

push the telling finding that when the number of underrepresented candidates visiting campus increases from one to two in a group of four, the odds of hiring an underrepresented candidate increase from zero to 50% (Johnson, Hekman, and Chan 2016). Push your department to use the site, Women Also Know Stuff (WAKS) (available at <https://womenalsoknowstuff.com>), to diversify speaker series, roundtables, and syllabi, among other things. Push, too, the affiliated site, People of Color Also Know Stuff (available at <https://sites.google.com/view/pocexperts/home>). Moreover, advertise your own expertise at WAKS, POCalsoknow, or both.

So far, I have discussed strategies as they pertain primarily to professional practices and less to intellectual agendas. We also can push ourselves to enter new subfields and pursue new research questions wherever they take us. For example, I was among the first political scientists to investigate systematically the phenomenon of legislative party switching, and this corner of the subfield now has grown and matured (e.g., Heller and Mershon 2005; 2008; Mershon 2014). Reflection on open questions in that area led me to develop a new theory of and amass evidence on degrees of change and stability in legislative party systems between elections (e.g., Mershon and Shvetsova 2013a; 2013b; 2014).

Push again as you cite research. Be sure to cite women and members of underrepresented groups working in a given area. Note that women are authors or coauthors on almost all of the research cited in this article. Cite yourself, which helps overcome the documented patterns of relatively low self-citation among women scholars (e.g., Maliniak, Powers, and Walter 2013).

In closing, the meta-strategy is to find support among the underrepresented and support those you find. Support yourself as well, whether through self-citation, blogging, presenting at other institutions, or proposing an “author-meets-critics” panel on your recent book. By supporting one another and ourselves, we amplify underrepresented voices in the field—and we all advance and thrive. ■

REFERENCES

- Baldez, Lisa. 2004. “Elected Bodies: The Gender Quota Law for Legislative Candidates in Mexico.” *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 29 (2): 231–58.
- Barnes, Tiffany D. 2016. *Gendering Legislative Behavior: Institutional Constraints and Collaboration*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cox, Gary W. 2006. “The Organization of Democratic Legislatures.” *The Oxford Handbook of Political Economy*, 141–61.
- Gandhi, Jennifer. 2008. *Political Institutions under Dictatorship*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Harbridge, Laurel, Neil Malhotra, and Brian F. Harrison. 2014. “Public Preferences for Bipartisanship in the Policymaking Process.” *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 39 (3): 327–55.
- Heller, William B., and Carol Mershon. 2005. “Party Switching in the Italian Chamber of Deputies, 1996–2001.” *Journal of Politics* 67 (2): 536–59.
- Heller, William B., and Carol Mershon. 2008. “Dealing in Discipline: Party Switching and Legislative Voting in the Italian Chamber of Deputies, 1988–2000.” *American Journal of Political Science* 52 (4): 910–25.
- Htun, Mala. 2004. “Is Gender Like Ethnicity? The Political Representation of Identity Groups.” *Perspectives on Politics* 2 (3): 439–58.
- Johnson, Stefanie K., David R. Hekman, and Elsa T. Chan. 2016. “If There’s Only One Woman in Your Candidate Pool, There’s Statistically No Chance She’ll Be Hired.” *Harvard Business Review*, April 26. Available at <https://hbr.org/2016/04/if-theres-only-one-woman-in-your-candidate-pool-theres-statistically-no-chance-shell-be-hired>.
- Kanthak, Kristin, and George A. Krause. 2012. *The Diversity Paradox*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krook, Mona L. 2010. *Quotas for Women in Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Lawless, Jennifer L. 2015. “Female Candidates and Legislators.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 18: 349–66.
- Malcom, Shirley M., Paula Q. Hall, and Janet W. Brown. 1976 (April). “The Double Bind: The Price of Being a Minority Woman in Science.” Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- Malesky, Edmund, Paul Schuler, and Anh Tran. 2012. “The Adverse Effects of Sunshine: A Field Experiment on Legislative Transparency in an Authoritarian Assembly.” *American Political Science Review* 106 (4): 762–86.
- Maliniak, Daniel, Ryan Powers, and Barbara F. Walter. 2013. “The Gender Citation Gap in International Relations.” *International Organization* 67 (4): 889–922.
- McClendon, Gwyneth H. 2016. “Race and Responsiveness: An Experiment with South African Politicians.” *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 3 (1): 60–74.
- Mershon, Carol. 1996. “The Costs of Coalition: Coalition Theories and Italian Governments.” *American Political Science Review* 90 (3): 534–54.
- Mershon, Carol. 2001. “Contending Models of Portfolio Allocation and Office Payoffs to Party Factions: Italy, 1963–79.” *American Journal of Political Science* 45 (2): 277–93.
- Mershon, Carol. 2002. *The Costs of Coalition*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Mershon, Carol. 2014. “Legislative Party Switching.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Legislative Studies*, eds. S. Martin, T. Saalfeld, and K. Strøm, 418–35. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mershon, Carol, and Olga Shvetsova. 2013a. “The Microfoundations of Party System Stability in Legislatures.” *Journal of Politics* 75 (4): 865–78.
- Mershon, Carol, and Olga Shvetsova. 2013b. *Party System Change in Legislatures Worldwide: Moving Outside the Electoral Arena*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mershon, Carol, and Olga Shvetsova. 2014. “Change in Parliamentary Party Systems and Policy Outcomes: Hunting the Core.” *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 26 (2): 331–51.
- Mershon, Carol, and Denise Walsh. 2015. “Organizing Women: Diversifying Leadership and Addressing Discrimination in Political Science Departments.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 48 (3): 459–63.
- Orey, Byron D. A., Wendy Smooth, Kimberley S. Adams, and Kisha Harris-Clark. 2007. “Race and Gender Matter: Refining Models of Legislative Policy Making in State Legislatures.” *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* 28 (3–4): 97–119.
- Palanza, Valeria, and Gisela Sin. 2014. “Veto Bargaining and the Legislative Process in Multiparty Presidential Systems.” *Comparative Political Studies* 47 (5): 766–92.
- Smooth, Wendy. 2011. “Standing for Women? Which Women? The Substantive Representation of Women’s Interests and the Research Imperative of Intersectionality.” *Politics & Gender* 7 (3): 436–41.

GENDER BIAS IN LEGISLATIVE STUDIES?

Lynda Powell, University of Rochester

DOI: 10.1017/S1049096519002063

I was fortunate to begin my career as a PhD student at the University of Rochester. (I was actually lucky that my first-choice school offered to put me on its waiting list, stating that I would be accepted if any of their admits were drafted and unable to attend.) Bill Riker was establishing a serious graduate program at Rochester, and he looked for applicants that the top-ranked schools might overlook. Hence, at Rochester, often underrepresented groups (e.g., women) were overrepresented. Bill’s merit-based attitudes were shared by the faculty—women and other underrepresented groups were not treated as second-class citizens. Consequently, Rochester produced several well-known women scholars. Dick Fenno’s presence in the department ensured that some of them would be Congress scholars, including Barbara Sinclair, Wendy Schiller, Linda Fowler, Diana Evans, and Christine DeGregorio, and in comparative legislatures, Gail McElroy and Tanya Bagashka.

These Rochester alumnae all started their careers as legislative scholars and generally continued to publish exclusively or primarily in that subfield. However, many of us either have

interests in more than one subfield or we started publishing in one subfield and moved to another. I went to Rochester to study game theory and was Dick McKelvey's first PhD student; we learned the dissertation process together—he received his PhD the year I was writing mine. I became more deeply interested in substantive questions by coauthoring with colleagues in my first job. Although I wrote occasionally on Congress, it was not until 1995 that all of my work was on legislatures or legislators, and it has become increasingly institutional. As a Rochester graduate, the legislative field was welcoming to me. Several of my cohort were legislative scholars, and after I returned to teach at Rochester, many of my students became legislative scholars. I have served on paper, book, and now career award committees for the section. It seems to me to be an exemplary section in terms of openness to women scholars, including in leadership selection.

Thus, I was surprised when Gisela Sin and Laurel Harbridge told me that our section was the third lowest in female membership among the 43 APSA sections (Roberts 2018). It would be interesting to break down female–male representation in the sections by PhD-year cohorts and to construct an individual-level dataset including variables to show sections to which APSA members submitted papers and presented in by year, along with their section memberships. That might allow us to distinguish among various explanations for our relative gender imbalance. One possibility is that younger scholars are more likely to be female and to publish on topics that fall into more than one APSA section. If so, are legislative-“plus” scholars disproportionately choosing to be involved in other sections rather than ours? That is, are we losing the competition to attract younger scholars, which incidentally is showing up in our overall male–female ratio? If so, this is important because young scholars, male as well as female, are the future of our section. Or are we losing more young female scholars than young male scholars? Or is the problem less about age cohorts and more about gender? The answer to these and other questions may lead us to different solutions about addressing the problem.

I asked several untenured female scholars whose work fits in our section and at least one other section about their perception of our section and the other(s). One said that the Congress field and, hence, the legislative section had a reputation as a “boys club” more than the other. Another said that the other field had an open yearly conference to present papers and seemed to be an especially friendly and mentoring section. Congress and History

value because of the easy availability of online articles through university subscriptions.

Also, although the section has tried in terms of panels, officers, and awards to include comparative legislative as well as state legislative scholars, researchers in those fields are still less likely to belong to our section than they should be. Both of those groups, I suspect, have a higher proportion of women. I think that as a section, we would be enriched by their participation, both male and female.

Gisela and Laurel also pointed out that in the past two years of *Legislative Studies Quarterly* articles, 18% were authored by women (solo or team), 59% by men, and 23% by mixed-gender teams. I compared that with the report I received for the *American Political Science Review* (APSR) editorial board: the APSR's comparable percentages are 12%, 69%, and 19%. Therefore, we do not fare as badly as the APSR in women's representation. Yet, I think a better comparison would be with other section journals. Of course, what is truly important is the equal treatment of identifiable subgroups, such as women, and the publication percentages cannot speak directly to that. Although our reviewing is blind, many of us sometimes can guess the authorship or have actually seen the manuscript presented at a conference. Furthermore, I suspect that if a reviewer googled the title, the paper often would come up as a previously presented conference paper. So, it is an interesting question about how “blind” our review process really is.

Identifying bias is typically difficult. Gisela and Laurel asked me to comment on my early experiences in a male-dominated field. Of course, bias is easily identifiable if it is overt. For example, I asked a colleague and good friend why a new hire had been assigned to teach a grad course, whereas I had taught there (not Rochester) for several years but had not yet been given a grad seminar. He said that they did not think that, as a woman, I would be able to handle a grad course filled with male students. I did start teaching grad courses shortly thereafter.

The problem is identifying bias that is not overt—did bias play a role in a journal rejection or not being invited to a conference? When I had a manuscript rejection, I assumed the fault was mine—that my actual work would be evaluated only for its content, not in relationship to my gender. It is only recently that experiments have been used to identify the effects of gender bias in academia. It is especially worrisome to find notable gender bias in evaluating the quality of research, which in turn affects publication

The problem is identifying bias that is not overt—did bias play a role in a journal rejection or not being invited to a conference? When I had a manuscript rejection, I assumed the fault was mine—that my actual work would be evaluated only for its content, not in relationship to my gender.

has been a wonderful resource for Congress scholars, but our section does not have an annual legislative conference. Moreover, of course, Congress and History does not include comparative legislatures and US state legislatures. I think both the annual methods and the state politics conferences have been helpful in attracting and mentoring young scholars. The latter, in particular, seems to have more female participation. The opportunity to attend a section conference is a valuable selective benefit, whereas the other benefit—receiving the section journal—has decreased in

and career prospects. Experimental research, for example, has found that randomizing the gender of the “author” on an abstract affects—negatively for women—a PhD student's evaluation of the research and their interest in collaborating with the author. Knobloch-Westerwick, Glynn, and Huges (2014) found this to be true for “masculine” topics—that is, what we study, unless the research is on women, families, and children. Two articles by economists in the *American Economic Review* found that women are disadvantaged in attaining tenure in top-rated economics

departments because men are given significantly more credit than women for coauthorship on a mixed-gender team publication (Sarsons 2017). Research also found that women are about as likely as men to manifest gender bias disadvantaging women—so, the problem is “us” collectively. Addressing the problem is difficult. One solution designed to take childbearing out of the equation had the opposite effect of what was intended. Gender-neutral tenure-clock stopping increased the likelihood that a man gained tenure while decreasing the likelihood that a woman would (Antecol, Bedard, and Stearns 2018). With regard to Sarsons’ work on team authorship, it has been suggested that changing our authorship pattern from alphabetical last names to an ordering that reflects each author’s contribution to the work might be helpful. We need to think creatively about ways to reduce gender and other forms of bias in our profession. Top orchestras used to be overwhelmingly male, because—we were told—men were simply “better.” This changed when auditions using screens that concealed the gender of the musician showed otherwise and created orchestras that now are close to gender parity. ■

REFERENCES

- 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.
- Knobloch-Westerwick, Sylvia; Carroll Glynn, and Michael Hoge. 2014. “The Matilda Effect in Science Communication: An Experiment on Gender Bias in Publication Quality Perceptions and Collaborative Interest.” *Science Communications* 35 (5): 603–25.
- Roberts, Margaret E. 2018. “What Is Political Methodology?” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51 (3): 597–601.
- Sarsons, Heather. 2017. “Recognition for Group Work: Gender Differences in Academia.” *American Economic Review* 107 (5): 141–45.

WELCOMING AND MENTORING WOMEN IN LEGISLATIVE STUDIES

Cindy Simon Rosenthal, *University of Oklahoma*

DOI: 10.1017/S1049096519002075

The legislative studies field transformed during the period of my career but, unfortunately, not enough to benefit fully from and provide professional mentoring to the growing number of women political scientists. As the paucity of women members in the Legislative Studies Section (LSS) suggests, women political scientists turned to other venues for their professional networks and research outlets.

...the legislative studies field has not been particularly welcoming to research on women and politics.

My own experience suggests two of the key realities for women scholars pursuing legislative and congressional studies in the 1980s and 1990s. First, the legislative studies field has not been particularly welcoming to research on women and politics. In legislative studies long dominated by scholars of the US Congress, American gender scholars typically turned to state legislatures or comparative legislatures to research interesting questions. As long as women were largely absent from the US Congress, so too

was the study of gender and legislatures an underappreciated “stepchild” in legislative studies. Second, and as a consequence, many scholars of my generation turned to other professional networks, mentoring, and research outlets, particularly the Women and Politics Section of APSA.

Welcoming New Scholars

When I attended my first LSS business meeting as a graduate student, I saw few women in the room beyond the distinguished and formidable Barbara Sinclair. When the meeting adjourned to the most important business of the section—the reception—I found myself a distinct minority, feeling literally on the sidelines and looking from the outside in. If a grad student was lucky enough to have a senior scholar to introduce her to colleagues, then the venue could be welcoming. If not, the cocktail hour event was an isolating event. Of 43 different APSA sections, LSS still is largely a male domain with the third lowest percentage of women (22% female), followed closely by the Political Methodology Section and the Executive and Presidential Politics Section. By contrast, the sections with the highest percentages of women are Women and Politics (more than 80%) and Migration and Citizenship (more than 50%). Perhaps a more similar, large membership section is Comparative Politics, which is approximately 35% women.

The absence of a welcoming environment went well beyond the social aspect of the LSS business meeting. I presented my first paper as an assistant professor at an APSA Annual Meeting in 1995 in Chicago. I had previously presented research as a graduate student at the Western Political Science Association (WPSA) conferences in 1993 and 1994 with encouragement from the late Rita Mae Kelly, who advised me that the WPSA was a friendly venue for women and politics research. My early-career conference experience confirmed Rita’s advice and shaped my own career.

Our 1995 APSA panel had been assembled to reflect some of the best emerging research on women in legislatures and to pose a future research agenda on gender and politics. The LSS accepted the panel and then assigned a young male Congress scholar, who proceeded to tear into the papers, offer a scathing critique of which statistical tests were being used, and essentially “show off” his political science bona fides. His behavior derailed the panel’s goal of framing future research questions and focused instead on dismissing research as inconsequential, given the small-N nature of the population being studied. The experience stayed with me for years, and that discussant’s behavior later became recognizable on other panels and in job talks as something one of my male

colleagues referred to as “towel-snapping” one-upmanship—a locker-room practice to display knowledge dominance.

Notably, a search of the *Legislative Studies Quarterly* revealed only nine articles between 1991 and 2000 identified with the term “gender” or “women”; another eight between 2001 and 2010; and only eight more since 2011 to the present. This may reflect multiple factors, including the establishment of *Politics and Gender* in 2005, but other journals have clearly been more