

The Profession

Improving the Status of Women in Political Science: A Report with Recommendations

Committee on the Status of Women, American Political Science Association

Editor's Note: The report from the Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession (CSWP) is the result of deliberations by committee members over the last three years. The initial complete draft of the report was prepared by Pamela Conover, University of North Carolina, CSWP chair, 1988-89. The final report was prepared by Marian L. Palley, University of Delaware, current CSWP chair.

Contributors to the committee's report were: Louise K. Comfort, University of Pittsburgh; Mona Harrington, Vassar College; Jane S. Jaquette, Occidental College; Mary F. Katzenstein, Cornell University; Sue Tolleson-Rinehart, Texas Tech University; and Dorothy M. Stetson, Florida Atlantic University. Contributions were also made by these presidents of the Women's Caucus (past and current): Barbara J. Nelson, University of Minnesota; Karen J. O'Connor, Emory University; and Margaret M. Conway, University of Florida.

Introduction

Since its inception the APSA Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession has identified strategies for achieving equity between men and women in the political science profession. In this report, the committee considers the problems associated with training, recruiting, nurturing, and retaining women as academic political scientists. Many of the problems that will be discussed are not problems for women scholars alone. Some are problems that also disadvantage male faculty. And, all are problems whose solutions depend

upon men and women faculty alike working together. (See Debra E. Blum, "Environment Still Hostile to Women in Academe, New Evidence Suggests," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 9, 1991.)

In recent years, the task of eliminating gender inequities has been complicated by the changing nature of political science itself. A sizable body of theoretical and empirical

. . . a commitment to eliminate gender inequities may require departments to define positions in flexible, nontraditional ways.

research on women and politics has emerged over the past two decades. The boundaries between women and politics research and other disciplines increasingly have become blurred so that cross-disciplinary research has become more common.

The cross-disciplinary flavor of much of women and politics research combined with the relative youth of the subfield sometimes makes it difficult to assess the quality of this research. This, in turn, can complicate and sometimes bias phases of some women's academic careers (e.g., training, hiring, tenure and promotion decisions). Other heavily cross-disciplinary subfields face similar problems.

Not all women political scientists are involved with women and politics research. Many women scholars iden-

tify with the more traditional subfields of the discipline. Sometimes, however, the concerns of these "mainline scholars" lead them to ask questions that focus on issues of gender and class.

Nor is it suggested that only women do women and politics research. The men who do women and politics research may also encounter some bias.

The inequities that women political scientists encounter are not all attributable to the subject matter they study. Women who do not study women and politics still suffer inequities. The interest that some women political scientists have in the women and politics subfield, however, may contribute to the inequities they encounter in their careers.

Departments must recognize that improving the status of women requires accepting both the differing points of view that women bring to political science and the corresponding ways in which these points of view are altering the face of the discipline. With this in mind, consider these various areas in which women political scientists, and especially women of color, are often disadvantaged.

Recruitment of Female Faculty

During the recruitment process, a commitment to eliminate gender inequities may require departments to define positions in flexible, nontraditional ways. Defining positions in terms of traditional categories may inhibit recruiting the best people, particularly when they are women,

and consequently perpetuate existing patterns of discrimination.

The successful recruitment of female faculty is likely to be enhanced by (1) an aggressive attempt to locate appropriate women candidates; (2) recruitment committees that understand that some women pursue research on gender and politics; and (3) recruitment visits that reveal an hospitable university and departmental climate for women faculty and students.

Locating Women Candidates

Too often a department may carefully seek out women candidates for entry level positions and neglect looking for qualified women candidates for senior level positions, endowed chairs, and department chairs. Recruitment committees should present specific requests to members of their own departments, leading scholars in the field, and the chairs of Ph.D. departments that they aid in identifying qualified women candidates at all levels. In addition, for a small fee, both the APSA and the Women's Caucus will provide mailing labels for subgroups of women political scientists who may be interested in the position or who would know of qualified female candidates.

Recruitment advertisements can be placed in the APSA *Personnel Service Newsletter*, the Women's Caucus Newsletter, and relevant organized section newsletters. Institutional memberships are available in the Women's Caucus which provide several free advertisements in the Caucus newsletter.

Careful attention should also be paid to the language employed in recruitment advertisements. Though many women political scientists have research interests similar to those of their male colleagues, the research of some women political scientists does not fit easily into the traditional sub-field categories that are employed in job advertisements. It may be useful to frame job advertisements in such a way that they do not rule out gender related research and teaching. For example, departments might include in their advertisements a phrase such as the following: "applicants whose scholarship and teaching

include the study of gender politics are welcome."

Finally, the APSA Committee on the Status of Women does not function as a clearinghouse for alerting qualified women of available positions. Notifying the Committee on the Status of Women should not be used as a means of satisfying affirmative action requirements.

Forming a Short List

Recruitment committees must avoid the "insincere recruitment" of women: that is, inviting a woman candidate to interview who the department knows beforehand is not a serious candidate for the job. This is done so that the department can say that it interviewed the best available woman. While insincere recruit-

Recruitment committees must avoid the "insincere recruitment" of women.

ment occurs for all levels of positions, increasingly we have received complaints about it with regard to senior level recruitment.

Recruitment committees can give fair consideration to women candidates by including at least one faculty member who is committed to improving the status of women in the profession and who recognizes the legitimacy of women and politics research. This faculty member need not be female. Some women faculty may be insensitive to the impact of gender bias or hostile towards women and politics research. The interests of women candidates can be represented by male faculty committed to eliminating sex inequities and who value women and politics research.

Members of recruitment committees should be made aware of the subtle ways in which gender bias may influence the examination of vitae. Information that the candidate provides about family members (e.g., spouses and children) should be treated carefully for all candidates, male and female. The existence of a spouse should not influence a candidate's viability. After interviewing a candidate for a position, the depart-

ment chair at a major research institution told a woman faculty member: "We did not consider her seriously because her husband needed a job in New York or Washington. Even if she came here, she would always be on the market trying to get closer to him."

Similarly, care should be taken in interpreting career breaks, particularly in the case of women candidates who may have interruptions due to child-rearing and family responsibilities. Consider the following situation. In a large department, a junior faculty member adopted a young infant. The university had a pregnancy leave policy (basically a disability policy) but no policy covering adoption. Neither the chair nor any of the senior faculty in the department suggested that she take a leave or that any special arrangement be made for her courses. On her part, as a junior member soon to be considered for tenure, she hesitated to ask for special consideration. The previous semester, however, one of her male colleagues had been through a difficult divorce, and then broke his arm. The chair, in a collegial move, arranged for him to continue on the payroll and to make up classes in a subsequent semester.

Finally, committee members should not penalize women candidates for their feminist professional activities. Participating in national or regional women's political caucuses is an important avenue for the socialization and mentoring of women political scientists.

Letters of recommendation are also subject to gender bias on the part of the author and the reader. Authors may focus on a woman candidate's qualities as a colleague while neglecting to mention her research. Similarly, readers may give undue weight—either in a positive or negative direction—to information about the extent to which the candidate fulfills traditional feminine stereotypes.

Members of recruitment committees should not make assumptions about the substantive interests of women candidates, e.g., that all women candidates have a pedagogic or intellectual interest in the women and politics area. And, in fact, women candidates may be irritated by such an assumption, much as

Chinese candidates might be irritated if it were expected that they could teach Chinese politics. Nonetheless, in the case of women candidates who have an interest in women and politics research, recruitment committees need to recognize how those interests may affect comparisons with male candidates.

First, a concern with women and politics may contribute to a substantial divergence between the teaching and research interests of women candidates, a divergence that is less typical of male candidates. For example, a woman candidate may have a strong interest in teaching a women and politics course though in her research she focuses on voting behavior. Or, in her research, a woman candidate might focus exclusively on feminist theory, and yet still be capable and willing to teach standard American Government courses.

Second, a concern with women and politics may lead some women candidates to pursue research agendas that diverge from traditional fields of political science research, both in their substantive focus and their epistemological grounding. The topics of interest may be cross-disciplinary, or sensitive to alternative ways of knowing. To appreciate the value of such research, recruitment committees must recognize that the study of women and politics lies at the intersection of political science and women's studies. Consequently, the topics of interest are often necessarily cross-disciplinary (e.g., the operation of power and privilege in disguised forms or a focus on non-privileged groups).

It is critical to recognize the ways in which women candidates, particularly those interested in women and politics, may differ from male candidates. Failure to accept these differences as legitimate may lead committees to reject qualified women candidates for positions defined in traditional terms. This constitutes a form of discrimination.

The Recruitment Visit

The likelihood of a successful recruitment visit can be increased by the information provided to women candidates, the ways in which faculty and graduate students treat women

candidates, and the resources available for the recruitment.

Neither women nor men candidates should be grilled about their families, their significant other's job prospects, or their plans to have children. Departments do not need such information to make their decisions. However, all candidates need information that will allow them to make informed decisions should an offer be extended. In particular, all job candidates should receive information about maternity/parental leave policies, sexual harassment policies, job referral programs for significant others, and child care both within the university and the larger community. It would be useful to compile such information in a handout that is

Members of recruitment committees should not make assumptions about the substantive interests of women candidates. . . .

routinely given to all candidates.

Most women candidates will be interested in assessing the extent to which the university, and the political science department in particular, present an hospitable versus a "chilly climate" for women. During the recruitment visit women candidates should have ample opportunity to meet privately with other women both within and outside the department, and with women graduate students. It is important to enable women candidates to interact with other women in the university as a matter of course. In addition, departmental members should treat women candidates as potential colleagues (rather than female visitors), inquire about their research and teaching interests (rather than what they like to cook), and routinely explain to them how the department works.

Women candidates who express interest in women and politics research should be informed about Women's Studies programs, and formal and informal networks for interacting with other feminist scholars on campus. The candidate also might be

asked if she would like to meet during her visit with the director of the Women's Studies Program. If there is no Women's Studies Program, the candidate might meet with other leading women scholars on campus.

Finally, as in recruiting male candidates, the successful recruitment of women may ultimately hinge on the resources of the department. A senior woman accepted a position at a major western university. When she requested that her moving expenses be covered she was told, "Your husband can get his moving expenses paid. We don't have to cover your expenses." Beyond competitive salaries, departments may increase their probability of recruiting women by offering to pay the expenses associated with second visits and moving, and by helping to smooth the transition for other family members through job referral services. When women candidates decline job offers, departments should conduct a follow-up interview to determine what factors contributed to the candidate's decision.

Progress Through the Ranks

The progress of women faculty depends on two main factors: the department's attitude towards non-tenure-track appointments, and tenure and promotion procedures.

Nontenure-Track Appointments

A serious threat to the progress of women through the ranks, and more generally to the health of the discipline, is the creation of a two-class faculty structure in which tenure-track positions are supplanted by full-time, nontenure-track or part-time positions. This is obviously a problem that affects both men and women, but women are disproportionately affected. Often, departments are able to take advantage of available female scholars who are presumed to lack mobility. In political science, for example, women hold 12% of full-time, tenure-track appointments and over 22% of positions off the tenure-track.

This is a deliberate effort conceived by experts in higher education to save money on faculty. We encourage political science faculty to

fight this movement, not only for its devastating effect on the profession, but also for its implicit sex discrimination. Moreover, we urge political science departments to arrange for faculty occupying part-time or non-tenure-track positions to receive some credit towards tenure should a tenure-track position become available.

Tenure and Promotion

Women faculty benefit when the procedures for promotion and tenure are standardized and professional. Beginning with the initial recruitment visit, junior faculty must be accurately informed about expectations for the performance necessary to merit promotion and tenure. And junior faculty should be apprised regularly of the extent to which they are making normal progress towards institutional standards for tenure and promotion. Similarly, associate professors should be provided with clear guidelines concerning what is necessary for them to attain promotion to full professor.

Department chairs can take steps towards improving the likelihood that women faculty will achieve tenure and promotion. For one thing, chairs should be aware that women faculty are sometimes overworked by departmental and university committees to which they are often appointed as “tokens.” Recognizing this, chairs should protect the time of their junior women faculty. Similarly, chairs should also be sensitive to the increased university demands that are placed on tenured women faculty.

Department chairs must be alert to the ways in which discrimination can enter into the tenure and promotion review process. Chairs should see to it that internal and external reviewers are carefully selected to be in the same field and/or open to research in the candidate’s subject. Individuals known to be hostile to the study of women and politics should not be asked to be reviewers of women who work in this subfield. One woman noted that when she came up for tenure her department put forward her case in two fields—a traditional field in the discipline and women and politics. Of the six external reviewers,

five were in the traditional field. Likewise, in a meeting of tenured political science faculty at a major east coast university to discuss the reappointment prospects of one of the untenured women faculty members, there was much discussion of her work on feminist theory and the role of women in politics. Most of the comments were negative, both about the quality of her work and its subject matter. A comment of the department chair was particularly harsh. He described one paper in draft as “endlessly noodling around about sex and gender, gender and sex, without ever getting into anything that would be of interest to

A serious threat to the progress of women through the ranks, and more generally to the health of the discipline, is the creation of a two-class faculty structure . . .

political scientists.”

The integrity of the review process is also threatened by the tendency to devalue recommendations offered by women reviewers, attributable to the lower status of women in the discipline and the “underplacement” of many women scholars at less prestigious institutions. This devaluation puts many female and male candidates for tenure and promotion into a “catch-22” situation: when the most qualified reviewers are women—as is likely to be the case in the women and politics area—those recommendations may not be taken as seriously as the recommendations of less qualified male reviewers.

The committee expressed concern that a presumption is made about women who do co-authored research. More frequently than in the case of men, women who do co-authored work may not be given the credit due them for their share of the work. This may be particularly true when junior women co-author with more senior men.

Candidates may also be penalized for failing to publish in “mainstream” journals that may not be the most appropriate outlets for the publication of their research. At the same time, candidates may not receive sufficient credit for publishing in journals that are more appropriate for reaching interdisciplinary audiences. In particular, political scientists (and university committees as well) may undervalue articles published in *Women and Politics*, *Signs*, and *Feminist Theory*, to name a few.

While department chairs may not be able to completely eliminate bias in the review process, they can take actions that will reduce the impact of such biases. First, they can help select appropriate reviewers and assure that the opinions of these reviewers are not devalued. Second, they can accept the legitimacy of women and politics research and the value of publication in journals that may not appear mainstream to many male political scientists or social scientists in general. This acceptance can provide cues to other departmental members.

In addition to eliminating biases from the review process, departments should urge their universities to take a more flexible approach to the tenure process, one that potentially allows junior faculty to “stop the tenure clock.” Maternal/parental leaves lose much of their meaning if they may only be taken while the tenure clock is running. A more humane policy for both sexes is one that does not force junior faculty to choose between careers and parenthood. This is a politically feasible proposal. When the U.S. Congress was debating parental leave policy, the faculty senate at a large east coast state university passed a maternity/paternity leave policy that incorporated the principle of “stopping the tenure clock.” The support for this program was overwhelming among both men and women.

Faculty Development

Male and female faculty benefit from efforts to enhance faculty development. These efforts may include developing: an hospitable departmental climate, supportive atti-

tudes towards the teaching and research of women faculty, and annual conferences to inform faculty of their progress towards tenure and promotion.

Departmental Climate

In virtually all political science departments men significantly outnumber women, and therefore they primarily determine the nature of the climate for women. Even in the most hospitable departments the imbalance in the ratio of men to women, in and of itself, may make women feel isolated and separated. This sense of isolation is exacerbated to the extent that women are excluded (intentionally or unintentionally) from the professional and social networks that define the life of a department. It is important, therefore, for all members of a department to work together to establish courteous, nonsexist patterns of professional interaction. Developing such collegial relations requires sensitivity to the individual and a conscious effort to make women feel comfortable.

Most departments are aware that the sexual harassment of women faculty and students by male faculty is illegal and creates a hostile environment that is a detriment to all members of the department. Unfortunately, department members may be less aware of the deleterious effects of more subtle forms of gender insensitivity that contribute to a "chilly climate" for women faculty and students. By themselves these behaviors may seem so insignificant that they may not be identified, much less protested, as forms of gender insensitivity. However, the cumulative effects of these behaviors create a hostile environment for women faculty, staff, and students. Such a chilly climate is a substantial barrier for women to overcome.

Some of the forms of subtle discrimination against women that create a chilly climate include the following: condescension, role stereotyping, sexist comments, hostility, denying the status and authority of women, treating women as if they were invisible, employing double standards for men and women, and making only token appointments of women.

The elimination of a chilly climate creates a more hospitable work environment for male and female department members. We advise all chairs to educate their faculty and graduate students annually of their university's specific policies on sexual harassment, on the mechanisms for dealing with sexual harassment, and on the subtle forms of gender insensitivity. The chair must convey to the faculty the seriousness of the problem as well as the message that sexual and gender harassment will not be tolerated.

By altering their own reactions to gender harassment, women faculty can help educate their male col-

It is important, therefore, for all members of a department to work together to establish courteous, nonsexist patterns of professional interaction.

leagues. Many women faculty may react to gender harassment by ignoring it or joking about it. Instead, a more effective strategy may be to draw attention to the offending behaviors and to request that such behaviors be avoided in the future.

Teaching

Gender inequities can be eliminated and faculty development furthered by attention to course content and offerings, classroom climate, and departmental handling of teaching responsibilities.

The gender bias in political science cannot be eliminated simply by hiring several women or adding a few women and politics courses to the curriculum. Rather, all faculty—male and female—should be encouraged to examine the subject matter of their courses for gender-inclusiveness. Towards this end, the APSA has published a series of booklets that explore the role of women in various facets of American politics. Faculty

who are interested in teaching women and politics courses should be allowed—indeed encouraged—to develop such courses. Finally, political science departments can improve their curriculum by increasing linkages with women's studies programs.

A range of subtle behaviors may occur in the classroom that when taken together create a chilly climate for female students. Faculty may make overt or subtle discriminatory comments, often unintentionally. These remarks may disparage women in general, their intellectual and verbal abilities, their academic commitment, or their scholarship. Such remarks may use sexist humor. Alternatively, well-intentioned faculty may be more gentle with female students than with male students; they may be less demanding in their questioning and more paternalistic in their treatment of women.

Nonverbal behavior of faculty and the participation patterns it encourages can discriminate against women students. For example, faculty may, often unconsciously, make eye contact more frequently with male than female students; gesture more in response to men's questions than to women's; call more often, and more often by name, on male students than female students; address the class as if no women were present; use only masculine pronouns in reference to students, faculty, and especially political actors; and interrupt women students more than men students.

The cumulative effects of such behaviors often lead women students to doubt their own abilities, decreasing the likelihood of their academic success. The problem is likely to be especially acute in political science, a discipline dominated by men.

Department chairs can take some actions to alert their faculty to the problem of chilly climate in the classroom, such as including classroom climate issues in student evaluations, discussing the problem in departmental meetings, and encouraging faculty to monitor their own classroom behaviors, to name a few.

Departments can facilitate the development of junior faculty as teachers by making them aware of university resources devoted to teaching (i.e., teaching centers, visual aid

facilities, etc.); by restricting the number of new preparations in a year; by giving them the same, or even lower, teaching loads as those of senior faculty; and by allowing them to teach courses that complement their ongoing research. In assigning teaching loads and schedules, chairs should make an effort to accommodate junior faculty who may have highly constrained schedules due to family or child care responsibilities. And, chairs should take into account the extent to which women may perform extra administrative service when assigning teaching loads and schedules.

Research

Many of the steps that departments might take to improve the likelihood of women succeeding at research are steps that would further the professional development of male faculty as well. These include enhancing the visibility of faculty within the department and profession, mentoring, and research support.

There is a tendency to undervalue women as researchers and women and politics as a legitimate research area. This may reflect, in part, a lack of exposure to women faculty and their research. One way to remove this barrier and encourage the acceptance of women as political scientists, and women and politics as a legitimate field of inquiry, is to expose male faculty to the research of their female colleagues. Lunchtime "brown bags" and departmental colloquiums are to be encouraged for all faculty, but for women faculty they may be especially important vehicles for achieving legitimacy.

Similarly, departments should encourage junior faculty, especially women, to present their research at professional conferences. Such presentations can be facilitated by making adequate travel funds available and by having senior faculty read the convention papers of junior faculty and listen to dry runs of their convention presentations, and attend the panels on which they are participating.

Mentoring can also contribute to faculty development. Mentors can help educate junior faculty about

departmental expectations; and they can play a critical role in establishing connections with important research and professional networks. Departments may want to establish their own mentoring programs in which junior faculty are paired with scholars in their field. Finding an appropriate mentor, however, is likely to be more difficult for women faculty. The mentor must be someone who is comfortable in the role of mentoring a woman, and preferably it should be someone who has some understanding of the nature of her research. Where women are engaged in women and politics research, it may make the choice of an appropriate mentor especially problematic. In such cases, looking to other

There is a tendency to undervalue women as researchers and women and politics as a legitimate research area.

departments and other universities in order to find an appropriate mentor may be useful. Mentors should offer advice and help in a wide array of areas: understanding the department's tenure expectations; explaining how one becomes professionally active—getting on a convention program, what is expected of discussants, what convention presentations consist of . . . ; explaining the publication process; offering teaching tips; reading preliminary papers. Generally, mentors should guide apprentices toward the highest professional standards. These include not only excellence in teaching and research, but also courteous and dignified collegial behavior.

All faculty benefit from having sufficient institutional support for their research, but the professional development of junior faculty is especially boosted by such support, and consequently departments may want to consider skewing the distribution of scarce resources towards them. Departments should make every effort to provide junior faculty with time to do their research. Ideal-

ly, this should include a semester off at some point before the tenure review process begins. Faculty may also be offered a course off in order to free up time for the preparation of grant proposals. And finding summer support for junior faculty so that they do not have to teach summer school is especially useful.

Annual Meetings with the Chair

Many faculty may benefit from annual conferences in which they receive feedback on their progress toward promotion and tenure. Such conferences are most beneficial when their tone is positive and supportive, rather than punitive and harassing, and their style is that of a dialogue rather than a lecture. From the department's perspective, the conference should include a realistic assessment of how the faculty member is doing and an explanation of what the department can do to increase the likelihood of the faculty member's success. In addition, the chair has a valuable opportunity to listen to the faculty member's own assessment of personal progress. From the individual's perspective the conference should provide an opportunity to clarify ambiguities about the department's standards and to make requests for resources or help.

Graduate Students

Many of the same inequities that characterize the treatment of women faculty also exist in the treatment of graduate students. Of particular relevance to graduate students are problems associated with recruitment and admissions, financial aid, mentoring, and sexual harassment.

Recruitment and Admissions

Political science departments should actively encourage women to enter a political science program in graduate school. Many undergraduates simply lack information about what a career in political science and academia might be like. One way to recruit women to the discipline is to invite qualified undergraduates to meet with faculty for the express purpose of learning about graduate school in political science.

Recruitment of women to graduate school may also be facilitated by implementing graduate programs not geared strictly to students who come to graduate school immediately after college and who go through graduate programs without interruption. Programs should be equally receptive to older students (often women) and provide opportunities to interrupt one's studies without jeopardizing one's status. Generally, rigid programs tend to work against students who have family responsibilities such as child care and, therefore, put women students at a disadvantage.

Financial Aid

Women should be given equal consideration in financial aid decisions. In particular, department chairs should consider possible discrimination in the awarding of research assistantships, summer teaching assignments or "bonus" courses, and extra years of aid. Departments also need to develop means of accommodating pregnant students without jeopardizing their funding.

Mentoring

Male and female graduate students should be offered sufficient professional counseling. Men and women students need to recognize that graduate school is a professional apprenticeship for preparing them to be scholars and teachers. Departments may want to establish professional development seminars for all graduate students. Such courses might be taught on a pass/fail basis and deal with such topics as article writing, the publication process, writing grants, and teaching. And when students go on the job market, care needs to be taken to ensure that they understand the placement process.

In addition to such professional advice, female graduate students often have an extra need for mentoring because they may enter graduate school and the process of professionalization with socially imposed burdens heavier than those of male students. These are burdens that women often do not recognize or understand, and consequently they

do not anticipate and guard against the resulting problems. The worst of these burdens stem from deeply rooted social attitudes that hold women's intellects in suspicion and resist women's holding positions of serious authority in society. Such attitudes conflict with beliefs in equality and can create doubts and confusion in the minds of women graduate students. Accordingly, women graduate students need to be made aware of the impact of such conflicting beliefs and to learn ways of dealing with it. This is likely to be especially important in a male-dominated discipline such as political science.

Finally, when appropriate, women

Political science departments should actively encourage women to enter a political science program in graduate school.

graduate students need to learn about the potential risks involved in doing women and politics research that may be labeled by some as "out of the mainstream" and "less serious" than other fields of study. They need to recognize that there are several options if they wish to pursue such interests: (1) doing such research beginning in graduate school and accepting the risks (e.g., difficulties in getting a job and tenure); or (2) establishing oneself by doing "mainstream" research and only later (e.g., after tenure) moving into the riskier areas. Here, too, there may be obstacles. A recent Ph.D. from a prestigious department presented a paper, based on a chapter from her recently completed dissertation on Soviet military policy and U.S.-Soviet military doctrine competition in the 1960s at the APSA annual meeting. After the panel a professor at one of the W.S. war colleges came up to her and said, "You know, women who study the military will never be taken seriously, because they have not seen active duty."

Sexual Harassment

Women graduate students are vulnerable to sexual harassment because of the ongoing and unequal power relationships they have with male faculty. Unfortunately, many men may fail to recognize the extent to which sexual harassment involves the abuse of a power relationship between faculty and students. Consequently, it is critical that chairs assume responsibility for educating their faculty. Department chairs should also inform all graduate students at orientation sessions of their university's sexual harassment policy. Again, they should make clear that they support the policy; that they take the policy seriously; and that they will enforce the policy. Male chairs may want to designate a woman faculty member as the initial contact person for sexual harassment complaints, if that is allowable by their university's procedures for dealing with sexual harassment.

Recommendations

A. Recruitment

1. Departments should make an aggressive attempt to locate women candidates.
2. Recruitment committees should include at least one member (either male or female) who is especially committed to improving the status of women in the profession, and supportive of women and politics research.
3. During recruitment visits, women candidates should be given ample opportunity to meet with other women on campus and to become familiar with the formal networks for interaction that exist on campus. As a matter of routine, they should also be offered information about sexual harassment policies, child care opportunities, etc.

B. Progress Through the Ranks

1. Political science departments should discourage the creation of two-class faculty structures that disadvantage part-time faculty who are typically disproportionately female.
2. Tenure and promotion proce-

The Profession

dures should be standardized and professional.

3. Untenured women faculty should be protected from being overburdened by service assignments.

4. Department chairs should prevent bias from entering the review process through the interpretation of vitae, the reading of letters of recommendation, the treatment of co-authored research, the devaluing of women reviewers, and the devaluation of women and politics research.

5. Universities and departments should adopt family leave policies.

C. Faculty Development

1. The elimination of a “chilly climate” for women benefits all members of a department. Accordingly, department chairs can improve the working environment for women—faculty, students, and staff—by educating their faculty about the

nature and consequences of sexual harassment and gender insensitivity.

2. Gender inequities in the classroom should be reduced by encouraging faculty to develop courses that are gender-inclusive in their content, and by sensitizing faculty to the subtle ways in which classroom behavior can create a “chilly climate” for women students.

3. Departments should take a number of steps to increase the likelihood that women will succeed at research.

- a. The tendency to devalue women as political scientists as well as “women and politics” as political science can be reduced by exposing the entire faculty to the research of women.
- b. Mentoring should be encouraged to further the research of women faculty.
- c. Junior faculty should have annual

conferences with the chair to discuss their concerns, while the chair is able to express the department’s concerns.

D. Graduate Students

1. Political scientists should actively encourage women to attend graduate school.

2. Financial aid decisions should be made in a gender-neutral fashion.

3. All graduate students should receive professional mentoring. In addition, where appropriate, women graduate students should be offered additional personal mentoring to help them overcome the barriers created by long-standing gender bias in society and the educational process.

4. All students and faculty should be informed about their institution’s sexual harassment policy.

Practitioners and Political Scientists*

Dale R. Herspring, *The National War College*

If current trends continue, the gap separating practitioners, who deal with foreign affairs on a daily basis, and political scientists, who study the conceptual and theoretical aspects of such questions, is likely to widen. The result will be a further lessening of the relevance of political science as a discipline for formulating and implementing foreign policy—an unfortunate loss of knowledge and experience for both sides.¹

There has always been a tension between career bureaucrats and academics. The former, with their operational orientation, have long been suspicious of abstract analyses. Such analyses often appear to practitioners to have little *immediate* policy relevance and as a result are often discarded as “academic nonsense.” Likewise, the knowledge practitioners gain from day-to-day bureaucratic battles often appears irrelevant to political scientists because it cannot be tested or generalized and therefore

is of minimal use in theory building. What is new is that practitioners are increasingly seeing little *short-term* or *long-term* relevance for many of the kinds of abstract conceptualizing frameworks used by political scientists.

Some political scientists argue that they are not concerned with policy relevancy and instead are focused on theory construction. There is nothing wrong with such a position. Theory building is a critical part of political science.

Similarly, some political scientists point to the recent emergence of policy studies programs, arguing that it is the task of these programs/departments/institutes to make political science conceptualizing relevant.

The fact is that both practitioners and policy makers need the benefit of conceptual frameworks. My own experience as a practitioner-manager suggests that policy studies programs do not do a good job in this regard.

I have supervised graduates of some of the most prestigious policy study programs in this country, and while most of them are prepared for the nitty-gritty of public service (e.g., fiscal policy, procurement procedures), they are relatively ignorant when it comes to the conceptual frameworks common to political science. The result is that we are producing a generation of worker bees—which is helpful in some respects. The problem, however, is that if they cannot conceptualize problems, then the policy-makers for whom they work, and who have neither the time nor the interest in such schemes, will not see the issues they must resolve from a broad perspective. Only a good grounding in a field such as political science—whether while a student or at the mid-career point when one is sent back to the university for graduate training—will teach practitioners the desired abstract thinking ability.