

---

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 adviser–advisee collaborations) and to mentoring about the place of coauthored work.

Third, we might make an effort 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. However, there also are 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 diversify the section on several different fronts.

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

---

#### NOTES

1. The evidence indicates that this has not changed greatly in the intervening 17 years. As part of the invitation to write this piece, Gisela Sin and Laurel Harbridge-Yong shared some statistics, including that about 25% of the attendees at the 2018 business meeting were women, which is largely in line with their percentage in the section overall (i.e., 22%). This ties LSS with the Presidents and Executive Politics section (i.e., also 22%) and slightly ahead of Political Methodology (i.e., the lowest percentage of women in all of APSA's sections: 21%).
2. I do not see these stylistic differences as determined by gender; simply that they seem to be unevenly distributed among men and women.

---

#### REFERENCE

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

#### NAVIGATING POLITICAL SCIENCE AS A WOMAN

Diana Z. O'Brien, *Rice University*

DOI: 10.1017/S1049096519002154

How do you succeed in academia? Since taking a faculty position, I have thought a lot about this question. Since earning tenure, I have 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 collected advice based on both research and insights from successful women academics. This article summarizes 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—is on my website (<https://sites.google.com/view/dianazobrien/women-in-the-academy?authuser=0>).

#### 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. However, it often is tempting to focus that critical eye too much on ourselves.

Academia can be isolating, and there is a great deal of readily available advice on building friendships and finding support structures in your personal life to aid with loneliness. However, it also is important to build a support structure within the discipline. Strong networks contribute to professional success. They lead to invitations to give talks, contribute to special issues, and other related opportunities. Perhaps more important, having friends in the discipline makes this job much more fun.

Networks matter and do not 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 networks. You also should try to meet one new person at every conference. Reach out to scholars (both men and women) whom you admire for their particular strengths and request a meeting in which you can ask specific questions. Senior colleagues often are happy to meet with you, but be sure to respect their time. Keep the first meeting brief and have a clear agenda. Furthermore, whereas more experienced scholars are important for your professional advancement, remember that in difficult 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 in all career stages, and you should seek advocates both within and outside of your department. You do not have to rely on a single mentor; instead, have several who help you with different parts of the job.

Just as it is important to seek out mentorship in all career stages, it also is important to provide support to others. You are never too young to be a mentor and, in 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, advocate 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 intrinsic joy. My job—and my life—have been enriched by my female friends in political science.

#### Research

A key reason to build a support structure is to position yourself to have the skills, resources, and confidence necessary to publish research that makes you proud. If possible, give yourself 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 (Djupe, Smith, and Sokhey 2019; Koenig et al. 2018). Of course, there are other venues for important and ambitious work, but the gender gap in submissions suggests 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.

The gender and politics literature finds that even highly qualified women are sometimes less confident in their abilities than men (Lawless and Fox 2005; Shames et al. 2020), and I believe that this holds among political scientists as well. I do not think that this is irrational because 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 minor projects to the *American Political Science Review*. However, 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 important, you must become self-assured enough to ask for comments on your work at many points along the way. Share early drafts and obtain feedback from many people (including, and especially, peers). You do not need to take all of the advice given; however, all of the articles that I have published in highly competitive journals have been vetted by smart and sympathetic colleagues.

Once you have circulated a draft, submit it for publication. When it is rejected—which is almost inevitable—revise based on reviewer comments and resubmit as soon as possible. Finally, when you have a reasonable paper draft, watch for awards for which you are a plausible candidate (e.g., best paper or best dissertation) and make sure you are nominated. Not only is there a chance that you will win but simply being nominated also provides 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; Teele 2020), and female academics do more second-shift domestic labor than their male counterparts (Mason, Wolfinger, and Goulden 2014; Teele 2020). On any given day, it is easy to focus your time and energy on more pressing demands—such as 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 the next day that lets you pay yourself.

that means. Describe your area of expertise to your students. Regarding evaluations, remember that bias exists. It is important that you 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 because 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. However, it is important to make sure that your service work also works for you.

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

To gauge whether your teaching and service load is reasonable, consider a male “benchmark.” 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 are unsure whether 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 are 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, sometimes give unhelpful and contradictory suggestions. Use the strategies that work for you and feel no shame about disregarding the rest. ■

*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.*

### 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; Holman, Key, and Kreitzer 2019; MacNell, Driscoll, and Hunt 2015). Remember, especially when you first start teaching, that you are an expert and introduce yourself as such. Explain that you are a PhD (or in a PhD program) and what

### REFERENCES

- Boring, Anne. 2017. “Gender Biases in Student Evaluations of Teaching.” *Journal of Public Economics* 145: 27–41.
- Djupe, Paul A., Amy Erica Smith, and Anand Edward Sokhey. 2019. “Explaining Gender in the Journals: How Submission Practices Affect Publication Patterns in Political Science.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 52 (1): 71–77.
- 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* 79 (3–4): 1–15.
- 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.
- Holman, Mirya, Ellen Key, and Rebecca Kreitzer. 2019. “Evidence of Bias in Standard Evaluations of Teaching.” Available at [www.rebeccakreitzer.com/bias](http://www.rebeccakreitzer.com/bias).
- 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): 478–84.

- Lawless, Jennifer L., and Richard L. Fox. 2005. *It Takes a Candidate: Why Women Don't Run for Office*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 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, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Shames, Shauna, Rachel Bernhard, Mirya R. Holman, and Dawn Teele. 2020. *Good Reasons to Run*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Teele, Dawn. 2020. "What's Wrong with Replicating the Old Boy's Network?" In *The Production of Knowledge: Enhancing Progress in Social Science*, ed. Colin Elman, John Gerring, and James Mahoney. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Winslow, Sarah. 2010. "Gender Inequality and Time Allocations Among Academic Faculty." *Gender & Society* 24 (6): 769–93.

## WALKING IN LARGE FOOTPRINTS AND FORGING NEW PATHS

Wendy Schiller, *Brown University*

DOI: 10.1017/S1049096519002166

I entered graduate school in political science at the University of Rochester in 1989 after several years working in the US 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 asked if I would be interested. As my best friend Fiona McGillivray remarked that day, "Well, that's a career maker." And she was right.

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. 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 already had produced several 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* (Swain 1993). 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 on bill sponsorship in the Senate in the *American Journal of Political Science* (Schiller 1995), 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. However, 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 type 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 and resubmitting them. Years later, I realize that for most people reading a CV—especially university administrators—a longer list of published articles always ranks higher than a shorter list of articles in more prestigious journals. This is a key lesson for younger colleagues, both female and male.

I also found that coauthorship networks tended to be male dominated, but that very well could 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 also were evident in the "circuit" of presenting papers in departmental seminars, which was a key way of having 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; when there is an opportunity in their own department to run a seminar series, they should be sure to reciprocate. Parallel to this would be trying to secure invitations to smaller conferences that increasingly are becoming important incubators for published work. There were fewer of these types of conferences 20 years ago, but now they frequently produce opportunities to vet articles and book ideas.

Women scholars in legislative studies also should 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 important only for securing the resources to conduct research; they also are 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 (of 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 US Senators. He and I had separately been pursuing parallel tracks on the question of indirect Senate elections, and it seemed to be a good opportunity to work together. Some observers would argue that it 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. However, 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 coauthorship partnerships, doing so to pursue major grants and publications can further a 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 (1989), Barbara Sinclair published *The Transformation of the US 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 seven to 10 more years before Sarah Binder and Steve Smith published *Politics or Principle? Filibustering in the United States Senate* (1996); Frances Lee and Bruce Oppenheimer published *Sizing up the Senate: The Unequal Consequences of Equal Representation* (1999); and I published *Partners and Rivals: Representation in US Senate Delegations* (2000). It would be another 10 years after that when we could argue that the Senate would reach almost parity with the House as the subject of exploration in the legislative studies subfield. This was demonstrated by an increase in peer-reviewed journal articles and books, including *Party Polarization in Congress* by