underrepresented colleagues to do the work. Tina Zappile calls for men to “stand up” for women in groups. There are many formal and informal groups in academic life, and she discusses how men can ensure that women are not excluded from the benefits of these groups. Based on Black and Latina feminist literature as well as his personal experience, Guillermo Caballero presents a framework for men to understand their actions and change problematic behavior. Elizabeth Carlson and Christopher Zorn share their experience in developing search-committee processes aimed at mitigating implicit bias in letters of recommendation for new faculty hires. As they explain, this has increased the number of women candidates interviewed and hired. Finally, Patricia A. Stapleton and Melissa R. Michelson offer insights gained from the #MeTooPoliSci collective and APSA’s survey of women in the profession. In addition to corroborating the disproportionate service burden and negative bias in student evaluations of teaching, they offer practical methods for men to ally with their women colleagues.

We also recognize the diverse scholars that reviewed the spotlight articles: Lisa Argyle, Victor Asal, Marijke Breuning, Paul Collins, Kerry Crawford, Emily Farris, Julia Marin Hellwege, Mirya Holman, Matt Lebo, Melissa Michelson, Sarah McLaughlin Mitchell, Rebecca Reid, David Siegel, Cameron Thies, John Tuman, Lee Walker, Tarah Williams, Anne M. Whitesell, Leah Windsor, and Kim Yi Dionne. This entire spotlight is a collective effort of the writers, editors, and reviewers, and it is intended to capture the diversity of our discipline and to engage mid- and early-career men in allyship.

NOTE
1. We are sensitive to the potential downside of using the “allyship” label to describe men’s work in promoting gender equity. For a helpful review of these issues, see Carlson et al. (2020). However, given the centrality of the term in the 2018 Hackathon’s discourse and the need to utilize commonly understood language for this concept, we opt to use the term.

REFERENCES

MENTORSHIP: “MEN IN THE MIDDLE” AND THEIR ROLE AS ALLIES IN ADDRESSING GENDER BIAS
Leah C. Windsor, The University of Memphis
Cameron G. Thies, Arizona State University

DOI:10.1017/S1049096521000044

The issue of mentorship for women in political science has gained traction and prominence in recent years. Conceptualized initially as a “leaky pipeline” (Blickenstaff 2005), Crawford and Windsor (2021) suggest that a “chutes and ladders game” is a better metaphor for the twists and turns of academic careers given endogenous bias and exogenous life events. The pioneering leadership of female scholars in the Women’s Caucus for Political Science and the Women’s Caucus in International Studies, for example, have provided professional support that has helped women navigate male-dominated academic spaces (Akos and Kretchmar 2016; Claypool et al. 2017; Crawford and Windsor 2019; Hesli, Lee, and Mitchell 2012; Mitchell and Martin 2018; Mitchell, Lange, and Brus 2013). Programs including Visions in Methodology, Journeys in World Politics, and Pay It Forward have continued these efforts, providing best practices for tangible skills such as bargaining and negotiations (Mitchell and Hesli 2013), navigating the job market (Kim and Grofman 2019), achieving balance amid the competing demands of work and family formation (Kim, Fitzsimons, and Kay 2018), and maximizing their research productivity (Hancock, Baum, and Breuning 2013). Led by women for women, these groups have been a necessary first step for validating the legitimate concerns of women in our profession.

Women initially embraced the message of “lean in” promoted by Sandberg (2013) as a call to support one another, but the movement quickly lost favor given its reliance on classism and
sexism (Kim, Fitzsimons, and Kay 2018). Women can lean in when they have ample support systems, social safety nets, financial security, and often stay-at-home spouses (or surrogates in the form of nannies, personal assistants, or other support staff). Leaning in also places the burden of responsibility on women, reflected in the collective silence of male colleagues toward this policy.

Even worse, leaning in can backfire and foster an antagonistic workplace, such as women suffering professional penalties for bargaining and negotiating (Mitchell and Hesli 2013; Tinsley et al. 2009). Men receive no formal training about how to be deliberate workplace, such as women suffering professional penalties for

We offer several propositions about why this may be the case: (1) men do not see how it explicitly applies to them; (2) men feel that they have nothing substantively to contribute to the conversation; and (3) “woke” men may have concerns about the perception of “mansplaining” in a space geared toward women’s advancement. In the first case, men may have come to understand

We offer several propositions about why this may be the case: (1) men do not see how it explicitly applies to them; (2) men feel that they have nothing substantively to contribute to the conversation; and (3) “woke” men may have concerns about the perception of “mansplaining” in a space geared toward women’s advancement.

that experiences in academia are gendered; however, given that women began the movement to manage their differential experience, they should be left to pursue it. Relatedly, in the second case, because women created the various caucuses and programs for mentoring other women, men may feel that their advice is not needed. In the third case, men who are concerned about women in academia may feel that their advice is not wanted. The responsibility for creating a culture change regarding gender bias in academia should not be the exclusive purview of women; rather, it should fall on men to individually change their behavior. There are proven institutional strategies for reducing biases and changes at the systemic level that can be implemented from the top down from the provost offices through colleges and academic units. There also are classroom and interpersonal strategies that men and women can adopt, many of which were outlined in the American Political Science Association (2018) Hackathon.

To summarize, male colleagues need to “lean in” to their roles in addressing biases in academia. At the institutional and systemic levels, we argue that mentorship tracks—for example, at conferences—should include mentorship training and best practices for male colleagues. At a roundtable discussion at the 2019 International Studies Association Midwest Annual Conference, senior male scholars debated best practices in mentoring women+ graduate students. We need more of these open discussions to compare, assess, and promote strategies that will benefit women+ in the profession. Other strategies include learning to write gender-unbiased letters of recommendation (Madera, Hebl, and Martin 2009), increasing gender balance in syllabi (Sumner 2018), refusing to participate in “manels,” and setting the standard that women speak first in seminars (Carter et al. 2018). Conferences such as PolMeth began encouraging chairs and discussants to make a statement before the question-and-answer portion of conference presentations—citing Carter et al. (2018)—that they commit to calling on women+ in the audience first. All panels and roundtables at conferences can and should adopt this policy as a necessary step toward transforming academic culture.

In our institutions of higher education, more women+ should be hired and not penalized for family formation. Do not tell women+ when to start a family. Do not sexually harass women+ colleagues. Senior colleagues can model ideal behavior, call out other male peers for inappropriate and biased behavior, and be the standard bearers for junior colleagues. When men take parental leave, it should be for active parenting and not used for bonus research time (Antecol, Bedard, and Stearns 2018). Many men in our discipline have had long histories of mentoring women to success in obtaining a PhD, landing a tenure-track job, and achieving tenure and promotion. Their knowledge can be a useful bridge between the many caucuses and programs designed by women for women and the growing group of men who want to help the cause but may not know how. We need systemic initia-
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Growing research identifies problems in academia that contribute to the “leaky pipeline,” wherein academia fails to retain women faculty due to salary inequalities (Ginther 2003), publication inequities (Mathews and Anderson 2001; Teele and Thelen 2017), and promotion disparities (Misra et al. 2011; Monforti and Michelson 2008; Perna 2001; Social Sciences Feminist Network Research Interest Group 2017). Furthermore, “having children amplifies and intensifies all of the obstacles female scholars already face in academia” (Windsor and Crawford 2020, 276). As a result, nearly a third of tenured women consider leaving academia (Hurtado et al. 2012). Yet, little scholarship focuses on the disproportionate burdens of invisible labor on women and faculty of color (Turner 2002). Invisible labor consists of student-initiated (Whitaker 2017) mentorship, in which faculty provide “hands-on attention” to serve as role models, mentors, and even surrogate parents (June 2012) and engage in caregiving and emotional work (Hochschild 1989), especially pertaining to student diversification and inclusion (Flaherty 2019). This time-consuming work often is overlooked and undervalued because it is considered unnecessary and voluntary. Combined with rampant inequities in research and teaching, it is no surprise that women would consider alternative careers when overburdened with this service while remaining unacknowledged, underappreciated, and exhausted for it.

Invisible labor is necessary and valuable to universities and departments because it directly ties into teaching, mentorship, and student success. This work supports students by helping them contextualize family expectations and pressures; mental and physical health issues; and assault, racism, colonialism, and other aggressions. It teaches skills such as navigating power dynamics, conflict resolution, and leadership. Invisible labor responds to students’ needs and generates crucial relationships such that they feel that faculty—and thus departments—welcome them, value them, and care about them as a person. This labor therefore directly contributes to student recruitment, retention, and success.

Yet, invisible labor can be exploitative for women because they are predominantly assumed to take on caregiving roles associated with gender stereotypes and motherhood. Furthermore, this exploitation often is exacerbated by the incompatibility of academia and motherhood, which holds women back professionally and requires them to “solve” work-life balances (Ginther and Hayes 2003; Hesli, Lee, and Mitchell 2012; Hochschild and Machung 2012). Beyond their standard professional obligations as faculty, working mothers thus are faced with two additional “second shifts” in which women are relied on for caregiving and homemaking for their families and home life and for the “care of the academic family” (Guarrino and Borden 2017). Women thereby incur compounded invisible-labor responsibilities in both private and professional settings that remain uncredited, devalued, and ignored.

Yet, rather than suggesting that faculty avoid this work (Pyke 2011), departments should offer credit for it. They could assign a departmental committee to create a consensual, explicit definition of invisible labor that fits the unique needs of the department, faculty, and students. Defining invisible labor should consider that faculty vary in terms of the types of services they are able to provide, are comfortable providing, and are expected to provide. Furthermore, the types of invisible labor that faculty engage in can shift over time. Hence, defining this work within a context of existing faculty engagement in invisible labor may be helpful. Definitions should be inclusive, expanding upon traditionally narrow, masculine conceptions of “work” (Budd 2016) and including racialized tasks that require faculty of color to preserve white privileging systems in academia (Wingfield and Skeete 2016). As built and largely controlled by white men, academia has entrenched and perpetuated social inequalities that maintain white men as the default for scientific inquiry, “objective” observation, moral authority, and work ethic (Reid and Curry 2019; Thomas 2017). Definitions of invisible labor therefore should expand beyond traditional notions of service and work as performed by white men.

Because all crediting strategies depend on the distinction between basic faculty responsibilities and invisible labor, definitions likely will vary by department. Some departments may select to include (1) mentoring marginalized students to assist them in navigating college and potentially racially hostile environments; (2) assisting students with application materials for graduate programs, jobs, scholarships, and internships; or (3) offering credit for it. They could assign a departmental committee to create a consensual, explicit definition of invisible labor that fits the unique needs of the department, faculty, and students. Defining invisible labor should consider that faculty vary in terms of the types of services they are able to provide, are comfortable providing, and are expected to provide. Furthermore, the types of invisible labor that faculty engage in can shift over time. Hence, defining this work within a context of existing faculty engagement in invisible labor may be helpful. Definitions should be inclusive, expanding upon traditionally narrow, masculine conceptions of “work” (Budd 2016) and including racialized tasks that require faculty of color to preserve white privileging systems in academia (Wingfield and Skeete 2016). As built and largely controlled by white men, academia has entrenched and perpetuated social inequalities that maintain white men as the default for scientific inquiry, “objective” observation, moral authority, and work ethic (Reid and Curry 2019; Thomas 2017). Definitions of invisible labor therefore should expand beyond traditional notions of service and work as performed by white men.

Because all crediting strategies depend on the distinction between basic faculty responsibilities and invisible labor, definitions likely will vary by department. Some departments may select to include (1) mentoring marginalized students to assist them in navigating college and potentially racially hostile environments; (2) assisting students with application materials for graduate programs, jobs, scholarships, and internships; or (3) offering