Carter, Alecia J., Alyssa Croft, Dieter Lukas, and Gillian M. Sandstrom. 2018. "Women's Visibility in Academic Seminars: Women Ask Fewer Questions than Men." *PloS One* 13 (9): e0202743.

Claypool, Vicki H., Brian D. Janssen, Dongkyu Kim, and Sara M. Mitchell. 2017. "Determinants of Salary Dispersion among Political Science Faculty: The Differential Effects of Where You Work (Institutional Characteristics) and What You Do (Negotiate and Publish)." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50 (1): 146–56.

Crawford, Kerry F., and Leah C. Windsor. 2019. "Best Practices for Normalizing Parents in the Academy: Higher- and Lower-Order Processes and Women and Parents' Success." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 53 (2): 275–80.

Crawford, Kerry F., and Leah C. Windsor. 2021. *The PhD Parenthood Trap: Caught Between Work and Family in Academia*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Hancock, Kathleen J., Matthew A. Baum, and Marijke Breuning. 2013. "Women and Pre-Tenure Scholarly Productivity in International Studies: An Investigation into the Leaky Career Pipeline." *International Studies Perspectives* 14 (4): 507–27.

Hesli, Vicki L., Jae Mook Lee, and Sara M. Mitchell. 2012. "Predicting Rank Attainment in Political Science: What Else Besides Publications Affects Promotion?" *PS: Political Science & Politics* 45 (3): 475–92.

Kim, Hannah June, and Bernard Grofman. 2019. "Job Mobility, Tenure, and Promotions in Political Science PhD-Granting Departments, 2002–2017: Cohort, Gender, and Citation-Count Effects." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 52 (4): 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096519000490.

Kim, Jae Yun, Gráinne M. Fitzsimons, and Aaron C. Kay. 2018. "Lean In Messages Increase Attributions of Women's Responsibility for Gender Inequality." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 115 (6): 974–1001. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000129.

Madera, Juan M., Michelle R. Hebl, and Randi C. Martin. 2009. "Gender and Letters of Recommendation for Academia: Agentic and Communal Differences." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 94 (6): 1591–99.

Mitchell, Kristina M. W., and Jonathan Martin. 2018. "Gender Bias in Student Evaluations." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51 (3): 648–52. https://doi.org/10.1017/S104909651800001X.

Mitchell, Sara M., and Vicki L. Hesli. 2013. "Women Don't Ask? Women Don't Say No? Bargaining and Service in the Political Science Profession." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 46 (2): 355–69.

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

Sandberg, Sheryl. 2013. *Lean In: Women, Work, and the Will to Lead*. New York: Random House.

Sumner, Jane Lawrence. 2018. "The Gender Balance Assessment Tool (GBAT): A Web-Based Tool for Estimating Gender Balance in Syllabi and Bibliographies." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51 (2): 1–5.

Tinsley, Catherine H., Sandra I. Cheldelin, Andrea Kupfer Schneider, and Emily T. Amanatullah. 2009. "Women at the Bargaining Table: Pitfalls and Prospects." *Negotiation Journal* 25 (2): 233–48.

RETAINING WOMEN FACULTY: THE PROBLEM OF INVISIBLE LABOR

Rebecca A. Reid, *University of Texas at El Paso*

Growing research identifies problems in academia that contribute to the "leaky pipeline," wherein academia fails to retain women faculty due to salary inequalities (Ginther 2004), publication inequities (Mathews and Anderson 2001; Teele and Thelen 2017), and promotion disparities (Misra et al. 2011; Monforti and Michelson 2008; Perna 2001; Social Sciences Feminist Network Research Interest Group 2017). Furthermore, "having children amplifies and intensifies all of the obstacles female scholars already face in academia" (Windsor and Crawford 2020, 276). As a result, nearly a third of tenured women consider leaving academia (Hurtado et al. 2012). Yet, little scholarship focuses on the disproportionate burdens of invisible labor on women and faculty of color (Turner 2002). Invisible labor consists of student-initiated (Whitaker 2017) mentorship, in which faculty provide "hands-on attention" to "serve as role models, mentors, and even surrogate parents" (June 2015) and engage in caregiving and emotional work

(Hochschild 1983), especially pertaining to student diversification and inclusion (Flaherty 2019). This time-consuming work often is overlooked and undervalued because it is considered unnecessary and voluntary. Combined with rampant inequities in research and teaching, it is no surprise that women would consider alternative careers when overburdened with this service while remaining unacknowledged, underappreciated, and exhausted for it.

Invisible labor is necessary and valuable to universities and departments because it directly ties into teaching, mentorship, and student success. This work supports students by helping them contextualize family expectations and pressures; mental and physical health issues; and assault, racism, colonialism, and other aggressions. It teaches skills such as navigating power dynamics, conflict resolution, and leadership. Invisible labor responds to students' needs and generates crucial relationships such that they feel that faculty—and thus departments—welcome them, value them, and care about them as a person. This labor therefore directly contributes to student recruitment, retention, and success.

Yet, invisible labor can be exploitative for women because they are predominantly assumed to take on caregiving roles associated with gender stereotypes and motherhood. Furthermore, this exploitation often is exacerbated by the incompatibility of academia and motherhood, which holds women back professionally and requires them to "solve" work–life balances (Ginther and Hayes 2003; Hesli, Lee, and Mitchell 2012; Hochschild and Machung 2012). Beyond their standard professional obligations as faculty, working mothers thus are faced with two additional "second shifts" in which women are relied on for caregiving and homemaking for their family at home and for the "care of the academic family" (Guarino and Borden 2017). Women thereby incur compounded invisible-labor responsibilities in both private and professional settings that remain uncredited, devalued, and ignored.

Yet, rather than suggesting that faculty avoid this work (Pyke 2011), departments should offer credit for it. They could assign a departmental committee to create a consensual, explicit definition of invisible labor that fits the unique needs of the department, faculty, and students. Defining invisible labor should consider that faculty vary in terms of the types of services they are able to provide, are comfortable providing, and are expected to provide. Furthermore, the types of invisible labor that faculty engage in can shift over time. Hence, defining this work within a context of existing faculty engagement in invisible labor may be helpful. Definitions should be inclusive, expanding upon traditionally narrow, masculine conceptions of "work" (Budd 2016) and including racialized tasks that require faculty of color to preserve white privileging systems in academia (Wingfield and Skeete 2016). As built and largely controlled by white men, academia has entrenched and perpetuated social inequalities that maintain white men as the default for scientific inquiry, "objective" observation, moral authority, and work ethic (Reid and Curry 2019; Thomas 2017). Definitions of invisible labor therefore should expand beyond traditional notions of service and work as performed by white men.

Because all crediting strategies depend on the distinction between basic faculty responsibilities and invisible labor, definitions likely will vary by department. Some departments may select to include (1) mentoring marginalized students to assist them in navigating college and potentially racially hostile environments; (2) assisting students with application materials for graduate programs, jobs, scholarships, and internships; (3) offering

professionalization training for resumes, interviewing, and salary negotiation; and (4) being a caregiver, "listening ear, shoulder to cry on, mentor, tutor, life coach, stand-in parent, friend, therapist, financial planner, etc." (Grollman 2015).

However it is defined, credit must be consistently acknowledged within faculty evaluations, perhaps within teaching or

Allyship requires that we take on the self-education and self-reflection to improve our understanding of the gendered nature of academia and society and then find ways to address them within ourselves and the environments that we inhabit.

student mentorship dossiers. The purpose is not to add service requirements or penalize faculty not engaged in this work but rather to give credit to those engaged and ensure that other service obligations are distributed more equitably. For example, faculty can record the number of hours engaged in this work. Alternatively, faculty can provide summaries of their work or impact, which avoids quantification, promotes self-reflection, and provides information about student needs. Faculty can receive equal or more credit for "more" work in either method. Perhaps the best strategy is to create a voluntary committee for faculty engaging in invisible labor in which all faculty receive the same credit and an equitable reduction of other service obligations. The benefits of this strategy are that it requires no extensive recording or self-assessment, avoids inflexible bright-line rules, reduces potential faculty competition for credit, offers a supportive faculty network, and makes this work equivalent to other service requirements in terms of priority and importance. Regardless, each department must have an honest discussion to determine how best to recognize its faculty. These strategies are not exhaustive and can be amended to fit departmental needs. No one should be mandated to engage in invisible labor, but faculty who do should receive credit for their work, like any other service commitment.

In addition, departments should consider reinforcing more systemic connections with campus resources, including counseling and health centers, disability services, and veterans' affairs. Similarly, universities must ensure adequate funding and accessibility for students to use these campus resources and ensure that they focus on student assistance rather than merely university liability. These connections will reduce the need for faculty to engage in the types of invisible labor that they may not be comfortable with or trained to provide. Furthermore, to reduce the exploitation of women via compounded invisible-labor responsibilities, universities must ensure that policies designed to protect mothers' careers are communicated transparently as well as consistently and equitably applied rather than ignored or bargained for (Windsor and Crawford 2020).

While individual allyship and acknowledgment of invisible labor is necessary, it is not sufficient. It must be institutionalized. Allyship requires that we take on the self-education and self-reflection to improve our understanding of the gendered nature of academia and society and then find ways to address them within ourselves and the environments that we inhabit. Hence, institutions also must be reformed to adequately include, value, and credit everyone. Although invisible labor may be disproportionately undertaken by women, many (white) men are highly engaged in invisible labor and provide substantial support to women and faculty of color. Similarly, being a woman does not automatically imply solidarity with other women or engagement in invisible labor. Hence, providing credit for invisible labor acknowledges the work that all engaged faculty are doing. As such, finding ways to generate institutionalized credit for all forms of contributions means that we have faculty who feel seen and valued by the institutions within which they reside.

Allyship thus requires active work to identify bias within institutions and initiate dialogues to reform them—not simply waiting for women to "lean in" or speak up and not only when convenient or socially advantageous (Sandberg 2013). Allies ensure that women are given the opportunities they need to be heard, feel heard, and be credited. Allies lend their platform to raise up women's voices without requiring women to assimilate to (cis, white) male standards (Cunningham, Crandall, and Dare 2017; Orr 2019). Allies do not *allow* women to be present; they *make* space for women—including women of color, queer women, and transwomen. All of these rules apply equally to our institutions. Hence, allyship assigns to each of us the responsibility to change institutional structures to value and credit everyone's contributions. Invisible labor is a good place to start. ∎

REFERENCES

Budd, John W. 2016. "The Eye Sees What the Mind Knows: The Conceptual Foundations of Invisible Work." In *Invisible Labor: Hidden Work in the Contemporary World*, eds. Marion Crain, Winifred Poster, Miriam Cherry, 28–46. Oakland: University of California Press.

Cunningham, Carolyn M., Heather M. Crandall, and Alexa M. Dare (eds.). 2017. *Gender, Communication, and the Leadership Gap*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Flaherty, Colleen. 2019. "Undue Burden." *Inside Higher Ed*, June 4. www.insidehighered.com/news/2019/06/04/whos-doing-heavy-lifting-terms-diversity-and-inclusion-work.

Ginther, Donna. 2004. "Gender Differences in Salary and Promotion in Political Science." *Unpublished manuscript. Paper presented at the APSA Workshop on Women's Advancement in Political Science*, Washington, DC, March 5. https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.595.4036&rep=rep1&type=pdf.

Ginther, Donna K., and Kathy J. Hayes. 2003. "Gender Differences in Salary and Promotion for Faculty in the Humanities 1977–95." *Journal of Human Resources* 38 (1): 34–73.

Grollman, Eric Anthony. 2015. "Invisible Labor." *Inside Higher Ed*, December 15. www.insidehighered.com/advice/2015/12/15/column-about-exploitation-minority-scholars-academe.

Guarino, Cassandra M., and Victor M. H. Borden. 2017. "Faculty Service Loads and Gender: Are Women Taking Care of the Academic Family?" *Research in Higher Education* 58 (6): 672–94.

Hesli, Vicki L., Jae Mook Lee, and Sara McLaughlin Mitchell. 2012. "Predicting Rank Attainment in Political Science: What Else Besides Publications Affects Promotion?" *PS: Political Science & Politics* 45 (3): 475–92.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hochschild, Arlie, and Anne Machung. 2012. *The Second Shift: Working Families and the Revolution at Home*. New York: Penguin Books.

Hurtado, Sylvia, Kevin Eagan, John H. Pryor, Hannah Whang, and Serge Tran. 2012. *Undergraduate Teaching Faculty: The 2010–2011 HERI Faculty Survey*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA. www.heri.ucla.edu/monographs/HERI-FAC2011-Monograph.pdf.

June, Audrey Williams. 2015. "*The Invisible Labor of Minority Professors.*" Chronicle of Higher Education, November 8. www.chronicle.com/article/The-Invisible-Labor-of/234098.

Mathews, A. Lanethea, and Kristi Andersen. 2001. "A Gender Gap in Publishing? Women's Representation in Edited Political Science Books." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 31 (1): 143–47.

Misra, Joya, Jennifer Hickes Lundquist, Elissa Holmes, and Stephanie Agiomavritis. 2011. "The Ivory Ceiling of Service Work." Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors. *January–February*. www.aaup.org/article/ivory-ceiling-service-work#.XqSngi-zo6g.

Monforti, Jessica Lavariega, and Melissa Michelson. 2008. "Diagnosing the Leaky Pipeline: Continuing Barriers to the Retention of Latinas and Latinos in Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 41 (1): 161–66.

Orr, Marissa. 2019. *Lean Out: The Truth about Women, Power, and the Workplace.* New York: Harper Collins.

Perna, Laura W. 2001. "Sex and Race Differences in Faculty Tenure and Promotion." *Research in Higher Education* 42 (5): 541–67.

Pyke, Karen. 2011. "Service and Gender Inequity Among Faculty." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 44 (1): 85–87.

Reid, Rebecca A., and Todd Curry. 2019. "The White Man Template and Academic Bias: 'Legitimate' Pursuits of Knowledge Are Expressions of Power." *Inside Higher Ed*, April 12. www.insidehighered.com/advice/2019/04/12/how-white-male-template-produces-barriers-minority-scholars-throughout-their.

Sandberg, Sheryl. 2013. *Lean In: Women, Work, and the Will to Lead.* New York: Knopf.

Social Sciences Feminist Network Research Interest Group. 2017. "The Burden of Invisible Work in Academia: Social Inequalities and Time Use in Five University Departments." *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations* 39 (39): 228–45.

Teele, Dawn, and Kathleen Thelen. 2017. "Gender in the Journals: Publication Patterns in Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50 (2): 433–47.

Thomas, Peter L. 2017. "Power, Responsibility, and the White Men of Academia." *Huffington Post*, May 30. www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/power-responsibility-and-the-white-men-of-academia_us_592d58bce4bo8861edoccbce.

Turner, Caroline Stoello Viernes. 2002. "Women of Color in Academe: Living with Multiple Marginalities." *Journal of Higher Education* 73 (1): 74–93.

Whitaker, Manya. 2017. "The Unseen Labor of Mentoring." *Chronicle Vitae*, June 12. https://chroniclevitae.com/news/1825-the-unseen-labor-of-mentoring.

Windsor, Leah C., and Kerry F. Crawford. 2020. "Best Practices for Normalizing Parents in the Academy: Higher- and Lower-Order Processes and Women and Parents' Success." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 53 (2): 275–80.

Wingfield, Adia Harvey, and Renee Skeete. 2016. "Maintaining Hierarchies in Predominantly White Organizations: A Theory of Racial Tasks as Invisible Labor." In *Invisible Labor: Hidden Work in the Contemporary World*, eds. Marion Crain, Winifred Poster, and Miriam Cherry, 47–68. Oakland: University of California Press.

SUPPORTING JUNIOR WOMEN: STRATEGIES FOR MEN COLLEAGUES

Emily M. Farris, *Texas Christian University*
Julia Marin Hellwege, *University of South Dakota*
Andrea Malji, *Hawaii Pacific University*

Women are less likely to be tenured and promoted due in part to an inhospitable gendered institutional climate (Hesli, Lee, and Mitchell 2012). Interventions often direct women to undertake tasks to improve their odds at success; we instead suggest ways that men can be better allies to improve junior women's advancement. Based on our experiences, observations, and academic literature, we specifically examine the ways that junior women may be undermined in the profession in research, teaching, and service and make suggestions for men to intervene formally and informally to produce more equitable institutions.

Research

Scholarly productivity is generally the primary measure of promotion, and women can face challenges related to research. Empirical comparisons of academic submissions find that women submit to journals at lower rates and subsequently are published less frequently due to systemic issues, such as journal gatekeeping on gendered research interests (Key and Sumner 2019; Teele and Thelen 2017). Women face additional challenges to their time for research, with increased demands from teaching, service, and unequal distribution of household and childcare duties, which likely have been further exacerbated during the COVID-19 pandemic (Goulden, Mason, and Wolfinger 2013).

Male colleagues can help to overcome these disparities beginning within their own university by taking an active interest in the research of junior female colleagues. Men can organize scholarly opportunities (e.g., brainstorming sessions and manuscript workshops) and assist in the development of junior women's work by providing constructive feedback and encouraging submission. Men should highlight women's research both within and outside of the department. University events should include junior women colleagues, not simply because representation is needed but rather because of their expertise.

Journal editors and conference organizers should make explicit expectations for intersectional diversity during calls for submissions. Male allies should avoid organizing and serving on male-exclusive panels, also known as "manels." They should avoid publishing only with other men and also include junior women in networking opportunities. Men should reflect on the underlying cause of the exclusion and actively work to remedy it by recruiting through resources such as Women Also Know Stuff (Goodman and Pepinsky 2019).

Teaching

In the classroom, sexist barriers challenge junior women in developing their teaching portfolio and practices. For instance, students hold women to different standards and make additional demands on female faculty (El-Alayli, Hansen-Brown, and Ceynar 2018). Students evaluate women, especially women of color, with bias (Flaherty 2019).

To overcome these challenges, we recommend that junior women's needs are addressed first in course development and scheduling. To assist in course development, faculty should share teaching resources—including previous syllabi and course materials—to reduce the burden of new course preparation, particularly for women who spend a greater percentage of their time devoted to teaching (Winslow 2010). Men can lead the department in conducting an audit of course offerings and schedules to ensure gender equity. We suggest scheduling practices that accommodate those with caregiving responsibilities, along with advocating for family-friendly leave policies and childcare facilities at the univer-

Junior women faculty cannot reach parity in achieving tenure simply by leaning in.

that men can be better allies to improve junior women's advancement. Based on our experiences, observations, and academic literature, we specifically examine the ways that junior women may be undermined in the profession in research, teaching, and service and make suggestions for men to intervene formally and informally to produce more equitable institutions.

sity. Departments can be mindful of who offers more labor-intensive classes and responsibilities (e.g., overseeing internships and theses) and find ways to balance and compensate accordingly.

We also suggest that men develop teaching practices that are more inclusive for their women students and colleagues, thereby creating an institutional culture that recognizes and values