

After reading the various papers that have been written for this working group/NSF grant, I am not confident I have any new insights to offer. The various authors have done an excellent job summarizing the various threads of literature that speak to this issue of building coalitions to advance diverse leadership and address discrimination in political science. But I shall try to be of use and to avoid repeating that which has already been said.

The first task, of course, is to have a coalition in place. One cannot agenda set without having built the coalition first. Bond (2015) addresses this issue in depth in her paper presented for the NSF workshop in January of 2015. But a key challenge to building and maintaining coalitions, is the issue of deciding what the end goal is (or are). While this might seem obvious.....a movement wants suffrage, or equal rights, or clean air.....it is never as clear as it seems. Because all of those goals have numerous iterations that can frustrate efforts....do we work for woman suffrage at the state level or a national amendment? Which rights do we want? Clean air but via cap and trade or monetary fines? Thus, the end goal must be agreed upon. So the first goal of this panel is to discuss what the priorities of the coalition should be. Agreement is not always easy. Thus the second goal of this panel is to identify procedures within coalitions for deciding priorities.

Identifying priorities is not an easy task. Sometimes, even recognizing that something is a problem is not easy. As Gaventa's (1982) work on the fourth face of power shows, those in power often construct mechanisms that prevent individuals from even seeing/identifying something as a problem. And another challenge in identifying priorities/goals is that the goal is not enough, there needs to be a plan for attaining that goal. For instance, we may agree we want to increase the level of diversity in academic leadership, but how? What will the mechanism(s) for doing so be? And we need to be sure we have a solid understanding of the pros and cons of the goals.

So, what should the priorities of the coalition be? As the title of the NSF grant suggests, two likely goals are to advance diverse leadership in Political Science and to address discrimination within the discipline. Thus the obvious first goal could be to increase the numbers of those from various backgrounds who hold positions of leadership within the discipline. This raises two

questions: How and why? I will address why first. There are both symbolic and practical reasons for increasing diversity in leadership in Political Science. At a practical level, we know from decades of research that the presence of women in political office is impactful. The research is most definitive on the impact of women, as they are the group that has reached statistically meaningful numbers. As I have summarized elsewhere (Henderson and Jeydel, 2014):

Scholars have shown that female legislators tend to hold more liberal views than their male colleagues do.<sup>67</sup> Women are also more likely to make feminist speeches on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives than their male colleagues are<sup>68</sup> and are more likely to take the lead in advocating for women's issues bills on the Hill.<sup>69</sup> Further, women are also more likely to sponsor or cosponsor feminist legislation in Congress than their male colleagues are.<sup>70</sup> Similarly, Swers, in her analysis of voting behavior in the 103rd (1993–1995) and 104th (1995–1997) Congresses, finds that women are more likely than men to vote for women's issues bills, even when controlling for ideological, partisan, and district factors.<sup>71</sup> And further, she finds that gender is more likely to influence a female representative's vote when the bill deals directly with issues that affect women, such as reproductive policy and women's health concerns, rather than on issues that do not affect women as directly, such as education.<sup>72</sup> Frederick finds similar patterns in the Senate. He finds that when female senators replace male senators they tend to be more supportive of women's issues than their male predecessors and when male senators replace female senators they are less supportive of women's issues than their female predecessors.<sup>73</sup> Thus, at the national level in the United States, the presence of women in Congress does make a difference; women are more likely than their male colleagues to introduce legislation of concern to women, to vote for women's issues bills, and to fight hard for their passage.

At the subnational level in the United States, a study in 1991 by the Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP) finds that women state legislators have distinct issue priorities from men and are more active on women's rights legislation than male legislators are.<sup>74</sup> For instance, women are more likely to sponsor or cosponsor feminist legislation than their male colleagues are.<sup>75</sup> And Thomas and Welch find that among state legislators, female-sponsored bills on women's issues are more likely to pass than are male-sponsored bills on men's issues.<sup>76</sup> Further, women actively advocating for women's issues appears to enable

their passage.<sup>77</sup> And, legislative committees in state legislatures that blocked anti-abortion legislation had a greater proportion of women on them than in the chamber at large.<sup>78</sup> Thus, as at the national and subnational levels in the United States, women clearly make a difference to the legislative agenda and output of those legislatures.

There is even more that can be added to that discussion in terms of the impact of women on legislatures. And the discussion can be carried to other countries, both developing and advanced industrial, where the presence of women is clearly impactful. So while it may have seemed obvious, the answer is yes, increasing diversity in leadership may impact the discipline. I say may, because the reason for our wanting to increase numbers matters, as the literature on the impact of women in executive office and judicial branches is not as clear. Female executives do not appear to behave terribly differently than their male counterparts (Henderson and Jeydel 2014) nor do female judges (Kenney 2012). So increasing diversity in the leadership ranks may not result in substantive change in terms of practical issues of concern to minority groups. But as Kenney (2012) argues, their presence is important for other reasons....namely symbolic ones. When people see people who look like them in positions of leadership then their belief in the legitimacy of the institution may increase. Thus the goal of increasing diversity in the leadership of Political Science is a worthy goal. So, how do we do that?

That is likely where much brainstorming needs to be done. Other papers from this grant have discussed methods, such as quotas, for increasing diversity. So I will not repeat what has previously been stated. Suffice to say, this is the more challenging piece of the puzzle and will require the vast majority of our attention, and may ultimately be a divisive issue as members of the coalition may not agree on the methods for increasing numbers. The “how” of something has often been a challenge for social movements seeking to affect change. For the women’s movement, this displayed itself in the divide between what are often called “liberal feminists” who wished to work primarily to change laws and “radical feminists” who largely wished to change the consciousness of individuals and who believed that the entire corporate, political, and academic structure, one that is male, white, privileged, and heteronormative should be torn down and rebuilt. This divide was also present in Act Up, as some members wanted to work mainly on increasing the accessibility of AIDS drugs and decreasing their cost, and others wished to work on changing individuals consciousness and US culture (Halcli 1999).

Another goal, albeit one that is controversial, is the whole scale restructuring of academe. I will address this briefly and mainly through a series of concerns that confront academia in the 21<sup>st</sup> century in general, but which are intimately connected to the goal of increasing diversity. Here are the main challenges that I would argue confront academe in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and beyond:

- Tenure. Does it still serve the purpose for which it was created? Or does it maintain some ineffective faculty (many of whom will be male given the numbers of tenured faculty in Political Science) who could be removed, thus making space for new faculty. This would benefit both women, minorities, and adjuncts. But, it also has its downsides which outweigh its benefits. But research and discussion would be beneficial. The other discussion around tenure is how it is awarded, what counts toward tenure, and such.
- Service work. This work is largely still done by women and minority groups for a variety of reasons. But one reason is that as diversity has increased, committees have sought to diversify their membership and as the ranks of those from diverse groups is often small, many get asked/recruited to multiple committees. And likely due to socialization and fear of reprisal, they accept these requests. Thus the vast majority of service work in academe is being placed on the shoulders of minority groups. This is not sustainable, it only serves to add to the burden of survival for minorities in academe as it is not often weighed very heavily in promotion and tenure decisions.
- Adjunct faculty. The ranks of adjunct faculty are growing. They are not paid well and generally do not have benefits. This is not sustainable either. So the question isn't just getting adjuncts into full time positions, but rather doing away all together with the abuse of adjunct faculty. There is always a need for some part time faculty, but we have clearly moved way beyond this.
- The role of research in tenure and what constitutes research.
- Are too many PhDs being awarded and does it take too long to complete one? And the treatment of doctoral students. <http://chronicle.com/article/The-Future-of-the-PhD/131749/>

All of these issues are connected to the goal of increasing diversity because all of them, in one way or another, are a barrier to various groups, and if things are left as they are, we may increase diversity but to what end? To sustain an institution that has not adapted to the changing times? To be in power but feel that there is no balance in one's life? There has been a bevy of recent articles by female corporate leaders, female political leaders, and female faculty, all discussing the insanity of working full time (especially if in a high powered position like a Dean, Provost, CEO, top political appointee), having a partner, having children, and trying to be present for them all. (Slaughter 2012). So to what end are we increasing diversity in an institution that is replete with problems? It has also been noted that under-represented groups are leaving political science for other fields (Hero 2015). Why? If increasing diversity in leadership is a goal, these other attendant issues must be addressed as well.

As Sjoberg (2015) argues, we are caught up trying to "home" the homeless and perhaps this is not the answer. Implicit in our discussion of increasing diversity is that there is a correct end goal...a more diverse leadership and faculty, one that will create change that benefits diverse groups. While I am not against these things, I am in favor of them, I am reticent to accept the idea that purely increasing diversity in Political Science and its leadership will solve the root problems. It is a bit of a band-aid. As we see with any theory that assumes a correct direction or path, for instance Rostow's Stages of Economic Growth (1991, 3d ed), this is often a flawed perspective that prevents us from seeing new ways of conceptualizing the world. Why are we trying to adapt and fit into an academic world created by and for white, heterosexual, males? A world that doesn't truly serve anyone, including students, very well any more.

So how do we decide what the priorities of the coalition will be. How do we insure that all voices are heard? I think the first task is to accept that we will not always be in agreement on every idea or plan of action, but that:

- Our voices are stronger if we work together
- Diversity of views and goals within a coalition can hurt it, as it can allow those in power to divide and conquer, but it can also be helpful. Diversity of ideas and views and goals can energize a coalition and provide new ways of conceptualizing problems and looking for answers. Arguably the women's suffrage movement benefited in various ways from the emergence of the younger, more militant wing. They brought a new energy, they brought new tactics, and they convinced those in political power

that they really needed to do something. Wilson became weary of the militant suffragettes, they were embarrassing him internationally and at home, and thus he wanted the issues resolved but didn't want to work with the militant branch. So, he became more amenable to working with the older wing (Jeydel 2004) . But the end result was the same....a national women's suffrage amendment.

- We do have common concerns. There is much that may divide us, but the overarching issue problem is one we all share: The system was created for men by men. It must change.

Next, we may need to adopt some practical skills for learning to work together. One useful tool is Non Violent Communication (NVC), as set forth by Marshall Rosenberg in the 1960s. NVC training is a useful tool to assist groups in learning how to effectively work together to achieve a common end. It would not be hard to conduct NVC training. <https://www.cnvc.org/> I have personally attended such trainings and found them very useful and my department at Oregon State had a member with such training who worked with us to use it in our deliberations.

We then will need some clear decision rules. NVC is based on attaining consensus and while this may sound like a monumental or impossible task, with proper training it is possible. Further, it ultimately serves the group well as all members of the group must ultimately agree. There is no voting, which often leaves a large group of individuals feeling frustrated and unheard. As we all come from groups that have historically not been heard and are thus rightfully sensitive to it, it would seem that NVC might be a wise path to follow.

In sum, increasing diversity matters from both a practical and symbolic perspective. That said, diversity alone may not be enough to alter a system that was created to serve the interests of white male heterosexuals. We may need to look beyond numbers and dig into the roots, uproot the tree, and plant a new one, one that bears a new fruit. We need to adopt procedures for decision making and NVC may be a promising path. And finally, we need to do this, we need to work together, for it is only together that we can affect any lasting, monumental change and create an academic world that fits the needs of its diverse faculty and diverse student bodies in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

What else can we do, either on our own or as a group?

- Help adjuncts unionize.
- Work to change our institutions so that they have family friendly policies....family leave, onsite daycare.... Institutions need to “lean forward” as one article puts it....  
<http://chronicle.com/article/WomenAcademic-Leadership-143503/> We cannot merely lean in, as Sandberg would like us to. As the authors of the a-fore cited article note, “Merely leaning in to traditional male systems fails to question the assumptions behind a culture of overwork and lack of work-family integration.”
- Conduct more research as to why faculty from diverse groups are leaving Political Science departments for other departments, like ethnic studies and sociology. What are we doing to drive people off?

<http://chronicle.com/article/The-Pyramid-Problem/126614/>

Women are worse off in academe still, than men.

## Bibliography

- Bond, Kanisha. 2015. "Advancing Group Interests through Agenda Setting and Coalition-Building." Arlington, VA: NSF Workshop. January 7-9, 2015.
- Gaventa, John. 1982. Power and Powerlessness. Champagne-Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Halcli, Abigail. "Aids, Anger, and Activism: ACT UP as a Social Movement Organization." 1999. Waves of Protest: Social Movements Since the Sixties. Eds, Freeman, Jo and Victoria Johnson. Rowman and Littlefield.
- Henderson, Sarah and Alana Jeydel. 2014. Women and Politics in a Global World, 3d edition. Oxford: University of Oxford Press.
- Hero, Rodney. 2015. "Reflections on 'How Political Science Can be More Diverse.'" PS (July 2015, No 3): 469-471.
- Jeydel, Alana. 2004. Political Women: The Women's Movement, Political Institutions, the Battle for Women's Suffrage and the ERA. Routledge Press.
- Kenney, Sally. 2012. Gender and Justice: Why Women in the Judiciary Really Matter. Routledge Press.
- Rostow, Walt. 1991, 3d ed. The Stages of Economic Growth: a Non Communist Manifesto. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sjoberg, Laura. 2015. "Queer Failure for Diversity Seekers." Arlington, VA: NSF Workshop. January 7-9, 2015
- Slaughter, Anne Marie. 2012. "Why Women Still Can't Have it All." The Atlantic. July/August 2012.