(McDermott 2019). Second, we still find evidence of these effects among those with more education, although those effects are slightly diminished.[2]

The implication of this research for political science is that men have an important role to play in advancing gender equity. Although changing the composition of networks and professional opportunities is key, the conversations that happen among men should not be overlooked as opportunities to make change and create new norms in the discipline. This means that men will need to listen to the experiences of women—but our work also emphasizes that men need to talk to other men. Often, discussions of gender occur when women are present, precisely *because* women are present. Men should push themselves to have these conversations in less diverse contexts as well. Given that many spaces are still male-dominated—as evidenced by gendered citation and coauthorship networks (Dion, Sumner, and Mitchell 2018; Teele and Thelen 2017)—men should consider how they can talk about gender equity even when women are not present. Contributing to norms that support victims of harassment and condemn retaliation may be especially important (McDermott 2019). Simultaneously, of course, the discipline should work to make progress so that those settings become fewer and farther between. Diversifying networks while simultaneously challenging gender inequity in homogeneous networks can powerfully reshape social norms, which often is a crucial component for overcoming patterns of mistrust and discrimination (Paluck and Chwe 2017).

We think this is an important piece of a broader strategy to challenge gender inequities; however, we also must acknowledge the limitations to interventions by allies. To achieve gender equity, it is essential that allies do not overpower the voices of those marginalized because of gender. Instead, they should work to dismantle barriers within the discipline while using their ability to communicate with those who do not view gender inequity as a problem or with those who cannot identify how they may contribute to inequalities within the discipline. Working to "speak up" but not to "speak for" is a difficult balancing act but might be strictly necessary in homogeneous spaces.

Finally, more work is needed on this important topic. Our research focused on gender-relevant messages between men and women, but the images of men and women shown to subjects in our experiment were white. We did this to hold other demographic differences constant. However, this choice means that we do not know whether men of a different race, socioeconomic status, or sexuality would be equally effective as messengers. It may be that men from marginalized groups face greater challenges when advocating for women because scholars from dominant groups may tend to interact with and be influenced by messengers who are "like them" (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Cook 2001). Examining these possibilities is important not only for addressing issues of gender inequity but also for addressing other equity issues in the discipline. ∎

NOTES

1. This experiment was administered to two different samples: one convenience sample through Mechanical Turk (N=1,137) and one nationally representative sample through Qualtrics (N=1,000). Our dependent variables of interest measured support for the #MeToo Movement.

2. Those with a higher level of education are less likely to avoid a #MeToo message from a woman (in one of our two samples). Similarly, our results are somewhat stronger among those with less education. However, there still are persuasive effects even for those with a higher level of education.

REFERENCES

Brown, Nadia E. 2019. "Mentoring, Sexual Harassment, and Black Women Academics." *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* 40 (1): 166–73.

Czopp, Alexander M., and Margo J. Monteith. 2003. "Confronting Prejudice (Literally): Reactions to Confrontations of Racial and Gender Bias." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 29 (4): 532–44.

Dion, Michelle L., Jane Lawrence Sumner, and Sara McLaughlin Mitchell. 2018. "Gendered Citation Patterns Across Political Science and Social Science Methodology Fields." *Political Analysis* 26 (3): 312–27.

Dodd, Elizabeth H., Traci A. Giuliano, Jori M. Boutell, and Brooke E. Moran. 2001. "Respected or Rejected: Perceptions of Women Who Confront Sexist Remarks." *Sex Roles* 45 (7–8): 567–77.

Fitzgerald, Louise F., Suzanne Swan, and Karla Fischer. 1995. "Why Didn't She Just Report Him? The Psychological and Legal Implications of Women's Responses to Sexual Harassment." *Journal of Social Issues* 51 (1): 117–38.

Kaiser, Cheryl R., and Carol T. Miller. 2001. "Stop Complaining! The Social Costs of Making Attributions to Discrimination." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 27 (2): 254–63.

McDermott, Rose. 2019. "Political Science's #MeToo Moment." *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* 40 (1): 148–55.

McPherson, Miller, Lynn Smith-Lovin, and James M. Cook. 2001. "Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27 (1): 415–44.

Munger, Kevin. 2017. "Tweetment Effects on the Tweeted: Experimentally Reducing Racist Harassment." *Political Behavior* 39 (3): 629–49.

Paluck, Elizabeth Levy, and Michael Suk-Young Chwe. 2017. "Confronting Hate Collectively." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50 (4): 990–92.

Rasinski, Heather M., and Alexander M. Czopp. 2010. "The Effect of Target Status on Witnesses' Reactions to Confrontations of Bias." *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 32 (1): 8–16.

Sulfaro, Valerie A., and Rebecca Gill. 2019. "Title IX: Help or Hindrance?" *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* 40 (1): 204–27.

Teele, Dawn Langan, and Kathleen Thelen. 2017. "Gender in the Journals: Publication Patterns in Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50 (2): 433–47.

Testa, Paul F., Tarah Williams, Kylee Britzman, and Matthew V. Hibbing. Forthcoming. "Getting the Message? Choice, Self-Selection, and the Efficacy of Social Movement Arguments." *Journal of Experimental Political Science*.

HOW MEN CAN "STAND UP" FOR WOMEN IN GROUP SETTINGS

Tina Zappile, *Stockton University*

How can we use the impressive body of research on gender dynamics in group settings to make meaningful changes toward advancing gender equity in our discipline, on our campuses, and in other spheres of our lives? This article highlights key takeaways and practical strategies from empirical research in multiple disciplines.

First, why focus on group dynamics? Academic life consists of navigating a system of formal and informal networks and groups. This article focuses on how men can advance gender equity in group settings; however, it also is important to recognize the need for greater equity for people of color (men as well as women), non-Western scholars, LGBTQ scholars, and other underrepresented groups in the discipline. After all, although our discipline has seen the emergence of the #WomenAlsoKnowStuff movement, Weber (2015) noted that the inaugural International Studies Association

Sapphire Series of high-profile panels were gender balanced... without a single person of color.

Although the emphasis in this article is on what happens in a group setting, of equal importance is the type of groups in which women participate. For example, empirical research on labor in academia demonstrates that women often take on most of the invisible disciplinary and institutional labor that carries a burden of extra time and energy, which then can reduce their ability to fully participate in groups centered around their research. They also are less likely to take on administrative and/or leadership roles with higher profiles and more power. The invisible labor of women of color is particularly troubling because that work (e.g., supporting students of color) has been identified as strategically important, yet it remains unrewarded through the tenure and promotion process (Matthew 2016). To "fully play their role" in our discipline, women and their voices must be included in research groups and networks, from leadership positions and editorial boards within our professional organizations and journals to high-profile committees with greater visibility and decision-making power. How can we resolve the tension between gender equity and diversity so that women do not have to be everywhere? Given the demographics of the discipline shifting from only 10% of female full professors in 1980 to 28.6% in 2010 (APSA 2011; Dionne 2019), an equity approach to service is recommended. Men in leadership and administrative roles can assign, approve, and recommend service roles with a higher workload and lower profile to men with seniority. This is especially important for departments and institutions in which women are underrepresented and stretched thin because they have assumed a greater burden of service toward the goal of diversity. Instead, women could be given opportunities for higher-profile service roles with lower workloads. At the same time, women also must be rewarded for the work they choose to do instead of being shepherded away from it. Equity requires meaningful changes to standards for tenure and promotion that recognize the diversity of work being done by women in our discipline, and it expands the notion of a "model" colleague in the three areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The flexibility of our jobs opens doors for incredible opportunities for different types of work, yet standards for tenure and promotion may serve to punish those who deviate from the narrowly defined work model(s) established mostly by men.

beyond" the issue of representation (Barnes 2016, 17); and female judges in the United States more often deciding cases in favor of the party alleging gender discrimination and influencing male judges on mixed-gender panels to do the same (Boyd, Epstein, and Martin 2010). In business, more women on corporate boards leads to improvements in monitoring (Adams and Ferreira 2009) and strategy (Post and Byron 2015) functions.

Organizational Rules Matter

To preserve and/or amplify women's voices (regardless of how many are present), men can advocate for decision-making rules based on consensus or unanimity. Research in our own discipline (Karpowitz and Mendelberg 2014) demonstrated that women's voices in smaller groups (i.e., fewer than 10) are more likely to be suppressed when deliberation and decision making are based on majority rule *and* there are fewer than a majority of women present. Small groups essentially can preserve the voices of women through two choices: "unanimous rule and few women, or (...) majority rule and many women" (Karpowitz, Mendelberg, and Shaker 2012, 533). This challenges our understanding of a "critical mass," in which there are more than one but fewer than 50% women in a group. Simply stated, a critical mass of women may suffer the same suppression in a group that operates under majority rule. So, what can men do? Unless a group already has a majority of women, men can advocate strongly for and implement a different set of rules—for example, consensus or unanimity—that may foster greater dialogue and debate and may require more than 50% buy-in for decisions. Paying closer attention to organizational rules and encouraging more dialogue in decision making might be better for everyone.

Amplification

Amplification is a strategy that can be used by men in any group setting, regardless of organizational rules, to limit the suppression of women's voices and go one step further to amplify their contributions. It is borrowed directly from the term used by White House staffers under Barack Obama to describe what they did during meetings, according to Eilperin (2016): "When a woman made a key point, other women would repeat it, giving credit to its author. This forced the men in the room to recognize the contribution—and denied them the chance to claim the idea as their own." This may entail saying, "Thanks, (her/them), that is an excellent idea for us to

The strategies presented herein focus on preserving (i.e., not diminishing) and amplifying the voices of women in groups, recognizing that whereas their presence is a necessary condition for gender equity, it is not sufficient. In short, their voices also must be heard.

The strategies presented herein focus on preserving (i.e., not diminishing) and amplifying the voices of women in groups, recognizing that whereas their presence is a necessary condition for gender equity, it is not sufficient. In short, their voices also must be heard. We know from empirical research that when women are present and their voices are heard, it can change group outcomes *for the better.* Examples in politics include more women in Parliament leading to more stringent climate-change policies (Mavisakalyan and Tarverdi 2019); women's participation in legislative bodies improving democracy "above and

pursue further" or "I'd like to return to what (she/they) said, it was a good insight for us to consider further." This strategy also can shift the way that others interact with women in the room: Eilperin (2016) reported that because of this "amplification" by Obama's aides, he called on women and junior aides more often as a result.

Although developed by women for women, men can use the same strategy. Amplification also can mean directly calling on a woman first when moderating a roundtable, chairing a panel, and soliciting questions and/or input from an audience (Hinsley, Sutherland, and Johnston 2017).

Interruptions

We know from empirical research that when women speak, they are more likely than men to be interrupted (Cannon, Robinson, and Smith-Lovin 2019; Jacobi and Schweers 2017). However, research in linguistics provides a more nuanced story, identifying different types of interruptions. Cooperative interruptions are intended to help the speaker by offering agreement, assistance, and/or clarification (Li 2001). When used in combination with the amplification strategy, this type of interruption may be acceptable. Intrusive interruptions, conversely, are disruptive and can take the form of disagreement, floor taking, topic change, and/or tangentialization (Li 2001). Men can establish a rule or a norm of avoiding intrusive interruptions as a clear boundary within a group and then hold other people (i.e., men) accountable by reminding them of this expectation and explicitly calling it out when it occurs. As a variant on the amplification strategy, men can do this by responding directly to intrusive interruptions with language such as "(she/they) was interrupted and I'd like to hear what (she/they) has to say" or "I don't think (she/they) was done, let's hear the rest of what (she/they) has to say."

If men are willing to take accountability for their own pattern of interrupting others, they can put this strategy into action by using a technique from sports. Men can figure out their average rate of (intrusive) interruptions by tallying them at their next meeting and then set a goal to reduce that rate by paying close attention when they are about to speak, evaluating whether what they want to say meets the criteria of an intrusive interruption. If they are on the fence, the answer is usually "yes." Men can self-correct by stopping themselves from speaking in the moment, saying something more cooperative, or using the amplification strategy. To be fair, this may not be natural and some men may even protest in the spirit of Robert Altman, who famously used "overlapping sound and dialogue [...] as a symbol of the messiness of real life" (University of Michigan 2013).

Give Credit Where Credit Is Due

Men can explicitly praise the contributions of women to others outside of a group, with the intention of making their contributions more visible (Hinsley, Sutherland, and Johnston 2017). This credit should be clear and specific. Ambiguity about who is responsible and deserves credit for group effort can exacerbate gender inequality because "women are rated as being less competent, less influential, and less likely to have played a leadership role on the task than men in the same group" (Chang and Milkman 2020). This also may include giving clear credit for publications through an acknowledgments section because norms for the order of author names vary across subfields in our discipline and can create confusion about where credit is due.

In conclusion, men can be powerful advocates for gender equity in the discipline and workplace. A key area for improvement is understanding the context of gender dynamics in group settings and actively adapting their own behavior in response. Why might this be difficult for some men to do in practice? Lack of awareness is one explanation; however, it also must be said that "men who (speak) up with ideas (are) seen as having higher status and were more likely to emerge as leaders" (McClean et al. 2018). These strategies indirectly may threaten or reduce their power and influence, and men must first come to terms with that before they can purport to be an advocate for gender (or racial) equity.

REFERENCES

Adams, Renée B., and Daniel Ferreira. 2009. "Women in the Boardroom and Their Impact on Governance and Performance." *Journal of Financial Economics* 94 (2): 291–309.

American Political Science Association. 2011. *Task Force on Political Science in the 21st Century*. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.

Barnes, Tiffany. 2016. *Gendering Legislative Behavior*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boyd, Christina L., Lee Epstein, and Andrew D. Martin. 2010. "Untangling the Causal Effects of Sex on Judging." *American Journal of Political Science* 54 (2): 389–411.

Cannon, Bryan C., Dawn T. Robinson, and Lynn Smith-Lovin. 2019. "How Do We 'Do Gender'? Permeation as Over-Talking and Talking Over." *Socius* 5: 2378023119849347.

Chang, Edward H., and Katherine L. Milkman. 2020. "Improving Decisions That Affect Gender Equality in the Workplace." *Organizational Dynamics* 49 (1): 100709.

Dionne, Kim Yi. 2019. "There's a Gender Gap in Political Science: Our Series Examines the Problem—and Looks at Some Solutions." *Monkey Cage* [blog], August 19. www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2019/08/19/theres-gender-gap-political-science-our-series-examines-problem-looks-some-solutions.

Eilperin, Juliet. 2016. "White House Women Want to Be in the Room Where It Happens." *Washington Post*, September 13. www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/wp/2016/09/13/white-house-women-are-now-in-the-room-where-it-happens.

Hinsley, Amy, William J. Sutherland, and Alison Johnston. 2017. "Men Ask More Questions Than Women at a Scientific Conference." *PloS One* 12 (10):e0185534.

Jacobi, Tonja, and Dylan Schweers. 2017. "Justice, Interrupted: The Effect of Gender, Ideology, and Seniority at Supreme Court Oral Arguments." *Virginia Law Review* 103 (7): 1379–485.

Karpowitz, Christopher F., and Tali Mendelberg. 2014. *The Silent Sex: Gender, Deliberation, and Institutions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Karpowitz, Christopher F., Tali Mendelberg, and Lee Shaker. 2012. "Gender Inequality in Deliberative Participation." *American Political Science Review* 106 (3): 533–47.

Li, Han Z. 2001. "Cooperative and Intrusive Interruptions in Inter- and Intracultural Dyadic Discourse." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 20 (3): 259–84.

Matthew, Patricia. 2016. "What Is Faculty Diversity Worth to a University?" *The Atlantic*, November 23. www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/11/what-is-faculty-diversity-worth-to-a-university/508334.

Mavisakalyan, Astghik, and Yashar Tarverdi. 2019. "Gender and Climate Change: Do Female Parliamentarians Make a Difference?" *European Journal of Political Economy* 56:151–64.

McClean, Elizabeth J., Sean R. Martin, Kyle J. Emich, and Col. Todd Woodruff. 2018. "The Social Consequences of Voice: An Examination of Voice Type and Gender on Status and Subsequent Leader Emergence." *Academy of Management Journal* 61 (5): 1869–91.

Post, Corinne, and Kris Byron. 2015. "Women on Boards and Firm Financial Performance: A Meta-Analysis." *Academy of Management Journal* 58 (5): 1546–71.

University of Michigan. 2013. "Altman Sound & Music." In *The Many Hats of Robert Altman: A Life in Cinema* [Online Exhibit]. https://apps.lib.umich.edu/online-exhibits/exhibits/show/altman.

Weber, Cynthia. 2015. "ISA's Sapphire Series: Is Blue the New White?" *Duck of Minerva* [blog], February 6. https://duckofminerva.com/2015/02/isas-sapphire-series-is-blue-the-new-white.html.

ARE YOU REALLY ABOUT IT? DEVELOPING A CRITICAL PRAXIS FOR MEN IN THE DISCIPLINE

Guillermo Caballero, *Purdue University*

Practicing gender equity for men means, in part, keeping ourselves accountable. However, for what are we being held accountable?[1] I contend that one approach that men can take to advance gender equity is for us to develop critical frameworks to help us (i.e., men) interpret when women are being marginalized in the political science discipline in everyday social moments.