underrepresented colleagues to do the work. Tina Zappile calls for men to "stand up" for women in groups. There are many formal and informal groups in academic life, and she discusses how men can ensure that women are not excluded from the benefits of these groups. Based on Black and Latina feminist literature as well as his

*This spotlight directly addresses men in the discipline about their role in promoting gender equity.*

personal experience, Guillermo Caballero presents a framework for men to understand their actions and change problematic behavior. Elizabeth Carlson and Christopher Zorn share their experience in developing search-committee processes aimed at mitigating implicit bias in letters of recommendation for new faculty hires. As they explain, this has increased the number of women candidates interviewed and hired. Finally, Patricia A. Stapleton and Melissa R. Michelson offer insights gained from the #MeTooPoliSci collective and APSA's survey of women in the profession. In addition to corroborating the disproportionate service burden and negative bias in student evaluations of teaching, they offer practical methods for men to ally with their women colleagues.

We also recognize the diverse scholars that reviewed the spotlight articles: Lisa Argyle, Victor Asal, Marijke Breuning, Paul Collins, Kerry Crawford, Emily Farris, Julia Marin Hellwege, Mirya Holman, Matt Lebo, Melissa Michelson, Sarah McLaughlin Mitchell, Rebecca Reid, David Siegel, Cameron Thies, John Tuman, Lee Walker, Tarah Williams, Anne M. Whitesell, Leah Windsor, and Kim Yi Dionne. This entire spotlight is a collective effort of the writers, editors, and reviewers, and it is intended to capture the diversity of our discipline and to engage mid- and early-career men in allyship. ∎

## NOTE

1. We are sensitive to the potential downside of using the "allyship" label to describe men's work in promoting gender equity. For a helpful review of these issues, see Carlson et al. (2020). However, given the centrality of the term in the 2018 Hackathon's discourse and the need to utilize commonly understood language for this concept, we opt to use the term.

## REFERENCES

Anicha, Cali L., Canan Bilen-Green, and Roger Green. 2020. "A Policy Paradox: Why Gender Equity Is Men's Work." *Journal of Gender Studies* 29 (7): 847–51.

Argyle, Lisa P., and Tali Mendelberg. 2020. "Improving Women's Advancement in Political Science: What We Know About What Works." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 53 (4): 718–22.

Bodkin, Candice Pippin, and Casey J. Fleming. 2019. "Supporting Women Scholars' Paths to Academia: An Examination of Family-Friendly Policies of Public Affairs Doctoral Programs." *Journal of Public Affairs Education*:1–25. https:// doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2019.1694385

Carlson, Juliana, Cliff Leek, Erin Casey, Rich Tolman, and Christopher Allen. 2020. "What's in a Name? A Synthesis of 'Allyship' Elements from Academic and Activist Literature." *Journal of Family Violence* 35 (8): 889–98.

Goodman, Sara Wallace, and Thomas B. Pepinsky. 2019. "Gender Representation and Strategies for Panel Diversity: Lessons from the APSA Annual Meeting." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 52 (4): 669–76.

Htun, Mala. 2019. "Promoting Diversity and Inclusion through Engagement: The APSA 2018 Hackathon." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 52 (4): 677–83.

Kittilson, Miki Caul. 2015. "Advancing Women in Political Science: Navigating Gendered Structures of Opportunity." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 48 (3): 450–53.

Myers, Kyle R., Wei Yang Tham, Yian Yin, Nina Cohodes, Jerry G. Thursby, Marie C. Thursby, Peter Schiffer, Joseph T. Walsh, Karim R. Lakhani, and Dashun Wang. 2020. "Unequal Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Scientists." *Nature Human Behaviour* 4 (9): 880–83.

O'Brien, Diana Z. 2020. "Navigating Political Science as a Woman." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 53 (2): 315–17.

Palmer, Barbara, Laura van Assendelft, and Mary Stegmaier. 2020. "Revisiting the Presence of Women in Political Science Journal Editorial Positions." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 53 (3): 499–504.

Perry, Kate, and Tobias T. Gibson. 2020. "Not All Mentors." *Inside Higher Ed*, July 31. www.insidehighered.com/advice/2020/07/31/advice-successful-male-mentorships-women-academe-opinion.

Prime, Jeanine, and Corinne A. Moss-Racusin. 2009. *Engaging Men in Gender Initiatives: What Change Agents Need to Know*. New York: Catalyst Press.

Washington, Jamie, and Nancy J. Evans. 1991. "Becoming an Ally." In *Beyond Tolerance: Gays, Lesbians and Bisexuals on Campus*, ed. Nancy J. Evans and Vernon A. Wall, 195–204. Alexandria, VA: American Association for Counseling and Development.

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.

Yildirim, T. Murat, and Hande Eslen-Ziya. 2020. "The Differential Impact of COVID-19 on the Work Conditions of Women and Men Academics During the Lockdown." *Gender, Work & Organization* advance online publication.

## MENTORSHIP: "MEN IN THE MIDDLE" AND THEIR ROLE AS ALLIES IN ADDRESSING GENDER BIAS

**Leah C. Windsor,** *The University of Memphis*
**Cameron G. Thies,** *Arizona State University*

The issue of mentorship for women in political science has gained traction and prominence in recent years. Conceptualized initially as a "leaky pipeline" (Blickenstaff 2005), Crawford and Windsor (2021) suggest that a "chutes and ladders game" is a better metaphor for the twists and turns of academic careers given endogenous bias and exogenous life events. The pioneering leadership of female scholars in the Women's Caucus for Political Science and the Women's Caucus in International Studies, for example, have provided professional support that has helped women to navigate male-dominated academic spaces (Akos and Kretchmar 2016; Claypool et al. 2017; Crawford and Windsor 2019; Hesli, Lee, and Mitchell 2012; Mitchell and Martin 2018; Mitchell, Lange, and Brus 2013). Programs including Visions in Methodology, Journeys in World Politics, and Pay It Forward have continued these efforts, providing best practices for tangible skills such as bargaining and negotiations (Mitchell and Hesli 2013), navigating the job market (Kim and Grofman 2019), achieving balance amid the competing demands of work and family formation (Kim, Fitzsimons, and Kay 2018), and maximizing their research productivity (Hancock, Baum, and Breuning 2013). Led by women for women, these groups have been a necessary first step for validating the legitimate concerns of women in our profession.

Women initially embraced the message of "lean in" promoted by Sandberg (2013) as a call to support one another, but the movement quickly lost favor given its reliance on classism and

sexism (Kim, Fitzsimons, and Kay 2018). Women can lean in when they have ample support systems, social safety nets, financial security, and often stay-at-home spouses (or surrogates in the form of nannies, personal assistants, or other support staff ). Leaning in also places the burden of responsibility on women, reflected in the collective silence of male colleagues toward this policy.

Even worse, leaning in can backfire and foster an antagonistic workplace, such as women suffering professional penalties for bargaining and negotiating (Mitchell and Hesli 2013; Tinsley et al. 2009). Men receive no formal training about how to be deliberate allies and advocates for their female colleagues. They are excluded from the conversation about actively working to achieve gender parity in academia. Most conference panels on gender and bias in academia speak to a predominantly female audience. The lack of male participation in promoting gender parity may be self-censorship in some cases: they may not see a logical and responsible entry point into the conversation.

We offer several propositions about why this may be the case: (1) men do not see how it explicitly applies to them; (2) men feel that they have nothing substantively to contribute to the conversation; and (3) "woke" men may have concerns about the perception of "mansplaining" in a space geared toward women's advancement. In the first case, men may have come to understand

2009), increasing gender balance in syllabi (Sumner 2018), refusing to participate in "manels,"and setting the standard that women speak first in seminars (Carter et al. 2018). Conferences such as PolMeth began encouraging chairs and discussants to make a statement before the question-and-answer portion of conference presentations—citing Carter et al. (2018)—that they commit to calling on women+ in the audience first. All panels and roundtables at conferences can and should adopt this policy as a necessary step toward transforming academic culture.

In our institutions of higher education, more women+ should be hired and not penalized for family formation. Do not tell women+ when to start a family. Do not sexually harass women+ colleagues. Senior colleagues can model ideal behavior, call out other male peers for inappropriate and biased behavior, and be the standard bearers for junior colleagues. When men take parental leave, it should be for active parenting and not used for bonus research time (Antecol, Bedard, and Stearns 2018). Many men in our discipline have had long histories of mentoring women to success in obtaining a PhD, landing a tenure-track job, and achieving tenure and promotion. Their knowledge can be a useful bridge between the many caucuses and programs designed by women for women and the growing group of men who want to help the cause but may not know how. We need systemic initia-

> *We offer several propositions about why this may be the case: (1) men do not see how it explicitly applies to them; (2) men feel that they have nothing substantively to contribute to the conversation; and (3) "woke" men may have concerns about the perception of "mansplaining" in a space geared toward women's advancement.*

that experiences in academia are gendered; however, given that women began the movement to manage their differential experience, they should be left to pursue it. Relatedly, in the second case, because women created the various caucuses and programs for mentoring other women, many men may feel that their advice is not needed. In the third case, men who are concerned about women in academia may feel that their advice is not wanted. The responsibility for creating a culture change regarding gender bias in academia should not be the exclusive purview of women; neither should it fall on men to individually change their behavior. There are proven institutional strategies for reducing biases and changes at the systemic level that can be implemented from the top down from the provost offices through colleges and academic units. There also are classroom and interpersonal strategies that men and women can adopt, many of which were outlined in the American Political Science Association (2018) Hackathon.

To summarize, male colleagues need to "lean in" to their roles in addressing biases in academia. At the institutional and systemic levels, we argue that mentorship tracks—for example, at conferences—should include mentorship training and best practices for male colleagues. At a roundtable discussion at the 2019 International Studies Association Midwest Annual Conference, senior male scholars debated best practices in mentoring women+ graduate students. We need more of these open discussions to compare, assess, and promote strategies that will benefit women+ in the profession. Other strategies include learning to write gender-unbiased letters of recommendation (Madera, Hebl, and Martin

tives developed through professional associations and institutions of higher education that will commit resources to increasing the number of male allies and their capacity to effectively advocate for women+ colleagues and students in our discipline.

As this experience suggests, at the individual level, we now can identify a subset of male allies who are positioned to make measureable strides in promoting gender equity in the workplace. The "men in the middle"—that is, the younger generation of scholars with tenure and job security—are the fulcrum between the historical status quo and a more equitable future workplace. The reality is that pre-tenure faculty—both men and women—are often hesitant to take a strong stance for fear of retaliation during their probationary period and reviews for promotion. Men in the middle can make a significant difference as mentors to younger faculty and students, as search committee and tenure and promotion committee members, and as potential future administrators in creating a culture change. ∎

**REFERENCES**

Akos, Patrick, and Jennifer Kretchmar. 2016. "Gender and Ethnic Bias in Letters of Recommendation: Considerations for School Counselors." *Professional School Counseling* 20 (1): 1096–2409.

American Political Science Association. 2018. "Strategies for How Men Can Advance Women's Equality in Political Science." Boston: 2018 APSA Annual Meeting.

Antecol, Heather, Kelly Bedard, and Jenna Stearns. 2018. "Equal but Inequitable: Who Benefits from Gender-Neutral Tenure Clock Stopping Policies?" *American Economic Review* 108 (9): 2420–41.

Blickenstaff, J. Clark. 2005. "Women and Science Careers: Leaky Pipeline or Gender Filter?" *Gender and Education* 17 (4): 369–86.

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