The Status of Women in Political Science: Female Participation in the Professoriate and the Study of Women and Politics in the Discipline

Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession: Lisa Brandes, Eloise Buker, Susan Burgess, Constance Cook, Janet Flammang, Shirley Geiger, Susan Okin, Bang-Soon Yoon, and Martha Ackelsberg, Chair of the Women's Caucus

It is important to take stock of the status of women in the profession because the integration of women into the professional ranks of political science achieves two important goals: first, it opens the profession to the very best political scientists without regard to gender; second, it enables the profession to take account of the contributions of women to politics and so keeps the profession on the cutting edge of new gender-related research.

Approximately every 10 years, *PS* asks the Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession of Political Science to assess that status in an article for *PS*. These reports serve to frame some important issues for our understanding of the current situation of political science's response to women in the field. While political science remains a male-biased field both in terms of the structure of the professoriate and the structure of knowledge, we note progress, and we expect the trend to create gender balance because we believe that political scientists are continuing the work of the elimination of such male bias both in the professoriate and in the study of politics.

We will begin with a summary of some key issues from the 1992 assessment, then we will move to an analysis of the status of women within the profession, and then we will assess the integration of the study of women into the study of politics by political scientists. We focus on changes over the last 10 years. We will close with specific policy recommendations designed to continue the removal of barriers to women's participation in political science and to the fuller integration of research on women into all the subfields of political science. These recommendations are directed toward departments of political science; the American Political Science Association, regional associations, and their committees; to conference organizers; and to professional journals in the field.

Looking Back: The Status of Women in Political Science, 1992

In 1992 the Committee on the Status of Women published its report, "Improving the Status of Women in Political Science: A Report with Recommendations." The report urged departments to acknowledge that women may bring perspectives that may challenge the current shape of the discipline and prompt a reconsideration of longstanding departmental practices and policies. To that end, the report offered several suggestions that departments might consider regarding recruiting and retaining women in the profession.

With respect to recruitment, the report suggested that departments should consider defining positions flexibly, in a manner that signifies openness to scholarship on gender, race, class and sexuality. Rather than simply reproducing position announcements that reflect the discipline of 30 years ago, departments that wish to be both equitable and on the cutting edge should rethink their announcements in order to incorporate developments in research on gender, race, class, and sexuality that have affected the shape of scholarship in all the organized sections. Similarly, the report suggested that departments should consider encouraging applications from women and minorities by announcing their positions in established networks that speak to diverse populations in the profession. These would include newsletters of Caucuses such as *WCPS: The Newsletter of the Women's Caucus for Political Science*, and newsletters of organized sections such as the Women and Politics section, and the Race, Ethnicity and Politics section. Since the last report, several Caucuses, such as the Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Political Science Caucus, have created extensive listservs and web sites that regularly post job announcements.

Despite societal progress in challenging traditional gender and sex roles, lingering bias may still impede retention and progress of junior faculty women toward tenure, and affect the way that female graduate students are trained and socialized into the profession, particularly in traditional departments.

Thus, the report suggested that departments should ensure that women, especially junior women, are not overburdened by service assignments such as advising (nurturing) large numbers of students or serving as the token woman on departmental, college, or university committees. If, as is often said in response, "there are not enough women to go around," this should serve as a sign that more women need to be hired and retained, not that those who have already been hired should be further worn down. In addition, departments need to reconsider traditional assumptions that excellence in research and teaching are mutually exclusive, particularly since assumptions about teaching and research are often gendered. The report suggested that departments should provide sustained mentoring from the chair and other appropriate department members as a means of promoting departmental buy-in to the success of junior women. The mentoring process should also foster a deepened understanding of the research, teaching, and service contributions of the candidate. In turn, this should provide a more solid foundation for the tenure review process, including appropriate choice of outside tenure reviewers as well as a more substantive understanding of the recommendations offered by the reviewers. Needless to say, the way that women faculty members are treated in the departments that graduate students are trained in will, for better or worse, powerfully affect the expectations and practices that women

TABLE 1
Male/Female 1981–1998: Receiving Ph.D.s in Political Science/Government

	1981	1985	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Male	264	196	226	200	225	228	264	290	305	345	315
	(76%)	(71%)	(70%)	(68%)	(68%)	(69%)	(66%)	(70%)	(67%)	(69%)	(61%)
Female	83	80	95	94	107	102	134	122	151	156	204
	(24%)	(29%)	(30%)	(32%)	(32%)	(31%)	(34%)	(30%)	(33%)	(31%)	(39%)

Source: APSA; table prepared from National Science Foundation data "Male/Female 1981–1998: #Receiving Ph.D.s Political Science/Government" and "Male/Female 1981–1998: # Receiving Ph.D.s as a % Political Science/Government" (Hall 2000, 65).

*% data was rounded off and some calculation errors (% of women in 1985 and 1993) were corrected.

TABLE 2
Political Science Faculty by Sex, Ethnicity,* and Tenure Status, 1991–1998

All Faculty** Year	All*** (Full-time only)	Women (Full-time only)	% Women (Full-time only)	% African American (Full-time only)	% Latino (Full-time only)	% Asian (Full-time only)	% Native American (Full-time only)
1991–92	9835	1900	19.3%	5.7%	1.3%	3.0%	0.1%
	(8256)	(1485)	(18.0%)	(5.0%)	(1.3%)	(2.9%)	(0.1%)
1993–94	10997	2303	20.9%	4.9%	1.4%	2.3%	0.3%
	(8535)	(1643)	(19.3%)	(4.6%)	(1.5%)	(2.8%)	(0.4%)
1995–96	12113	2865	23.7%	4.9%	1.6%	2.9%	2.8%
	(8595)	(1812)	(21.1%)	(4.5%)	(1.5%)	(3.1%)	(2.7%)
1996–97	12195	2827	23.2%	6.0%	1.7%	2.9%	1.2%
	(8773)	(1832)	(20.9%)	(5.0%)	(1.5%)	(3.2%)	(0.6%)
1997–98	11958	2727	22.8%	5.3%	1.8%	0.5%	0.6%
	(8622)	(1822)	(21.1%)	(4.9%)	(1.6%)	(0.0%)	(0.8%)
1999–2000	11180	2625	23.5%	5.9%	2.4%	2.3%	1.0%
	(8077)	(1794)	(22.2%)	(5.3%)	(2.1%)	(2.5%)	(0.3%)

Source: APSA Annual Surveys of Department Chairs. 1991–1998, on Political Science Faculty by Sex, Ethnicity, and Tenure Status, 1991–1998.

*Ethnicity includes both male and female faculty.

**All Faculty includes both full and part-time faculty.

***All includes both male and female faculty.

graduate students bring into the profession as faculty members.

Many of these points made in 1992 by the Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession are valid today, but it is encouraging to note progress. To examine the changes that have occurred since this time we turn to an analysis of the status of women in the last 10 years.

Looking at the Changing Present: Progress of Women in the Profession of Political Science

Women in the profession of political science have made visible progress in terms of the numbers of women receiving doctorates and of women obtaining professorships. To examine the situation of women gaining doctorates, Table 1 shows doctorates awarded to women in political science/government and reveals that between 1981 and 1998, the percentage of women attaining doctorates rose from 24% (83) in 1981 to 30% (95) in 1990 and to 39% (204) in 1998. This upward trend also corresponds with the growth of women in both M.A. and B.A. degrees awarded in political science, although the growth rate at the B.A. level is less remarkable than that of the M.A. level: For M.A.s, women made steep gains from 33% (1981) to 43% (1990) and 50% (1997). In B.A.s, women also made visible progress from 38% (1981) to 43% (1990), and 47% (1997).[1]

The number of women faculty, both full- and part-time, (Table 2) has also grown from 19.3% (1900) during 1991–92 to 23.5% (2625) during 1999–2000. Full-time faculty alone also rose from 18% to 22.2% during the same period. By academic rank, the most progress was made at the assistant professor level—which rose from 29.6% to 35%—compared to the growth made at full professor and associate professor levels—which rose from 9.4% to 11.2% and from 18.2% to 22.8% respectively—from 1991 to 1998 (Sarkees and McGlen 1999, 103).

Among ethnic minorities, both males and females combined, as shown in Table 2, Native Americans made visible progress although the percentage of faculty is still very small. White Americans continue to dominate the profession. The number of African Americans fluctuates rather than showing a steady growth. Latinos/Latinas made more steady progress than other groups with African-American and Native-American backgrounds both in the "all" and "full-time" categories. However, Latinos/Latinas are still underrepresented, considering the number of doctorates received by Latinos/Latinas. As Table 3 shows, between 1991 and 1998, Hispanics (both male and female) accounted for 3.4% (or 111 persons) of the Political Science/Government, Research doctorates awarded in the U.S. In teaching, Asian minorities experienced a decline in the past decade (Table 2): the full- and part-time status declined from 3% during 1991–92 to 2.3% during 1999–2000; full-time faculty also dropped from 2.9% to 2.5% during the same period. Given the number of Asian Americans receiving doctorates (Table 3), which accounted for 2.9% (or 94 persons) during 1991–98, one could expect more Asian faculty representation.

The APSA recognizes outstanding work in political science through the national awards it gives each year at its annual meeting. The APSA provided the Status Committee with a tally of the awards on the basis of gender from 1990 to 2000, which indicates that female political scientists are gaining recognition for outstanding work.[2] The results are shown in Table 4.

Looking at the Negative Sides of the Present: Resistance & Backsliding

Despite the visible progress women in the profession made in the political science discipline, resistance and backlash still pose serious problems. As Sarkees

TABLE 3
Political Science/Government Research Doctorates Awarded by Gender and Ethnicity 1991–1998

	Male	Female	Total
White	1876 (86%)	914 (85%)	2790 (86%)
Asian	58 (2.7%)	36 (3.4%)	94 (2.9%)
Black	94 (4.3%)	74 (6.9%)	168 (5.2%)
Hispanic	80 (3.7%)	31 (2.9%)	111 (3.4%)
American Indian	10 (0.5%)	5 (0.5%)	15 (0.5%)
Unknown	36 (1.7%)	7 (0.7%)	43 (1.5%)

Source: APSA; table prepared using National Science Foundation data, "Political Science/Government, Research Doctorates Awarded by Gender and Ethnicity 1981–1998" (Hall 2000, 65).

TABLE 4
National Awards by the American Political Science Association by Gender, 1990–2000

	M	F	Percent Female
1990	18	4	18%
1991	16	5	24%
1992	16	6	27%
1993	15	4	21%
1994	n/a	n/a	n/a
1995	19	4	17%
1996	16	5	24%
1997	19	6	24%
1998	18	5	22%
1999	16	6	27%
2000	15	4	21%

Source: APSA, Spring 2001.

and McGlen pointed out, it is far from the reality that women are "taking over the academic discipline" both in teaching and research (Sarkees and McGlen 1999). The nature of resistance and backlash is as follows:

1. Tables 1 and 2 show that the number of women achieving doctorates has increased, but this increase has not taken place at the same rate as the hiring of women into teaching positions.
2. Most progress in teaching was made at the entry, assistant professor level, followed by the associate professor level, whereas only a slight increase occurred at full professor level.
3. An antiaffirmative action mood seemed to have created a "chilly climate" for women, particularly toward feminist scholarship (e.g., hostile reaction to feminist scholarship in international relations) (Sarkees and McGlen 1999, 100).
4. Research on women falls behind these gains in the professoriate. "In nearly 100 years, only 433 female-focused articles have been published by the top 15 journals in political science" (Sarkees and McGlen 1999, 107) and "the discipline of political science has, for the most part, ignored the contributions of feminist epistemology and theory." (Sarkees and McGlen 1999, 107, quoting Kelly, Williams, and Fisher 1994, 10–11).

Beyond historical, legal, and ethical issues, faculty gender and ethnic diversity seem to have important practical implications for political science departments (Geiger and Travis 1997). Several factors concerning student enrollment may persuade departments to pay attention to issues of gender and ethnic diversity in faculty hiring and retention. First is the absolute decline in the number of students majoring in political science. Second is the growing proportion of men (especially black and white) who decide not to attend traditional four-year institutions, leaving women in the majority at many undergraduate institutions. In 1998, women earned 47% of bachelor's degrees and 50% of master's degrees in political science. During the same period, women were 22% of the political science faculty. The gap is obvious, and has implications for student well-being and career decision making. A report by the Southern Education Foundation asserts that "the presence of minority mentors and role models on campus as faculty members and staff plays an important role in creating a climate hospitable to minority students" (1995, 39).

Looking at the Field: Progress of Women and Politics in Political Science

Throughout the 1990s, there were many signs indicating that women and politics had become a legitimate field of political science. The Organized Section of Women and Politics, founded in 1986, grew from 493 members in 1991 to 565 in 1999, making it the eighth largest of the discipline's 32 organized sections. In 1999, 13% of the section's members were male. At the annual meetings of the American Political Science Association, the number of panels allotted to the women and politics section (a function of the previous year's attendance at section panels) averaged nine, and averaged 13 with cosponsorship with other organized sections.

Number of Women and Politics Section Panels at Annual APSA Meetings

1990 (9 with cosponsoring)
1991 (14 with cosponsoring)
1992 12
1993 10
1994 11 (17 with cosponsoring)
1995 7 (14 with cosponsoring)
1996 11
1997 9 (13 with cosponsoring)
1998 11 (15 with cosponsoring)
1999 8 (14 with cosponsoring)
2000 11

At the 1992 APSA meeting, more than 60 gender-related papers were presented; in 1994 130 scholars presented papers on women and politics. Section organizers often noted how many more women and politics submissions there were than spaces on the allotted panels.

There were also encouraging signs of a new generation of scholars interested in the field. For example, in 1986, Rutgers University's department of political science became the first in the country to offer women and politics as both a major and minor field of study toward a Ph.D. In 1998 the program had 35 majors and minors, and seven part-time and full-time faculty. In conjunction with APSA's meetings, the Women and Politics organized section sponsored two one-day seminars, entitled "Frontiers of Women and Politics Research," for advanced graduate students working on women and politics dissertations: in 1998 in Boston (where 80 students attended) and in 2000 in Washington, DC.

However, mixed evidence of progress appears in an examination of the publication of articles about women in the top 15 political science journals. Rita Mae Kelly and Kimberly Fisher found that there was only a handful of such

articles each decade, until the 1960s with 29, the 1970s with 119, and the 1980s with 200 (1993, 545). "If one were seriously interested in descriptions and explanations of women's role and position in political life, the women's movement, and feminist thought, only three of these 15 journals provide much of a comprehensive overview in the totality of their publications: *Western Political Quarterly*, *Journal of Politics*, and *Public Administration Review*" (Kelly and Fisher 1993, 548).

Furthermore, there was evidence of disciplinary resistance to the field of women and politics. While women and politics courses were being added to departmental curricula, the pace was glacial, and the courses were disproportionately in American politics. In 1990 the Women's Caucus for Political Science surveyed department chairs about the frequency of women and politics course offerings. Questionnaires were sent to about 1200 four-year colleges and universities granting degrees in political science and 105 department chairs responded, presumably those most sensitive to women's issues. About three-quarters of the departments responding offered courses on women and politics, and about one-quarter did not. About half of all departments offered courses on women and American politics, about 15% on women and political theory, and about 10% on women and international relations or comparative politics. Of all departments responding, about half offered courses on women once a year or more, and most of these courses were taught by tenure-stream faculty. Four of the top-10 ranked political science departments responded: Harvard, Stanford, University of Wisconsin, and Princeton (Ranking from *PS*, Summer 1986, 652). Among them, they offered two courses on women on an annual basis taught by a tenure-stream faculty member. Mount Holyoke College offered the most courses: six annually and two more occasionally.

In order to get a sense of the receptivity of gatekeeping institutions to women and politics as a field of study, in 1993–94 the Women's Caucus surveyed the 35 largest Political Science Ph.D.-granting institutions. Among the 22 institutions responding, the number of women and politics courses that were taught by tenure-stream faculty was, with two exceptions, disappointingly low.

Women and Politics Courses Offered by Tenure-Stream Faculty, 1993–1994

0	UCSB, Columbia, MIT, New York University, University of Pennsylvania, Temple
1	Chicago, Northern Illinois, Yale
2	Duke, U Mass Amherst, Minnesota, Princeton
3	Cornell, Harvard, Indiana, Texas-Austin, Wisconsin
4	Hawaii, Washington
7	Michigan
14	Rutgers

This information is important for two reasons. First, recognition of women's contributions to the field of political science is enhanced by courses and research that examine women and politics. The lack of courses on women and politics suggests that a department either is ignoring or is unaware of the important contributions that this field of study is making to political science. Second, whatever the reasons for the absence of such courses, future political scientists are being trained without sufficient knowledge about women and politics scholarship.

Resistance to such information may be measured by how few articles on women and politics appeared in the *American Political Science Review*: From its founding in 1904 through 1991, 24 articles appeared. In 1991, APSA's Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession conducted a survey of editors of 55 political and social science journals. Thirty editors responded with full or partial information. They were asked about involvement of women as editors and authors, and about publication of articles on gender and politics during 1988–1990. About 16% of editorial board members were women. *The Policy Studies Journal* reported the highest proportion (29% over three years). *Public Choice* reported no women on their board in three years. *APSR* was the median institution reporting, with 15% women. Women were represented on editorial boards at a rate that was less than their representation in the profession (24%), but greater than their proportion of advanced ranks (11%). Twenty percent of all articles published had at least one woman author. *APSR* fell just below the median at 14%. For the 12 editors who said they were able to determine whether submissions addressed gender and politics, 2% of all articles submitted were reported to address themes of gender and politics (37 of 1533 submissions); but these papers made up 4% of all published articles (28 of 667), indicating submissions on gender and politics had a higher survival rate than other articles. Articles on gender were twice as likely to be submitted in American politics and public policy, as compared to international relations and comparative politics. However, in all fields, the publication rate exceeded the submission rate.

Indeed, some women and politics scholars who served on the *APSR* editorial board noted that there were surprisingly few submissions from researchers in this area. By the late 1990s, many women and politics scholars had come to view *APSR* as so dominated by the rational choice approach, that they did not bother submitting their work to the journal.

There were, broadly speaking, two types of women and politics research throughout the 1990s: accommodationist and transformational. Accommodationist scholars adopted the discipline's conventional epistemology (positivism, with scientific explanation and prediction as the goal), concepts (such as voting, parties, nation-states, war and peace, political attitudes and participation) and methods (quantitative, survey research), and added women as political actors. Transformationalists employed a postpositivist epistemology (empirical, with interpretation as the goal), new concepts (largely drawn from the feminist movement), and expanded understandings of method (qualitative, in-depth interviews, participant observation, poststructural, ethnography).

The transformational challenge was described by Susan J. Carroll and Linda Zerilli in their "Feminist Challenges to Political Science" in *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II* (APSA 1993). "Women" as a concept incorporated identities, histories and contexts of class, race, and sexuality. "Just as feminists have shown that one cannot treat gender as a mere variable, neither can one treat race and class as mere variables" (71). Women's politics appeared in so-called nonconventional places (voluntary associations, mutual aid societies, battered women's shelters) and new policy areas (sexual harassment, reproductive rights).

At the 2000 APSA "Roundtable on: Has the Study of Women/Gender Changed Political Science?," Nancy Hartsock stated that there has been no significant change in the discipline's epistemology, ontology, or methodology in spite of decades of feminist scholarship. Political science was still characterized by an unexamined positivism, standard political problems that did not include what many feminist researchers found equally real and interesting, and quantitative and rational choice methodologies to the exclusion of qualitative approaches. Ann Tickner voiced a similar theme at the "Roundtable on the State of Gender Studies in Political Sci-

ence." Describing the field of international relations, she noted the dominance of a conventional ontology: states, rational actors and wars, with few inroads made by feminists who focused on social relations, global links, social structures, rape, prostitution, the sex slave traffic, refugees, and injustice towards the marginalized. Feminist research that was not rational choice or positivist was dismissed by journal editors as "Interesting, but not International Relations or scientific."

At the 1997 APSA meeting, the Women's Caucus for Political Science conducted a mentoring session for 30 graduate students from across the country, who met with a dozen senior women in the discipline. The graduate students reported that little had changed in Ph.D.-granting institutions over the past 20 years. Few courses were offered in the field of women and politics. Few faculty integrated feminist scholarship into their courses. Students were dissuaded from doing dissertations on feminist subjects, either with the claim that the department lacked the expertise to supervise such dissertations, or with the threat that such topics would impair the students' employment prospects.

To address this problem, the Women's Caucus and the Women and Politics Research Section of APSA has sponsored conferences for advanced graduate students in connection with APSA's annual meeting. At the 2000 Frontiers of Women and Politics Research conference for advanced graduate students, a number of scholars doing feminist work in the discipline assessed the state of research—and, specifically, the extent to which feminist perspectives have been incorporated into the conceptual frameworks of four central subfields: international politics, U.S. politics, comparative politics, and political theory. While all acknowledged that a great deal of high-quality research and writing is taking place, they explained that it is too often the case that some researchers fail to take account of that research and its potential consequences for reframing and enlivening some central debates of the discipline. Feminist research—which focuses on difference, inequality, the relationship between public and private, and the interstructuring of race, gender, and ethnicity—has the potential to transform the discipline in profound and productive ways. However, such research is still often marginalized and may even be considered by some to be irrelevant to political analysis. Because some of the presentations at this conference are helpful in articulating the issues on gender and research in political science, it is useful to provide a summary of some key points made in relationships to each subfield:[3]

International Politics: Cynthia Enloe noted that "it's a risk to be a political scientist located in the U.S.," and she cautioned everyone—whether scholars working on U.S. themes or in international or comparative politics—to *contextualize* their work. She warned that it is all too easy to treat the U.S. experience as both normative and normal. Adopting a more international perspective can facilitate asking comparative questions and seeing all our frameworks more critically. Elisabeth Prugl noted that most research in IPE focuses on the rules of international political economy—questions of "economic governance." She encouraged researchers to explore how that international political economy is creating "landscapes" that have significant impacts on gender, and urged more attention to research that examines international women's movements or advocacy groups.

American Politics: Sue Carroll urged scholars to consider the relevance of feminist theory for empirical work. She offered a number of challenges: to bring the insights of theory into the construction of empirical research projects; and to do a better job of making those theoretical perspectives and assumptions evident in the ways we engage in research that attends to the specifics of people's lives. Cathy Cohen argued that much of the best research about the political behavior of women of color in the U.S. comes from disciplines *other* than political science; and that some of the most exciting work in political science is being done by graduate students, who are creating data sets and developing interview strategies, to enable them to explore interstructuring of gender, ethnicity, and race.

Comparative Politics: Amrita Basu argued that, although comparative politics as a field has been slow to recognize or incorporate feminist perspectives, there is, in fact, much in common between the comparativist and the feminist approaches: specifically, both are interested in comparison and in difference. On the one hand, she suggested that the influence of women and gender perspectives within the subfields may be further weakened because of the decline of area studies, which has become more interdisciplinary. Although comparativists and feminists share interests, the field of comparative politics has been moving toward a focus on sameness, while feminist scholarship has focused more on understanding differences. In fact, feminist scholars are doing very important work on such issues as nationalism, transitions to democracy, and social movements—work that could have an important, transformative impact on the discipline. Mary Katzenstein argued along related lines that we need to put *culture* "front and center," and broaden our attention to realms beyond those considered arenas for "state action." She noted that it is important to highlight the ways inequality is normalized and made invisible. As did others, she applauded the renewed interest in "civil society," a broadening that represents a potential opening for feminist work. Yet little of that work focuses on inequality, or on the role of the state as a potential source of remediation of that inequality.

Political Theory: Joan Tronto and Nancy Hirschmann emphasized several related themes in their review of the status of feminist work within the subfield of political theory. Again, both noted that much important work is being done; on the other hand, it is still possible to write about historical topics without any acknowledgment of feminist insights about major figures. Both noted that theory should connect with contemporary issues, and it should offer visions of alternative possibilities.

Looking Ahead: Removing Barriers for Women Political Scientists

In order to attain both the integration of women into the profession of political science and fuller understandings of the contributions women make to politics, it is important to examine policies and practices that may serve as barriers to women's full participation.

At least as much as in other professions and academic disciplines, women in political science are by no means ensured equal opportunity by simply being treated the same as men are or have been in the past. This is because the profession of political science has been constructed for men and their life timetables, in many respects with the implicit assumption that "someone else" was at home to take care of their families. Thus, certain oft-unexamined practices make it harder for women who have such responsibilities to participate fully in professional activities. For example, APSA holds its national convention on Labor Day weekend, which occurs right before most American children's school years resume. Furthermore, many women work in teaching institutions and this same time often is the first week of classes, so for these faculty the timing

may also make participation more difficult. If women are to participate in the profession on equal terms with men, a number of adjustments must be made. These include the provision of pregnancy leave, parental leave, and child care (in the case of the former two, preferably paid leave, and the last preferably subsidized); adjustments of the tenure clock for those with responsibility for child care or elderly relatives; and mentoring for junior faculty.

Leave should be available for childbirth and any pregnancy-related disability on exactly the same terms as it is for illness or injury. While pregnancy is not, of course, a disability, it and childbirth do have disabling aspects and disabling periods (albeit varying widely from one woman to another and one pregnancy to another), and these must be treated by employers in the same way as the disabling aspects or periods of other conditions. There should be little disagreement about this leave being paid leave. Parental leave, after the birth or adoption of a child, should be made available on a gender-free basis. It is sometimes noted that such provision may inadvertently advantage some male professors who are not in fact taking primary or equally shared responsibility for their children's care. While there is some merit to this point, it seems necessary that parental leave be gender free, both in order to ensure fairness to those male professionals who share responsibility, and to encourage others to share equally in the care of their children. It is highly desirable that parental leave be paid leave, though this is more controversial than in the case of the disability leave discussed above. On the one hand, single parents cannot take advantage of it at all if it is not paid leave; on the other, families in which the nonpolitical-scientist parent undertakes the vast bulk of the child care will miss out on the benefit of paid leave not taken. The potential unfairness of a paid parental leave policy could be mitigated if it were part of a menu of benefit options. The same is the case with child care (including after-school care for older children), which universities should offer, at least as part of a menu of benefits, on a subsidized basis for all faculty and staff children. If parents are confident that their children are well cared for during working hours, they may focus undistractedly on teaching, research, and administration.

The tenure clock is another example of the construction of academic life around men's timetables. Unfortunately for universities, the clock's ticking coincides with the time at which young professional women are likely to want to bear children. Thus, to be fair to women, as well as to men who participate fully in rearing their children, the timing of tenure must be adjusted. Any political scientist who has acted as the caretaker of a small child or an elderly or sick relative should be permitted to have his or her tenure clock adjusted accordingly.

It also seems essential, if women political scientists are to be treated fairly, for mentorship to be provided to all junior faculty. Negotiating the pitfalls of the reappointment and tenure processes is difficult for most young academics, but is surely more often difficult for women, both because of the patterns noted above and because of their minority status within the profession. For women to have women mentors may not be always possible or even desirable. The literature on mentoring makes the point that it is often more advantageous for women and people of color to have mentors who are not like themselves (i.e., same sex or same ethnicity) because the most pertinent problem for these junior faculty may be a lack of information, and mentors like themselves may also lack information. However, in certain cases, especially in departments with a history of overwhelming maleness—which still exist—same-sex mentoring may be desirable. It may be helpful to assign *all* junior faculty two mentors, which has the added benefit of reducing dependency on a single individual. It would, of course, not be helpful to assign women and people of color two mentors while assigning males and Euro-Americans only one mentor because such imbalance would create problems. However, it is important to encourage women and faculty of color to form networks—within their institutions—that function as sources of career information. Finally, it should go without saying that universities should either achieve or continue to maintain high standards of nondiscrimination, and to act strongly and decisively to prevent sexual harassment and to punish it if it occurs.

Looking at Our Own Work: Committee on the Status of Women

The committee has taken on a number of projects and encouraged the development of analyses of women in the profession. Many of these have appeared in *PS* and have been cited in this article. Many more exist that we have not cited. The committee works closely with the Women's Caucus, and caucus presidents often attend the committee meetings to supply information, coordinate activities, and raise issues. The committee has also found it fruitful to work with the other status committees: The Committee on the Status of Blacks in the Profession, The Committee on the Status of Latinos y Latinas in the Profession, and The Committee on the Status of Gays, Lesbians, Bisexuals, and the Transgendered. In April of 2000, the four status committees created a joint letter to respond to APSA's strategic plan and the committees have consulted with each other on policy issues and nominations to APSA offices. The Committee on the Status of Women considers this collaborative work vital because these groups share a goal: eliminating bias that prevents political science from paying attention to work on the basis of merit. Furthermore, these committees share concerns about the importance of the incorporation of so-called marginalized groups into the study of politics, which would ensure that the discipline does not have a narrow focus either on the topic of white men or on epistemologies that favor large-scale data sets that may fail to take account of the contributions of groups with marginalized status.

Over the past decade or so, APSA and its various committees and caucuses have conducted a number of surveys and "climate reports," which address the situations of the groups represented by the status committees within the profession.[4] Some of the main themes in these reports articulate what it will take to move the profession (and its members) from a stance of "toleration" to one of "inclusion" and full acceptance. With relatively few exceptions (though these *do* exist, and their consequences are significant), most in the profession argue for the full inclusion of women, racial-ethnic, and sexual minorities within the profession. But what these reports note—and what reports from graduate students and female faculty at a variety of organizational meetings[5] seem to confirm—is that a considerable gap exists between a professed commitment to inclusion and the creation and maintenance of organizational and institutional structures that actually provide a welcoming climate that would serve as the basis for such inclusion.

These reports suggest that the first step to addressing the problem is recognition that the attention of many of these groups has moved from a primary focus on *recruitment* to an equal focus on *retention.* That is not to say that recruitment is not a problem—it is, particularly with respect to African Americans and Latinos. Rather, it is to acknowl-

edge that getting people into graduate school is only the beginning; helping people survive, thrive, make it into the professoriate, and achieve tenure is the next order on the agenda. This may be a more difficult step.

The progress of political science in these areas of recruitment and retention may be assessed through comparison with other social science disciplines. This comparison reveals that the figures on women are reasonably good; but those for minority scholars are far below the average of other social sciences. For example, in the fall of 1997, women represented 57% of all graduate enrollment in the social sciences.[6] In 1997, total graduate enrollment in all fields was 9% African American, 6% Asian, 1% American Indian, and 5% Hispanic/Latino. Figures for the social sciences as a whole were comparable to these averages for graduate enrollment in general. But within the discipline of political science, we find that 4.3% of graduate students were African American, 2% Latino, 0% American Indian, and 3% Asian. In fact, political science has the lowest proportion of minority students in graduate programs of all the social sciences, and lags behind natural sciences and engineering as well (Babco 2000, 297).

Both published reports and anecdotal evidence suggest that, in addition to differential recruitment (related to overall patterns of discrimination in society), once minorities (and women) get into graduate school, they often do not finish. Many studies cite hostile environments or environments of "benign neglect" as a strong contributory factor in dropout rates (National Research Council 1996). One might then ask, what are the components of this hostile or benignly neglectful climate? How will they vary with the situation or particular minority group under consideration? There are a number of common themes:

1. tokenism—being one of very few members of the group, which often results in the individual being overburdened by administrative tasks, mentoring, supervising dissertations, serving on committees, etc.;
2. inadequate mentoring and bias limitations on access to informal networks, because access to those networks often comes through relationships with others *in* one's group who are already there;
3. treating *research* on members of the group (e.g., blacks, Latinos, gays, women), or research that considers race, gender, or sexuality as a significant variable as *marginal* to the discipline and/or not serious political science; and, therefore, not making available adequate summer research funds, research assistantships, and other research tools;
4. treating *teaching* on these topics (racial politics, politics of sexuality, gender politics) as marginal and consequently devaluing those who do it;
5. sexual harassment (in the case of women, in particular)—not just of the quid pro quo type, but also of the "hostile environment" type, i.e., actions that make women (or gays/lesbians) and/or members of minority groups uncomfortable, place them under special scrutiny, and other such actions that harm workplace environments (Mink 2000);
6. issues of the hypervisibility of members of racial/ethnic minorities and of the invisibility (and consequent dilemmas around coming out) in case of gays and lesbians.

Reflection on these themes by APSA, departments, and individual members may move the profession toward the elimination of such biased practices that discredit persons on the basis of gender, ethnicity, and/or sexuality, so that political science will move toward being a profession based solely on the merit of the intellectual work.

APSA itself has worked to eliminate male bias in the selection of its leadership. Among the officers who served from 1990 to 1999, women were 39% of the vice presidents and 38.8% of council members; however, in the last 100 years there have been only two female presidents of the Association.[7] From 1990 to 1999, a total of 42 individuals served as officers or as president; 13, or 31% were women. During the same time, 55 opportunities to serve existed (six offices with treasurer appointed for two-year term); women filled 32.7% of the opportunities. During the 1980s, women filled only 25% of these opportunities. The lowest year was 1991 when no women were appointed to these posts; the best years were 1997 and 1999 when three of five posts were filled by women. Expanding to the Council as well as officers, 119 individuals served in the decade; 46 or 38.7% were women. Again for the same time, 135 opportunities to serve existed; women filled 53 or 39%. This compares very favorably to the 1980s when women filled 24.1% of these opportunities. The lowest year was 1990 when 21.4% were women; the best year was 1999 when 61.5% were women.[8]

Looking for Future Action: Specific Recommendations For Departments

- Departments should include women and politics courses and courses on U.S. ethnic groups as regular course offerings taught by tenure-track and tenured faculty.
- Departments should include qualitative methods in graduate methods course requirements: ethnology, discourse analysis, in-depth interviews, historical analyses, and other strategies of interpretation.
- Departments should actively pursue the various awards given by the Women's Caucus for Political Science (e.g., Best Treatment of Women in an American Politics Textbook, Most Women and Politics Course Offerings, and the like).
- Departments should institutionalize leave policies that are consistent with pregnancy and care for ill family members.
- Departments should have formalized mentoring programs that encourage women and men to be involved in both the formal and informal systems of information that help them develop their careers.
- Departments should develop reward structures that encourage and recognize good teaching and advising so that this valuable component of our work is given proper credit.

For APSA and Regional Associations:

- The APSA should conduct another survey to update information about the number of women and politics courses being offered at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. This should include questions about whether these courses serve to satisfy core requirements or merely serve as electives. APSA and regional associations should also support surveys conducted by the various status committees to accomplish these goals.
- APSA should conduct a survey of small grants given by APSA, to examine the ways in which these grants allocate resources in terms of subfields in political science, including women and politics. They should be sure that all grants from the association follow the above guidelines to eliminate barriers to women's participation in them.

- APSA should examine all programs that it supports—such as the Congressional Fellowship, the Preparing Future Faculty program, as well as other educational initiatives—to be sure that the programs observe all policies designed to remove barriers to women's participation, including family-friendly practices. Systematic analysis should be conducted on all programs to ensure that gender and/or ethnic bias does not exist within the programs' selection or retention practices. These programs should recognize gender scholarship as constitutive of important work in political science and to that end should be open to the variety of epistemologies that such work might represent.

- APSA should encourage the creation of a Committee on the Status of Asian Americans. APSA membership, in 2000 alone, indicates that Asian Americans (502) represent the second largest ethnic group, next to Caucasian (8379). An Asian-American status committee will not only promote interests of Asian Americans but will enable this group to work with other status committees on issues of underrepresentation.

- The status committees and the caucuses need to continue their work and APSA should continue to provide mechanisms to support this work. These groups provide important mechanisms for formal and informal mentoring, and assistance for those who find themselves isolated in their home departments.

For Regional and National Conferences:

- Conference Division heads should not automatically send gender-related papers to the women and politics section. These papers should be considered as part of subfield research.

- Conference Division heads should partner with the women and politics section in cosponsoring panels.

- Conference organizers and/or APSA should systematically track the involvement of women in Divisions through leadership and membership patterns and develop approaches to working with Organized Sections in order to rectify women's underparticipation.

For Journals:

- Journal editors should be encouraged to be open to articles that examine issues of everyday politics and so go beyond the examination of government institutions in order to more fully examine politics.

- Journal editors should be open to articles about women and politics, including those that employ qualitative methodologies. While *Women & Politics* focuses on these issues, the issues are sufficiently broad that other journals should seek articles that examine women's contributions to political life.

- *PS*, the most widely read journal in the profession, should continue to publish not only the results of these surveys and reports, but also articles/stories about departments and programs that work well, that effectively support women and minority graduate students and faculty members, and act to nurture their success in the profession.

Notes

1. Data for bachelor's degrees and master's degrees obtained from APSA, January 2001.
2. APSA supplied information from Sue Davis, March 2001.
3. This summary is provided by Martha Ackelsberg, President of the Women's Caucus for Political Science, 2000–2001.
4. This includes results from the report of survey of chairs and members by the Committee on Status of Gays and Lesbians in the Profession in 1993 and various reports on the "chilly climate" for women, most recently "Tenure in a Chilly Climate" (Anonymous and Anonymous 1999).
5. Most recently, at a session on "Surviving and Thriving in Political Science," at the Frontiers of Feminist Research II, miniconference held in Washington, DC August 30, 2000; and at a number of other sessions at the annual meeting that followed, in which graduate students, female faculty members, and faculty members of color shared their experiences.
6. Peter D. Syverson and Lisa Bagley, "Graduate Enrollment and Degrees, 1986–1997," Washington, DC: Council of Graduate Schools, 1998.
7. Data from APSA headquarters, Sue Davis, April 2001.
8. Data analysis for 1900–1999 by Georgia Duerst-Lahti with information from APSA headquarters, April 2001.

References

Anonymous and Anonymous. 1999. "Tenure in a Chilly Climate." *PS* 32:91–99.

Babco, Eleanor. 2000. "Professional Women and Minorities: A Total Human Resources Data Compendium." Thirteenth Edition. Washington, DC: Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology.

Carroll, Susan J., and Linda Zerilli. 1993. "Feminist Challenges to Political Science." In *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*, ed. Ada W. Finifter. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.

Committee on the Status of Women, American Political Science Association. 1992. "Improving the Status of Women in Political Science: A Report with Recommendations." *PS* 25:547–54.

Geiger, S., and T. Travis. 1997. "The Status of African American Faculty in Political Science Departments in the Southern Region." Full report may be obtained from Shirley Geiger, Savannah State University, Savannah, Georgia. The "Introduction" and "Conclusion" published in *PS* 30:219–21.

Hall, Susan T. 2000. "Political Science/Government Research Doctorates Awarded by Gender and Ethnicity 1981–1998" (Male/Female 1981–1998) and "Male/Female 1981–1998: # Receiving Ph.D.s Political Science/Government" and "Male/Female1981–1998: # Receiving PhD's as a % Political Science/Government." Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Studies. Science and Engineering Degrees: 1966–1997, NSF 00-310.

Kelly, Rita Mae, and Kimberly Fisher. 1993. "An Assessment of Articles About Women in the 'Top 15' Political Science Journals." *PS* 26:544–58.

Kelly, Rita Mae, Linda M. Williams, and Kimberly Fisher. 1994. "*Women & Politics*: An Assessment of its Role Within the Discipline of Political Science." *Women & Politics* 14(4): 3–18.

Klingemann, Hans-Dieter. 1986. "Ranking the Graduate Departments in the 1980s: Toward Objective Qualitative Indicators." *PS* 19:651–61.

Mathews, A. Lanethea, and Kristi Andersen. 2001. "A Gender Gap in Publishing? Women's Representation in Edited Political Science Books." *PS* 34:143–47.

Mazur, Amy G., and Andrew M. Appleton. 1997. "Mainstreaming Gender Research into the Classroom: Cases from Contemporary Western Europe." *PS* 30:194–95.

Mink, Gwendolyn. 2000. *Hostile Environment: The Political Betrayal of Sexually Harassed Women*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

National Research Council. 1996. "The Path to the Ph.D.: Measuring Graduate Attrition in the Sciences and Humanities." Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Sarkees, Meredith Reid, and Nancy E. McGlen. 1999. "Misdirected Backlash: The Evolving Nature of Academia and the Status of Women in Political Science." *PS* 32:100–108.

Southern Education Foundation. 1995. "Redeeming the American Promise: Report of the Panel on Educational Opportunity and Post-secondary Desegregation." Atlanta.

Syverson, Peter D., and Lisa Bagley. 1998. "Graduate Enrollment and Degrees, 1986–1997," Washington, DC: Council of Graduate Schools.