigan Press.

Schiller, Wendy. 2000. *Partners and Rivals: Representation in the U.S. Senate Delegations*. Princeton University Press.

Sin, Gisela. 2014. *Separation of Powers and Legislative Organization*. Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, Barbara. 1989. *The Transformation of the U.S. Senate*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Smith, Steven. 1989. *Call to Order: Floor Politics in the House and Senate*. Brookings Institution Press.

Swain, Carol. 2006. *Black Faces, Black Interests: The Representation of African Americans in Congress*. University Press of America.

Swers, Michele. 2002. *The Difference Women Make: The Policy Impact of Women in Congress*. University of Chicago Press.

Tate, Katherine. 2003. *Black Faces in the Mirror: African Americans and Their Representatives in the U.S. Congress*. Princeton University Press.

Theriault, Sean. 2008. *Party Polarization in Congress*. Cambridge University Press.

Editors

Gisela Sin

Gisela Sin is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. A Fulbright scholar who received her PhD in political science from the University of Michigan, she studies political institutions, emphasizing the strategic elements of separation of powers. She is the author of *Separation of Powers and Legislative Organization: the President, the Senate, and Political Parties in the Making of House Rules*, published by Cambridge University Press and winner of the Alan Rosenthal Prize from the Legislative Studies Section. She is co-author of a book on Argentinean institutions, *Congreso, Presidencia, y Justicia en Argentina*. She has published numerous articles on American and Comparative politics and is currently examining the strategic use of vetoes in the US States and Latin America. She is the co-chair of the Legislative Studies Group at the Latin America Political Science Association.



Laurel Harbridge-Yong

Laurel Harbridge-Yong is an Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science, and a Faculty Fellow with the Institute for Policy Research, both at Northwestern University. Her research focuses on partisan conflict and the lack of bipartisan agreement in American politics. Her 2015 book *Is Bipartisanship Dead? Policy Agreement and Agenda-Setting in the House of Representatives* explores how congressional parties prioritize partisan conflict over bipartisan agreement, and how this approach to legislating affects the responsiveness of members to their constituents and policy formation. She earned her PhD at Stanford University in 2009 and her work has been published in the *American Journal of Political Science*, *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, and *American Politics Research*, among others. This research has been supported by the National Science Foundation Time Sharing Experiments in the Social Sciences (TESS), the Dirksen Congressional Center, and the Social Science Research Council.



Editorial Assistant

Collin Paschall

Collin Paschall serves as an American Political Science Association Congressional Fellow. He received his PhD from the Department of Political Science at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. His research on the legislative consequences of congressional scandals (with Bill Bernhard and Tracy Sulkin) is forthcoming in *Political Research Quarterly*, and his research on the persuasive effects of the gun control debate (with Benjamin Kantack) is forthcoming at *Social Science Quarterly*. His dissertation research focuses on the policymaking strategies of members of Congress, particularly the legislative behavior of “policy wonks.” Collin received his J.D. from The George Washington University Law School and his B.A. from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.



Contributors

Nadia Brown

Nadia E. Brown (Ph.D., Rutgers University) is a University Scholar and Associate Professor of Political Science and African American Studies at Purdue University. She specializes in Black women's politics and holds a graduate certificate in Women's and Gender Studies. Dr. Brown's research interests lie broadly in identity politics, legislative studies, and Black women's studies. While trained as a political scientist, her scholarship on intersectionality seeks to push beyond disciplinary constraints to think more holistically about the politics of identity. Brown's *Sisters in the Statehouse: Black women and Legislative Decision Making* (Oxford University press, 2014) has been awarded the National Conference of Black Political Scientists' 2015 W.E.B. DuBois Distinguished Book Award, 2015 Anna Julia Cooper Award from the Association for the Study of Black Women and Politics, and the 2015 Center for Research on Diversity and Inclusion at Purdue University Faculty Research Award. Along with Sarah Allen Gershon, Professor Brown co-edited *Distinct Identities: Minority Women in U.S. Politics* (Routledge Press 2016). She regularly teaches the following courses: Black Political Participation; Black Women Rising; Introduction to African American Studies; and Race and Ethnicity in American Politics. Professor Brown is also the co-lead editor of *Politics, Groups and Identities*.



Guillermo Caballero

Guillermo Caballero is a second-year doctoral student in the Department of Political Science at Purdue University specializing in American Politics, Public Policy, and Social Movements. Currently, he is working to develop a concurrent theory of power. This theory aims to explain the ways that race-ethnic minority politicians create legislative influence.



Linda Fowler

Linda L. Fowler is Professor of Government and Frank J. Reagan Chair in Policy Studies at Dartmouth College, Emerita, where she continues to teach and conduct research. After stepping down from her position as director of the Nelson Rockefeller Center for the Social Sciences, Fowler received a Guggenheim Fellowship in 2005 to study congressional oversight of defense and foreign policy by the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees. The resulting book, *Watchdogs on the Hill: The Decline of Congressional Oversight of U. S. Foreign Relations*, was published by Princeton University Press in 2015. Fowler's previous books include: *Political Ambition: Who Decides to Run for Congress* (Yale 1989) and *Candidates, Congress and the American Democracy* (Michigan, 1993). She has published numerous articles and book chapters on American politics and is currently examining the transformation of the House Rules Committee. She has held a variety of positions in the Legislative Studies Section and served as Secretary of APSA in 2014-15.



Patricia A. Hurley

Patricia A. Hurley is Professor Emerita of Political Science and former Department Head and Associate Dean of Liberal Arts at Texas A&M University. She received her Ph.D. in Political Science from Rice University, and taught at the University of Houston and Rice University before moving to Texas A&M. She served as President of both the Southwestern Political Science Association and the Southwestern Social Science Association, and was recognized by the latter organization with a Distinguished Service Award. She served on editorial boards for the *American Journal of Political Science*, the *Journal of Politics*, *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, and *Social Science Quarterly*. Her research is on the linkages between public opinion, campaigns, and elections and institutional response and legislative representation in the American political system. Her articles have appeared in *AJPS*, *JOP*, *LSQ*, and a number of other journals. Her most recent work is *Representation in Congress: A Unified Theory* (Cambridge University Press, 2015) co-authored with Kim Quail Hill and Soren Jordan.

**Jasmine Jackson**

Jasmine C. Jackson is a second year graduate student in the Department of Political Science at Purdue University. She graduated summa cum laude with a Bachelor's degree in Political Science from Jackson State University. Jasmine's areas of focus are American politics and public policy. Her research interests include political knowledge and identity politics. In her most recent work, she has been examining political knowledge, focusing specifically on how the measurement of political knowledge can create knowledge gaps. Jasmine is the 2017 recipient of the George Washington Carver Fellowship and a 2017-2018 American Political Science Association Minority Fellow.

**Frances Lee**

Frances E. Lee is professor of Government and Politics at the University of Maryland. She is co-editor of *Legislative Studies Quarterly*. Most recently, she is author of *Insecure Majorities: Congress and the Perpetual Campaign* (University of Chicago Press 2016). Her 2009 book *Beyond Ideology: Politics, Principles, and Partisanship in the U.S. Senate* (University of Chicago Press 2009) received the LSS's Richard F. Fenno Award. She is also coauthor of *Sizing Up The Senate: The Unequal Consequences of Equal Representation* (University of Chicago Press 1999) and a textbook, *Congress and Its Members* (Sage / CQ Press). Her research has appeared in numerous journal outlets, including the *American Political Science Review*, *American Journal of Political Science*, *Journal of Politics*, and others. In 2002-2003, she worked on Capitol Hill as an American Political Science Association Congressional Fellow.



Carol Mershon

Carol Mershon is a Professor in the Department of Politics at the University of Virginia. She received her Ph.D. from Yale University. Her research focuses on political institutions, legislative politics, multiparty government, intraparty competition, the dynamics of party systems, and diversity in academe. Mershon's articles have appeared in such journals as *American Political Science Review*, *American Journal of Political Science*, *Comparative Political Studies*, *Journal of Politics*, *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, and *Politics & Gender*. She is the author of *The Costs of Coalition* (Stanford 2002) and co-editor of *Political Parties and Legislative Party Switching* (Palgrave Macmillan 2009). Her most recent book is *Party System Change in Legislatures Worldwide*, with Olga Shvetsova (Cambridge 2013). The recipient of three NSF awards, Mershon has also held three Fulbright grants, a Social Science Research Council Fellowship, and a Fellowship from the Collegio Carlo Alberto, Turin. Mershon serves on the International Scientific Board, *Italian Review of Political Science*, and the Editorial Board of the *Journal of Politics*. For more information, see her [website](#) and [Google scholar](#) profile.



Dana Moyer

Dana Moyer is a PhD Candidate in the Department of Politics at the University of Virginia. Her research agenda focuses on political violence in developing countries, particularly Latin America, both during authoritarian and democratic regimes.



Liza Mügge

Liza Mügge is associate professor in political science and director of the Amsterdam Research Centre for Gender & Sexuality at the University of Amsterdam. Her research focuses on political representation, intersectionality and equality of ethnic minorities and women. Liza is PI of the 5-year project 'Misrepresenting Diversity? How Personal Identities Clash with Ethnic Pigeonholing in Politics' which investigates political representation of citizens with a migration background in Western Europe. She has (co-)edited several special issues on diversity in political representation and political science research and teaching, in journals such as *Politics* (2016), *Parliamentary Affairs* (2016), *PS: Political Science and Politics* (2016), *European Political Science* (2016) and *Politics, Groups & Identities* (2013). She was residential fellow with the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences (2016-2017), the Women and Public Policy Program at the Harvard Kennedy School (2014-2015) and visiting scholar at the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies at Harvard University (2012). She is co-founding and lead-editor of the *European Journal of Politics & Gender*.



Diana Z. O'Brien

Diana Z. O'Brien is an associate professor in the Department of Political Science at Texas A&M University. Her research and teaching interests include women and politics, representation, political parties and institutions, the executive branch, and research methods. She has published articles on these topics in top-ranked journals, including the *American Political Science Review*, *American Journal of Political Science*, *European Journal of Political Research*, *Journal of Politics*, *Politics & Gender*, *Comparative Politics*, and *Legislative Studies Quarterly*.



Sanne van Oosten

Sanne van Oosten is a PhD candidate in Political Science at the University of Amsterdam. Her research focusses on diversity in politics and the way in which gender and ethnicity shape expectations and experiences of representation among individual citizens of the Netherlands, Germany and France. Previously, she worked in the Dutch Parliament, at an NGO for women's rights and as a junior lecturer.



Lynda Powell

Lynda Powell is a Professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Rochester. Her current research focuses on representation and polarization in the American Legislatures: the 50 state legislatures and Congress. She is studying the effects of institutional features (such as committees and leadership), donors and electoral constituencies on representation, polarization and lawmaking. Her most recent book, *The Influence of Campaign Contributions in State Legislatures: The Effects of Institutions and Politics* (University of Michigan Press) won the Fenno Prize, the best book award of the Legislative Studies Section of APSA, and was the inaugural winner of the Gray Prize, the best book award of the State Politics and Policy Section of APSA. Her other publications include three co-authored books: *The Financiers of Congressional Elections* (Columbia University Press); *Term Limits in the State Legislatures* (University of Michigan Press); *Serious Money: Fundraising and Contributing in Presidential Nomination Campaigns* (Cambridge University Press); and a variety of articles in journals including the *American Journal of Political Science*, the *Journal of Politics* and *Legislative Studies Quarterly*.



Cindy Simon Rosenthal

Cindy Simon Rosenthal is emeritus professor of political science and women and gender studies at the University of Oklahoma. She served as director of the Carl Albert Congressional Research and Studies Center from 2004 to 2018.



Wendy Schiller

Wendy Schiller is Professor of Political Science, International & Public Affairs, and Chair, Department of Political Science at Brown University. She did her undergraduate work in political science at the University of Chicago, served on the staffs of Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Governor Mario Cuomo, and then obtained her Ph.D. from the University of Rochester. After Fellowships at the Brookings Institution and Princeton University, she came to Brown University in 1994. She teaches popular courses titled The American Presidency, Introduction to the American Political Process, and Congress and Public Policy at Brown University. Among books she has authored or co-authored are *Electing the Senate: Indirect Democracy before the Seventeenth Amendment* (Princeton University Press), *Gateways to Democracy: An Introduction to American Government* (Cengage), *The Contemporary Congress* (Rowman & Littlefield) and *Partners and Rivals: Representation in U.S. Senate Delegations* (Princeton University Press). She has also published articles in the *American Journal of Political Science*, *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, *Studies in American Political Development*, and the *Journal of Politics*. She has been a contributor to MSNBC, NPR, CNN.com, and Bloomberg News, she provides local political commentary to the Providence Journal, WPRO radio, RIPBS A Lively Experiment, and she is the political analyst for WJAR10, the local NBC affiliate in Providence.



Tracy Sulkin

Tracy Sulkin is professor of political science at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and the author, most recently, of *Legislative Style* with Bill Bernhard.

**Michele Swers**

Michele Swers is Professor of American Government in the Department of Government at Georgetown University. Her research and teaching interests encompass Congressional policymaking and elections, and Women and Politics. She has written two books on women and representation in Congress. Her book, *The Difference Women Make: The Policy Impact of Women in Congress* (University of Chicago Press) explores gender differences in policy making activity on issues related to women, children, and families. *Women in the Club: Gender and Policy Making in the Senate* (University of Chicago Press) examines the impact of gender on senators' policy activities in the areas of women's issues, national security, and judicial nominations. Swers focuses on party differences to demonstrate how party reputations for issue ownership interact with perceptions of women's policy expertise to create opportunities and obstacles for women senators. Dr. Swers has written numerous articles and book chapters on women in Congress and women in elections as candidates and voters. She co-authors the textbook, *Women and Politics: Paths to Power and Political Influence* (Rowman & Littlefield) with Julie Dolan and Melissa Deckman. She is currently working on a project that examines differences in the policy views and support coalitions of Republican men and women in Congress.

**SoRelle Wyckoff**

SoRelle Wyckoff is a second year PhD student at the University of Maryland studying the U. S. Congress and public policy. Prior to joining the University of Maryland, she worked in the U. S. House of Representatives and U. S. Senate. She received a B. A. in History and Journalism from the University of Alabama.



How To Subscribe

The Legislative Scholar is distributed electronically to all members of the Legislative Studies Section of APSA. To join the section, please visit www.apsanet.org.

Previous issues of the newsletter will be posted to www.legislativestudies.org/legislativescholar.

Copyright 2018 American Political Science Association.
Address: 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20036-1206
Phone: (202) 483-2515 | Fax: (202) 483-2657 | Email: apsa@apsanet.org