Interruptions

We know from empirical research that when women speak, they are more likely than men to be interrupted (Cannon, Robinson, and Smith-Lovin 2019; Jacobi and Schweers 2017). However, research in linguistics provides a more nuanced story, identifying different types of interruptions. Cooperative interruptions are intended to help the speaker by offering agreement, assistance, and/or clarification (Li 2001). When used in combination with the amplification strategy, this type of interruption may be acceptable. Intrusive interruptions, conversely, are disruptive and can take the form of disagreement, floor taking, topic change, and/or tangentialization (Li 2001). Men can establish a rule or a norm of avoiding intrusive interruptions as a clear boundary within a group and then hold other people (i.e., men) accountable by reminding them of this expectation and explicitly calling it out when it occurs. As a variant on the amplification strategy, men can do this by responding directly to intrusive interruptions with language such as "(she/they) was interrupted and I'd like to hear what (she/they) has to say" or "I don't think (she/they) was done, let's hear the rest of what (she/they) has to say."

If men are willing to take accountability for their own pattern of interrupting others, they can put this strategy into action by using a technique from sports. Men can figure out their average rate of (intrusive) interruptions by tallying them at their next meeting and then set a goal to reduce that rate by paying close attention when they are about to speak, evaluating whether what they want to say meets the criteria of an intrusive interruption. If they are on the fence, the answer is usually "yes." Men can self-correct by stopping themselves from speaking in the moment, saying something more cooperative, or using the amplification strategy. To be fair, this may not be natural and some men may even protest in the spirit of Robert Altman, who famously used "overlapping sound and dialogue [...] as a symbol of the messiness of real life" (University of Michigan 2013).

Give Credit Where Credit Is Due

Men can explicitly praise the contributions of women to others outside of a group, with the intention of making their contributions more visible (Hinsley, Sutherland, and Johnston 2017). This credit should be clear and specific. Ambiguity about who is responsible and deserves credit for group effort can exacerbate gender inequality because "women are rated as being less competent, less influential, and less likely to have played a leadership role on the task than men in the same group" (Chang and Milkman 2020). This also may include giving clear credit for publications through an acknowledgments section because norms for the order of author names vary across subfields in our discipline and can create confusion about where credit is due.

In conclusion, men can be powerful advocates for gender equity in the discipline and workplace. A key area for improvement is understanding the context of gender dynamics in group settings and actively adapting their own behavior in response. Why might this be difficult for some men to do in practice? Lack of awareness is one explanation; however, it also must be said that "men who (speak) up with ideas (are) seen as having higher status and were more likely to emerge as leaders" (McClean et al. 2018). These strategies indirectly may threaten or reduce their power and influence, and men must first come to terms with that before they can purport to be an advocate for gender (or racial) equity.

REFERENCES

Adams, Renée B., and Daniel Ferreira. 2009. "Women in the Boardroom and Their Impact on Governance and Performance." *Journal of Financial Economics* 94 (2): 291–309.

American Political Science Association. 2011. *Task Force on Political Science in the 21st Century*. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.

Barnes, Tiffany. 2016. *Gendering Legislative Behavior*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boyd, Christina L., Lee Epstein, and Andrew D. Martin. 2010. "Untangling the Causal Effects of Sex on Judging." *American Journal of Political Science* 54 (2): 389–411.

Cannon, Bryan C., Dawn T. Robinson, and Lynn Smith-Lovin. 2019. "How Do We 'Do Gender'? Permeation as Over-Talking and Talking Over." *Socius* 5: 2378023119849347.

Chang, Edward H., and Katherine L. Milkman. 2020. "Improving Decisions That Affect Gender Equality in the Workplace." *Organizational Dynamics* 49 (1): 100709.

Dionne, Kim Yi. 2019. "There's a Gender Gap in Political Science: Our Series Examines the Problem—and Looks at Some Solutions." *Monkey Cage* [blog], August 19. www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2019/08/19/theres-gender-gap-political-science-our-series-examines-problem-looks-some-solutions.

Eilperin, Juliet. 2016. "White House Women Want to Be in the Room Where It Happens." *Washington Post*, September 13. www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/wp/2016/09/13/white-house-women-are-now-in-the-room-where-it-happens.

Hinsley, Amy, William J. Sutherland, and Alison Johnston. 2017. "Men Ask More Questions Than Women at a Scientific Conference." *PloS One* 12 (10):e0185534.

Jacobi, Tonja, and Dylan Schweers. 2017. "Justice, Interrupted: The Effect of Gender, Ideology, and Seniority at Supreme Court Oral Arguments." *Virginia Law Review* 103 (7): 1379–485.

Karpowitz, Christopher F., and Tali Mendelberg. 2014. *The Silent Sex: Gender, Deliberation, and Institutions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Karpowitz, Christopher F., Tali Mendelberg, and Lee Shaker. 2012. "Gender Inequality in Deliberative Participation." *American Political Science Review* 106 (3): 533–47.

Li, Han Z. 2001. "Cooperative and Intrusive Interruptions in Inter- and Intracultural Dyadic Discourse." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 20 (3): 259–84.

Matthew, Patricia. 2016. "What Is Faculty Diversity Worth to a University?" *The Atlantic*, November 23. www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/11/what-is-faculty-diversity-worth-to-a-university/508334.

Mavisakalyan, Astghik, and Yashar Tarverdi. 2019. "Gender and Climate Change: Do Female Parliamentarians Make a Difference?" *European Journal of Political Economy* 56:151–64.

McClean, Elizabeth J., Sean R. Martin, Kyle J. Emich, and Col. Todd Woodruff. 2018. "The Social Consequences of Voice: An Examination of Voice Type and Gender on Status and Subsequent Leader Emergence." *Academy of Management Journal* 61 (5): 1869–91.

Post, Corinne, and Kris Byron. 2015. "Women on Boards and Firm Financial Performance: A Meta-Analysis." *Academy of Management Journal* 58 (5): 1546–71.

University of Michigan. 2013. "Altman Sound & Music." In *The Many Hats of Robert Altman: A Life in Cinema* [Online Exhibit]. https://apps.lib.umich.edu/online-exhibits/exhibits/show/altman.

Weber, Cynthia. 2015. "ISA's Sapphire Series: Is Blue the New White?" *Duck of Minerva* [blog], February 6. https://duckofminerva.com/2015/02/isas-sapphire-series-is-blue-the-new-white.html.

ARE YOU REALLY ABOUT IT? DEVELOPING A CRITICAL PRAXIS FOR MEN IN THE DISCIPLINE

Guillermo Caballero, *Purdue University*

Practicing gender equity for men means, in part, keeping ourselves accountable. However, for what are we being held accountable?[1] I contend that one approach that men can take to advance gender equity is for us to develop critical frameworks to help us (i.e., men) interpret when women are being marginalized in the political science discipline in everyday social moments.

In my own lived experience, more often than not I have failed to live up to feminist principals of gender equity. For example, I participated in a debate with two colleagues, one a woman and the other a man. Our conversation centered around economic mobility in the Unites States. The woman and I disagreed with the man's claim that "no other place in the world can someone be poor and become rich but in the United States." As the woman countered his claims, he would cut her off in mid-sentence. I sat purposefully quiet because I did not want to talk over her. However, I grew frustrated because I felt that she was not getting to the point, so I interjected—even though she was in the middle of her argument. Soon after, the conversation ended. I apologized to the woman for interrupting her and, although she was surprised, she told me that it was okay. I expressed that it was not okay because I felt it was more important to be in solidarity with her in that moment than talking over her. I pointed out how I have been told by many women that they are constantly being spoken over by men. She agreed. In this case, both men in the room enacted problematic behaviors, an example of how men can behave in ways that create and reproduce gender inequity in political science and academia.

Scholarship on gender disparities shows how sexism exists in academia in a multitude of ways. Thanks to the efforts of Dr. Nadia Brown, the *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* organized a special issue, #MeTooPoliSci, dedicated to survivors of sexual harassment and individuals who support them in the political science discipline (Brown 2019). Along with #MeTooPoliSci, we see that gender inequities exist in other aspects of academia. For example, women are cited less often (Aksens et al. 2011; Davenport and Snyder 1995); between 1980 and 2010, Black women and Latina faculty increased from 4.3% to only 6.1% and from 2.3% to 3%, respectively, whereas white male professors did not decrease less than 71% (Alexander-Floyd 2008; 2015); many graduate syllabi are less likely to include women's scholarship (Smith et al. 2020); men benefit more from coauthorship compared to women (Djupe, Smith, and Sokhey 2019); men are likely to be the gatekeepers of professional networks whereas 75% of whites have only a white network (Cox, Navarro-Rivera, and Jones 2016; Van Den Brink and Benschop 2014); and women are more likely to be negatively evaluated for jobs in academia (Quadlin 2018).

From reading feminist critiques and listening to women, I learned how—in the context of everyday moments—women are marginalized by men vis-à-vis being cut off or silenced, belittled for their comments, degraded, or their ideas stolen. The current scholarship points to inequalities that exist for women in varying positions in the academy. From this, I developed a framework to recognize these inequities in everyday moments. However, even with this framework, I still must keep myself accountable. This article makes the normative argument that one approach for men to advance gender equity within the discipline is to develop a framework with principles that, for example, contextualize systemic oppression and practice accountability.

A framework is a collection of guiding principles that establish a specific way to understand ideas. A framework can give meaning to everyday interactions. For example, being a feminist can have a multitude of definitions based on an individual's principles. Some feminists lack a class analysis or may not recognize the way women's experiences are different based on cross-cutting identities.[2] Within political science, men having a framework for gender equity is extremely important because we (as men) are creating and re-creating gender inequities, whether or not intentionally. If our goal is ending gender inequity, then we (as men) must remove the burden we have placed on women. We need to lift as well, part of which is connecting the interpersonal dimension to larger principles that create a framework, a praxis. To help us create this framework, I turn to the conversations of women of color scholar–activists. I suggest the following four principles to inform this framework: (1) meaning of our actions, (2) viewing women as equals, (3) not competing in "Oppression Olympics," and (4) accountability.

Systems and Meaning

Feminists and women have a long history of writing and speaking about the inequalities they face from patriarchy, white supremacy, capitalism, and imperialism. Their response in many cases has been to create new concepts, frameworks, and theories from their lived experience in order to make sense of the violence that shapes their lives materially and symbolically (Anzaldúa 2002; Combahee River Collective Statement 2014 [1974]; Hull, Bell-Scott, and Smith 2015 [1982]). An implication from this labor is that we (as men) can learn from their writings and their lived experiences. Theorizing from their lived experiences, the Combahee River Collective (2014 [1974]) wrote a pioneering text naming Black feminism because, until that point, they had labeled themselves Third World Women (Taylor 2017). In their statement, they connected their personal everyday experiences to larger systems, including racism, sexism, heterosexism, imperialism, and capitalism, and how these systems were intertwined. They wrote for themselves to fight for themselves.

Having this understanding means that we can connect everyday moments to current systems of oppression. For example, as mentioned previously, women scholars are cited much less frequently compared to men (Aksnes et al. 2011; Davenport and Snyder 1995). The symbolic act of citing not only indicates who is perceived as an expert on a subject but also has material implications for women because citations are a form of social capital that garner advancement in academia. By recognizing how women are being devalued in academia due to patriarchy, we can correct this by asking ourselves: Am I citing enough women in my work? Am I incorporating the ideas of women scholars in my work? Thus, by understanding how everyday moments are connected to larger systems (e.g., sexism, racism, and capitalism), we can purposefully create behaviors that disrupt the devaluing of women scholars in political science.

Coalition Partners

As radical Black lesbian feminists, the Combahee River Collective theorized from their lived experience to build a systemic understanding of oppression and also created terms by which others can join them. They stated explicitly, "We reject pedestals, queenhood, and walking ten paces behind. To be recognized as human, levelly human, is enough." This is important because they communicated how others must interact with them (Combahee River Collective Statement 2014 [1974]). "Levelly human" implies that, on all accounts, individuals like the Combahee radical Black lesbians deserve to be coalition partners on the sole basis of their humanity. Those who do not occupy the same social location need to operate alongside them as equals.

Therefore, being in coalition with women in political science means that we work alongside them and look out for their best interests. For example, as discussed previously, men are likely to be the gatekeepers for other men whereas, at the same time, 75% of white Americans are likely to have only a white network. This means that if we (i.e., men) view women as coalition partners, we (i.e., men) work in ways that give women in the discipline opportunities—whether conference participation, grants, resources, or publishing. We need to purposefully think about the spaces we occupy and ask ourselves: Are there any women here? Is this a possible opportunity from which a woman peer can benefit? If women are coalition partners, then we should think of ways to include them.

Oppression Olympics

"Oppression Olympics" is a term I use to describe the way that individuals try to compete with one another about who is the most oppressed (Martínez 1993). It is important that as men, especially men of color, we make sure that we are not trying to show how we are more oppressed, instead recognizing that we face different forms of oppression because our social locations are situated differently. We are still responsible for our own behavior while keeping in mind that larger systems of oppression are part of the problem in creating gender inequities. For example, we may be at a conference and a senior woman scholar states something that devalues us or our work. Although this may not be fair, it is important to center the harm done and not react in sexist ways.

Accountability

In an effort to advance gender equity, men have a fundamental role in holding ourselves and one another accountable. This often means humbling ourselves by apologizing for actions that oppose the advancement of gender equity. At times, based on the situation, it means stepping in and ensuring that other men understand, for example, why it is not acceptable to keep talking over women. Accountability is critical. I began this article with a narrative from my own experience to illustrate that sometimes we do not live up to our own promises. However, this does not mean that we continue problematic behavior. Instead, we work toward changing our problematic behavior and work to change the hostile work environments at conferences, departments, and journals.

Conclusion

It is our responsibility to ensure that the next generation of scholars has a more equitable political science discipline than how we entered. For men to advance gender equity in political science, I argue that we need to have a framework grounded in the following principles: (1) systemic understanding, (2) viewing women as equals, (3) not competing in Oppression Olympics, and (4) accountability. Although I believe that more work needs to be done (i.e., policy and structural change), I contend that this groundwork is one interpersonal approach on which to build. A more equitable political science discipline is possible, but we have to work for it.

Acknowledgments

conceptual frameworks that establish how we discuss these topics. This conversation happened because our writing group was trying to point to literature that explains what a framework is. ∎

REFERENCES

Aksnes, Dag W., Kristoffer Rorstad, Fredrik Piro, and Gunnar Sivertsen. 2011. "Are Female Researchers Less Cited? A Large-Scale Study of Norwegian Scientists. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 62 (4): 628–36.

Alexander-Floyd, Nicole. 2008. "Written, Published…Cross-Indexed, and Footnoted." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 41 (4): 819–29.

Alexander-Floyd, Nicole. 2015. "Women of Color, Space Invaders, and Political Science: Practical Strategies for Transforming Institutional Practices." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 48 (3): 464–68.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. 2002. "Speaking in Tongues: A Letter to 3rd World Women Writers." In *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings By Radical Women of Color*, ed. Cherrie Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa, 165–73. New York: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.

Brown, Nadia. 2019. "Me Too Political Science: An Introduction." *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* 40 (1): 1–6.

Combahee River Collective Statement. 2014 [1974]. "A Black Feminist Statement." *Women's Studies Quarterly* 41 (3/4): 271–80.

Cox, Daniel, Juhem Navarro-Rivera, and Robert P. Jones. 2016. "Race, Religion, and Political Affiliation of Americans' Core Social Networks." Washington, DC: Public Religion Research Institute. www.prri.org/research/poll-race-religion-politics-americans-social-networks.

Davenport, Elisabeth, and Herbert Snyder. 1995. "Women Cite? An Exploration of Gender and Scholarly Citation in Sociology." *Journal of Documentation* 51 (4): 404–10.

Djupe, Paul, Amy E. Smith, and Anand E. Sokhey. 2019. "Explaining Gender in the Journals: How Submission Practices Affect Publication Patterns in Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 52 (1): 71–77.

Hull, Gloria T., Patricia Bell-Scott, and Barbara Smith (eds.). 2015 [1982]. *All the Women Are White, All the Blacks Are Men, But Some of Us Are Brave: Black Women's Studies*, 2nd edition. New York: The Feminist Press.

Martínez, Elizabeth. 1993. "Beyond Black/White: The Racisms of Our Time." *Social Justice* 20 (1/2): 22–34.

Quadlin, Natasha. 2018. "The Mark of a Woman's Record: Gender and Academic Performance in Hiring." *American Sociological Review* 83 (2): 331–60.

Smith, Amy E., Heidi Hardt, Phillippe Meister, and Hannah J. Kim. 2020. "Gender, Race, Age, and National Origin Predict Whether Faculty Assign Female-Authored Readings in Graduate Syllabi." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51 (1):100–106.

Taylor, Keeanga-Yamahtta. 2017. *How We Get Free: Black Feminist and the Combahee River Collective*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.

Van Den Brink, Marieke, and Yvonne Benschop. 2014. "Gender in Academic Networking: The Role of Gatekeepers in Professorial Recruitment." *Journal of Management Studies* 51 (3): 460–92.

TOWARD BETTER HIRING PRACTICES

Elizabeth Carlson, *North Dakota State University*
Christopher Zorn, *Pennsylvania State University*

Introduction

Observers of gender dynamics in the academy have long characterized academic careers as a "leaky pipeline," which refers to the tendency for women to occupy a steadily decreasing proportion of academic positions as the rank and status of those positions increase. Among the many loci of such leaks, implicit and explicit biases against women have been shown to affect the hiring process across the entire range of STEM fields (Moss-Racusin et al. 2012; Storage et al. 2020), including political science.

This article describes the impacts of several hiring practices that offer the potential for reducing gender-related biases in that process. Our description takes the form of a case study, focusing a faculty search at a Carnegie "Doctoral—Very High Research