Developments in Gender and Politics: A Call for Intersectionality

Morgan C. Matthews
Department of Sociology
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Forthcoming in *Sociology Compass* (2019)

ABSTRACT

Since “women and politics” scholarship emerged in the 1970s, social, institutional, and theoretical developments have shaped the trajectory of U.S. scholarship in this field. First, the presence of women in U.S. formal politics has increased, albeit unevenly across the country and over time. Simultaneously, the capacity to study ‘political women’ has become supported through institutional mechanisms such as academic journals and communities of practice. Moreover, gender as a critical focus of analysis has been developed and refined. In the literature on women and politics, the shift from studying sex differences to interrogating gendered political institutions is especially salient. This institutional focus, along with recent intersectional studies of gender and politics, increases opportunities for cross-pollination of sociological and political science perspectives. In this review, I provide a brief history of the U.S. scholarship on gender and politics and map these relevant social, institutional, and theoretical developments. I highlight the value of recent intersectional contributions in this field and make the case for bringing partisanship – an increasingly salient political identity and structure – into intersectional approaches to gender and politics.

KEYWORDS: gender, politics, intersectionality, partisanship, institutions, representation, legislatures

1. INTRODUCTION

The United States, which has a below-world average percentage of women in its Congress, lags behind most developed democracies on measures of women's political representation (Dahlerup, 2018; IPU, 2018). In 2018, women comprised 20.6 percent of the U.S. Congress's 535 members; 23.7 percent of statewide elective executive offices; and 25.4 percent of all state legislative seats nationwide (CAWP, 2019a). Black women held 3.6 percent of Congressional seats and 3.7 percent of state legislative seats in the same year, on average (CAWP, 2018). Despite Stacey Abrams' hard-fought gubernatorial race in Georgia in 2018, no black women have ever served as governor in any U.S. state. Latinx elected officials filled just over seven percent of the seats in the 115th Congress; ten of them were women (NALEO, 2019). Asian Pacific American (APA) congress members comprise just over three percent of the U.S. House and Senate; over two-thirds of these APA federal legislators are women (APAICS, 2019). Moreover, in the unprecedentedly diverse incoming class of U.S. congress members elected in 2018, the majority of women and racial minorities identified with the Democratic Party (Viebeck, 2018).

Gender and politics, a now-robust field, has been analyzing gender inequalities in politics since the 1970s. In the half-century since this area of scholarship was founded, women's political representation and approaches for studying it have seen tremendous change. To-date, the vast majority of research on the surging numbers of women in politics has been done under the aegis of political science. However, feminist political sociologists have contended that "sociology has much to offer the study of gender and politics," (Paxton & Hughes, 2013, 3). In the spirit of further bridging disciplinary gaps, this review maps the relevant social, institutional, and theoretical developments in gender and politics studies and synthesizes the institutional and

intersectional approaches where there is promise for synergy between sociology and political science going forward.

Below, I begin by briefly reviewing three major developments in the gender and politics literature. Having done so, I move on to highlight the intersectional approaches that are now moving scholarship in this area forward. I argue that intersectional studies of gendered political institutions offer insights into the complex relations of power in the constantly changing political field. In particular, I call attention to the structure of party politics and the dramatic shifts in party polarization in the U.S., which have received relatively little attention in gender and politics scholarship. Intersectionality provides a framework for understanding the complex interplay between the structure of partisanship and inequalities in representative politics.

2. A BRIEF HISTORY OF U.S. WOMEN AND POLITICS SCHOLARSHIP

Women were absent from most research on U.S. political actors prior to the 1970s. Historically, the political arena – and concomitantly, literature on political leaders – has been dominated by men (except see Addams, 1920; Breckinridge, 1938). Sociologist Seymour Martin Lipset’s *Political Man* (1960) exemplifies this broad erasure of women. When women’s politics was recognized (e.g., Duverger, 1955), it was viewed as inherently exceptional (Walby, 1988). The dearth of research on women *in political positions* reflects the exclusion of women at this time from both U.S. politics and universities (Deegan, 1988).

The Center for American Women and Politics, the first research center devoted to the study of U.S. women politicians, was founded in 1971. Its establishment was crucial to the emergent literature on women and politics, because previously “no one had bothered to count [women in state legislatures]. They were few and far between, hardly enough to consider a phenomenon worthy of study” (CAWP, 2017). The new Center, supported by the Ford

Foundation, held an inaugural conference for Women in State Legislatures in 1972 (O'Dea Schenken, 1999). The effect of the conference was twofold: It brought together a network of women in elective office from across the U.S. for the first time, and it inspired several foundational academic works on women in politics. Soon after CAWP's establishment, Jeane Kirkpatrick's *Political Woman* (1974), Jane Jaquette's *Women in Politics* (1974), Jo Freeman's *The Politics of Women's Liberation* (1975), and Irene Diamond's *Sex Roles in the State House* (1977) arrived to set a new academic agenda. These books are widely regarded as the germinal works on "women in politics" (Wolbrecht, 2008).

Over the course of more than four decades, there have been large gains in American women's social, political, and economic equality in a variety of arenas. Addressing all of these is beyond the scope of this paper, but three developments have advanced the now-robust area of gender and politics. Two are structural changes to the political and academic environment, while the other centers on the flourishing of more advanced theoretical approaches. From a pragmatic standpoint, increases in the number of women in U.S. legislatures (and other political offices) greatly expanded the universe of objects of study, and this change was complemented by the institutionalization of the subfield of gender and politics, particularly through academic networks and journals. The field has benefitted greatly from the work of feminist scholars who transformed the study of sex difference into a more critical analysis of gender and social relations of power in institutions. Below, I explain how these developments affect the scope and focus of research questions available to present-day scholars interested in gender inequalities in political representation.

2.1 Rising Numbers of Women in Politics, 1977-2019

Shares of state and national legislative seats held by women have increased dramatically since the late 1970s, and gender change has been uneven among minority groups. At the state level, the number of women representatives more than doubled between the late 1970s and the turn of the millennium, although the share of seats held by women in state assemblies and senates has on average remained unchanged since 2000 (CAWP, 2019a). The pace of change in legislative representation has differed among minority women: For instance, between 1990 and 2010, the number of Latinx state legislators increased from 8.9 percent to 14.1 percent; Latina legislators only occasionally comprise half of states' Latinx representatives over this time period, such as in Nevada in the 1990s (Ramírez & Burlingame, 2016). At the level of statewide executive office (e.g., governors, attorney general, secretary of state), Black women have been better represented compared to APA and Latina women; two-thirds of U.S. states have never elected a woman of color to statewide executive office (Sanbonmatsu, 2016). The first openly gay woman to achieve any statewide office was elected Massachusetts' attorney general in 2014 (CAWP, 2019b). Trends in federal representation of women since the 1970s also demonstrate intracategorical differences: While the number of all Congresswomen increased more than five-fold between 1979 and 2019 – from 20 to 110 (CAWP, 2019a), the share of congressional seats held by Black women decreased between 1979 and 1990. After more than doubling in the early 1990s, the number of Black women in Congress has since slowly risen to 39 (CAWP, 2018).

The overall increase in U.S. women legislators tracks major trends in women's political empowerment worldwide. The United Nations Decade for Women, designated as from 1975 to 1985, contributed to global awareness of women's rights (Paxton, Hughes & Green, 2006) and was followed by the Fourth World Conference on Women in 1995 that set an international agenda for state actions advancing gender equality (Olcott, 2017; Tripp, 2006). In the U.S.,

Geraldine Ferraro became the first woman to appear on a major political party's national ticket as the Democratic Vice Presidential nominee in 1984. Less than one decade later, a record of 47 women were elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in the 1992 general election, in what is now commonly known as "The Year of the Woman" (Cook, Thomas & Wilcox, 1994). After a notable stall in gender change in U.S. representative politics, Hillary Clinton became the Democratic presidential nominee in 2016 – a first for any major U.S. party. Women's activism shortly after this election in response to conservative policies on issues such as immigration (Filler, 2018) and violence against women in many fields, including politics, led to a "Women's March" in 2016 and a "pink wave" of women running for political offices from the local to the national level in 2018 (Dittmar, 2018).

Women's increased presence in legislatures has expanded the universe of study for answering the question of whether descriptive representation yields substantive effects for democracy (Reingold, 2008). We know from comparative research that women's descriptive representation does not always lead to substantive progress for women's rights in all contexts (Beckwith & Cowell-Meyers, 2007; Schwindt-Bayer, 2006; Tripp, forthcoming). As Mala Htun and S. Laurel Weldon point out, gender equality in politics is "not a project that can be pursued in a single domain or at a single point in time" (2018, 256). Nevertheless, representative politics is one domain that can effect change in gender governance. For instance, researchers have found that the visibility of women in political leadership roles has a "role model effect" (Campbell & Wolbrecht, 2006). Moreover, having more women at the top has symbolic significance for social movements that advocate for gender justice (Kenney, 2010) and for open and inclusive democratic institutions (Dahlerup, 2018).

2.2 Academic Institutional Capacity-Building

Pragmatically, the expansion of support in academic disciplines for the study of political women has improved research and raised the profile of this field. Women (and later – gender) and politics scholarship became institutionalized through the founding of several academic associations and journals. In turn, these venues for feminist discourse created networks of scholars and enhanced the capacity of feminist scholars in sociology and political science to study gender politics.

After the pioneering books in the nascent field of women and politics were published, feminist scholars built academic infrastructure to record and distribute research. *Women & Politics* (now the *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy*), the first journal dedicated solely as an outlet for studies on women and politics, was published for the first time in 1980. Sociologists for Women in Society (SWS) was formed at the 1970 winter meeting of the American Sociological Association (Ferree, Khan & Morimoto, 2007) and broke with ASA to publish its journal, *Gender & Society*, independently in 1987. The editors of the journal *Social Politics* introduced its first issue in 1994 by calling for more work that reexamines “familiar discussions of state, market, family, and civil society” (Hobson, Michel & Orloff, 1994, 2) through a gender lens. The *International Journal of Feminist Politics* published its first issues in 1999 and *Politics & Gender* – the official journal of the APSA Section for Women and Politics Research – was founded in 2005 (Tolleson-Rinehart & Carroll, 2006).

Most recently, the *European Journal of Politics and Gender* published its first volume in 2018. It is notable that in the first issue’s editorial the founding editors laid out a commitment to “intersectionality as a political objective” (Ahrens et al., 2018). Such journals are not merely outlets for individual publications. Their development has cultivated a network of scholars, set research agendas for the young field, and fostered legitimacy for the study of gender and politics.

2.3 Gender and Gendered Institutions

The feminist revolution in academic disciplines (Scott, 1986; Smith, 1974) transformed the research questions available to scholars of politics and gender. The late 1970s and early 1980s was an especially critical time period in political feminist thought. One of the earliest interventions was Lopata and Thorne's (1978) critique of the Parsonian term "sex roles" which had assumed stable, functional, and apolitical gender categories. Not a decade later, Stacey and Thorne's (1985) influential essay on the "Missing Feminist Revolution in Sociology" drew attention to the subversion of feminist work by mainstream sociology through its misappropriation of gender as merely a category or variable. Since these critical theoretical advances, feminist research on politics has shifted away from studying women as a homogenous category to analyzing gender as dynamic relations of power in institutions (Connell, 1987; Lorber 1994; Scott, 1986).

Feminist sociologists have been especially effective at politicizing how gender structures major institutions in society, such as the economy and the state (Martin, 2004; Risman, 2004). Research on organizations has benefitted from theoretical contributions that explain how the gendered logic of organizational practices contributes to inequalities in leadership and mobility at work (Acker, 1992; Britton, 1997; Ridgeway, 2011; Williams, 2013). For instance, Schilt's (2010) research on transmen at work demonstrates how gender creates a system of boundaries that organizes professional social relations and access to organizational resources. Similarly, access to state power – through policymaking and social movements – is constrained by context-specific gender regimes and gender politics (Brush, 2003; Ferree, 2012; O'Connor, Orloff & Shaver, 1999).

Scholarship on gender in political science has also taken up a focus on gendered institutions (Hawkesworth 2003; Kenney 1996). In feminist policy studies, the discursive institutionalist approach has been widely used. Fraser's (1989) research on "needs talk" and Bacchi's (1999) approach to the construction of policy problems both highlight how gender constrains state social programs. This approach has contributed to intersectional research on strategies for diversity mainstreaming (Verloo, 2006). Feminist institutionalism (FI) combines the insights of critical feminist scholars with the new institutionalist approach (Mackay, Kenny & Chappell, 2010). The basic premise of FI is that all institutions are gendered. Gender patterns the formal and informal "rules of the game" in political institutions, such as the structure of electoral systems (Kenworthy & Malami, 1999; Matland & Studlar, 1996; Norris, 2006), the division of labor in political agencies (Chappell & Waylen, 2013), and candidate recruitment in political parties (Bjarnegård & Kenny, 2016; Fox & Lawless, 2010).

Conceptualizing gender as an institution offers opportunities for productive dialogue between scholars trained in sociology and in political science by directing attention to organizational norms and institutional practices (Mackay, Monro & Waylen, 2009). Indeed, FI has informed compelling sociological studies on gender and politics, such as Bolzendahl's (2014) comparison of how the institutionalization of gender varies among national legislatures, using Germany, Sweden, and the United States as cases. FI can be usefully applied at the local level of politics as well: In their study of a volunteer state legislature, Matthews & Lively (2017) elaborate how gender shapes informal practices of balancing work and family in non-professional legislative contexts.

3. INTERSECTIONALITY AND POLITICS

The evolution of “gender and politics” – as a subfield and a community of scholarship – has challenged the literatures on politics and political representation that were not previously gender-critical. The conjunction of feminist and critical race scholarship has stimulated new questions by encouraging scholarship on intersectionality. In the following section, I first address what intersectionality is and how it has developed as an approach to studying politics and power. Then, I illustrate how intersectional perspectives have made inroads into research on political actors and processes and research on power relations in political institutions. Finally, I argue that progress in these areas provides a model for adding partisanship – an increasingly salient political identity and structural condition for governance – to intersectional frameworks.

3.1 Intersectionality

Black feminist legal scholar Kimberlé Crenshaw is credited with coining the term intersectionality (1991), but the idea of race and gender being more than separate identities or processes of inequality emerged from black women’s activism in the 1960s (Nash, 2011). As the concept of intersectionality has travelled, its exact meaning has been contested. According to Collins & Bilge (2016), intersectionality is “a way of understanding and analyzing the complexity in the world, in people, and in human experiences” (2016, 2). Intersectionality has also been called an “analytic disposition” (Cho, Crenshaw & McCall, 2013, 795) and a “research paradigm” (Hancock, 2007) that is defined by its attention to multiple non-additive identities and structures that affect relations of power in society.

Early works by intersectionality scholars shaped the trajectory of research on politics in the 1990s onwards. Crenshaw’s (1991) article emphasized political intersectionality in conceptualizations of rape and intersectional representations of violence against women in politics. In particular, she cites Anita Hill’s testimony in the Senate confirmation hearings of

Clarence Thomas as an example of complexity in political inequalities and assessments of injustice. Patricia Hill Collins writes in *Black Feminist Thought* (2000[1990]) of the insider resistance of women of color in domains of power, such as the academy. Scholars doing comparative work have extended intersectionality's political potential outside the U.S. context. Parreñas (2001) and Garcia-del Moral & Korteweg (2012) both apply intersectional approaches to explain how gender, nationality, race, and class differently position people in relation to state structures. Even in the U.S., Evelyn Nakano Glenn (2002) draws on regional case comparisons of the South, Southwest, and Hawaii to analyze how major political and economic institutions in American society have historically been organized simultaneously but differently on the basis of race, gender, and class.

Intersectionality's reach in gender scholarship has been broad. In the literature on gender, policy, and politics, in particular, intersectional discourse and approaches have been used widely (Collins & Chepp, 2013; Harnois, 2015; Kantola & Nousiainen, 2009) in spite of methodological obstacles to accounting for intersectionality in quantitative research (Dubrow, 2013; Hughes, 2013). I will focus my review on how intersectional approaches have changed the research questions about and understandings of 1) political actors and processes, as well 2) political institutions.

3.2 Political Actors and Processes at the Intersection

Intersectional approaches have taken different forms as the literature on gender and politics has expanded. Early intersectional approaches in the gender and politics literature focused especially on what Choo & Ferree (2010) call inclusion and process-centered applications of intersectionality. The former includes studies that do the important work of complicating "women" as heterogeneous political actors (Cammisa & Reingold, 2004; Brown &

Gershon, 2016). For instance, in her interviews with African American women serving in state legislatures, Smooth (2011) challenges “which women” the policies commonly associated with “women’s interests” represent. In this way, intersectionality can unpack within-group or intra-categorical complexity (McCall, 2005) among women in politics.

Process-centered approaches explore the effects of electoral and legislative practices on gender and racial inequality. Intersectional approaches to political processes can be informative about both the input (candidates and legislators) and output (policy) of representative politics. In an experimental study of voter perceptions of Black female candidates, Carew (2016) demonstrates how colorism affects voter behavior and shapes which women of color get elected. Hawkesworth (2003) applies an intersectional approach to the internal operations of legislatures: once elected, legislative practices such as exclusion and obstructionism affect the practical representation of minority groups. Studying the “output” of politics, scholars have drawn on intersectionality to unpack the effects of divergent understandings between policymakers, their constituents, and interest groups about notions like fatherhood (Haney & March, 2003), victimhood (Bernstein 2010; Jacobsen & Stenvoll, 2010) and violence against women (Armstrong, Gleckman-Krut & Johnson, 2018; Whittier, 2016).

3.3 Intersectionality, Institutions, and Politics

Recently, scholars have brought macro-level factors into interaction to explain intersectional puzzles with respect to political institutions. Intersectionality works from the premise that power relations between groups and organizations interact to produce complex inequalities in society (Mügge & Erzeel, 2016). Scholars using intersectional perspectives analyze not only the multiple jeopardy facing minority groups (King, 1988); they are also interested in the practices and opportunity structures that reinforce the hegemony of dominant

groups in political institutions (Childs & Hughes, 2018; Hughes, 2013; Swain & Lien, 2017). I hold up contributions to the robust study of gender quota laws to demonstrate how intersectional approaches complicate understandings of inequalities in political institutions.

Quota policies aim to enhance or guarantee some level of descriptive representation (Pitkin, 1967) of a social group by institutional rule changes. Gender quotas have been adopted by political parties and national assemblies in over half of the world's countries (Dahlerup, 2018). Minority quotas, while less common than gender quotas, are active in more than 20 countries worldwide (Htun, 2004). One puzzle is how these policies affect the political representation of women and ethnic minorities together and separately (Hughes, 2011). For instance, in Bolivia the indigenous-led government adopted a gender parity electoral law but granted indigenous groups a near-negligible five percent reserved parliamentary seats. Htun & Ossa (2013) bring together factors such as differences in coalition unity and party interests to explain this inequitable outcome. Similarly, Celis et al. (2014) find that quotas alone do not explain the electoral success of ethnic minority women in Belgium and the Netherlands. The institutionalization of gender and ethnicity quotas within parties and efforts of party elites to maximize electoral support based on masculinized stereotypes of ethnic threat interact to produce complex effects in different contexts.

A notable benefit of an institutional intersectional approach to politics – especially with respect to gender and race – is that it can explain complex outcomes of politics. In the words of Orloff, Ray & Savci (2016, 8), democratic politics is “multiple and... inescapably contentious.” Therefore, there will be unanticipated consequences of any state-institutionalized feminist policies (Roychowdhury, 2016). For instance, Tripp (forthcoming) illustrates how the motivation to pass women's rights provisions in the MENA region is related to the symbolic politics that

signal modernity to other nations. Moreover, the practical achievement of women's empowerment is uneven based on context-specific factors, such as religion and legacies of colonialism. Strolovitch & Crowder (2018) contend that "intersectionally responsible representation" must recognize such perversities, and how they are tied up with stereotypes and hegemonic notions of citizenship.

4. BRINGING PARTISANSHIP INTO INTERSECTIONALITY

Intersectionality has transformed the study of gender and politics in recent years. However, as Carastathis (2016) argues, intersectionality is a provisional concept meant to challenge continuously how scholars think with respect to social identities, relations, and structures. As such, there is room for intersectionality to bring together relevant social structures and political identities beyond the often-invoked gender, race, class, and sexuality. I argue that bringing partisanship into intersectional studies of gender and politics helps make sense of contemporary mechanisms of intersectional inequality in political representation. This section will first define partisanship – as an identity and as a structure – and explain its significance in the U.S. political system. Then, I synthesize the work – primarily by feminist political scientists – that has treated partisanship as an axis of oppression in line with intersectionality.

Partisanship, in the words of Green, Palmquist & Schickler (2002) is "a double entendre" with meanings at the micro as well as the macro level. In their micro-level "hearts and minds" approach, partisanship is the identification of individuals with political parties. Partisan social identities carry affective as well as symbolic meaning for voters. At the macro level, partisanship describes the party coalitions that interact with other social institutions (Aldrich, 2011; Cohen et al., 2008). Partisanship has taken on a uniquely dichotomous form in U.S. politics where two

major parties dominate in a first-past-the-post system, aside from intermittently disruptive minor parties and factions (Hirano & Snyder, 2007; Skocpol & Williamson, 2012).

Partisan identities and the structure of party politics have become increasingly salient with growing party polarization. Polarization describes the ideological movement of parties away from the political center (DiMaggio, Evans & Bryson, 1996). There is strong evidence of party polarization among elected representatives in the U.S. (Fiorina & Abrams, 2008; Heatherington, 2001). Among the voting public, experimental research has found levels of affective hostility and discrimination based on political party and on race that are similar in magnitude (Iyengar & Westwood, 2015). Information about demographic trends that apparently undercut white political dominance has also been shown to affect attitudes and voting intentions (Craig & Richeson, 2017). Since party identities and party structures are increasingly polarized in U.S. politics (but not only in the U.S., see Geva, 2019), intersectional approaches to gender and politics need to better address how political inequalities are produced at the nexus of gender, sex, race, and party.

Early research on the partisan “gender gap” (Kaufmann & Petrocik, 1999; Inglehart & Norris, 2000) brought attention to the intersection of these complex social structures. However, in public opinion surveys, “gender” is often conflated with sex, leaving findings about partisan gender gaps imprecise (Bittner & Goodyear-Grant, 2017). Furthermore, the language of a partisan gender “gap” masks the complex mechanisms by which the structures of party politics and gender produce inequalities in political representation, and how these structures interact with sexuality, race/ethnicity, and class. Research with an intersectional approach to including partisanship offers improved models to explain the complex outcomes in this area of gender and politics.

Political parties shape the “inputs” and “outputs” of representative politics in formal and informal ways. In terms of who is elected, formal mechanisms such as voluntary party quotas (Baldez, 2006; Dahlerup, 2018) and party leadership positions (Kunovich & Paxton, 2005; O’Brien, 2015) all have the potential to affect women’s representation in politics depending on the national electoral system. Informal factors such as party culture (Barnes & Cassese, 2017; Elder, 2012; Freeman, 1986) also shape intersectional disparities in representation across and within political parties. Party-motivated violence against women in politics may affect the tenure of women politicians’ careers (Kuperberg, 2018). Partisanship also shapes the output of politics in concrete policy terms and with respect to diverse constituents’ trust in their elected representatives. Where quotas (and in particular, party quotas) have now existed long enough to evaluate their effects, evidence is accumulating that changes in legislative demographics affect substantive outcomes (Bratton, Haynie & Reingold, 2006; Clayton & Zetterberg, 2018; Franceschet & Piscopo, 2008). Partisanship also affects constituents with diverse backgrounds’ perceptions of their elected representatives and the trustworthiness of democratic systems (Barnes & Beaulieu, 2019; English, Pearson & Strolovitch, 2018). These bodies of research lead the way in bringing partisanship into intersectional approaches to gender and politics.

5. CONCLUSION

Democratic institutions whose elected members do not represent their constituents are longstanding social problems. Research done by feminist political scientists and sociologists has provided better ways of understanding of how gender inequalities in politics are reproduced. Moreover, we have evidence that addressing these institutional problems yields results: Increasing the descriptive representation of women in decision-making positions has symbolic importance as well as substantive repercussions for policy and trust in democratic institutions.

Scholars' capacities to explore gender as a "critical problematic" (Ritter, 2008) in political institutions is now supported by an established foundation of research, academic networks and journals that have the capacity to grant status and set agendas for gender and politics research, and an expanded universe of women and people of color in politics to study. Just as the field of "women and politics" was transformed after the 1970s through theoretical, institutional, and social developments, the future of gender and politics depends also on changes in these realms.

This review has called for two (nested) theoretical advances. Intersectionality's political potential has just begun to be engaged in the recently institutionalized and still expanding field of gender and politics. In highlighting the contributions of intersectional approaches to political actors, processes, and institutions, I have also argued for bringing partisanship into intersectional analyses, both as an identity and structure of growing relevance in contemporary U.S. politics. Partisanship, like gender and race, is best understood as continuously constructed through relations of power rather than as a binary concept. Bringing partisanship in to intersectional approaches is not without challenges. Many critical scholars caution that intersectionality, an approach rooted in the academic labor of black feminists, has been used in colorblind ways (Alexander-Floyd, 2012; Carbado, 2013) and even as a buzzword (Davis, 2008) with the approach losing its critical edge as it travels into mainstream scholarship. As such, intersectional gender and politics research is best accomplished when researchers engage in scholarly reflexivity at the individual and disciplinary levels.

The academic journals and associations created around the study of gender and politics provide a foundation of institutional support for innovation. Nevertheless, scholars of gender and politics – especially in political science – face persistent challenges within their male dominated disciplines (Mershon & Walsh, 2016; Romero, 2017; Tolleson-Rinehart & Carroll, 2006;

Weldon, 2018). For instance, a special issue of *The Legislative Scholar* in winter 2019 addresses the underrepresentation of women in legislative studies. To remedy the myriad of challenges facing inclusiveness in this field, many contributors to this issue call for greater mentorship of and networking opportunities for women and ethnic minorities in this field (e.g., Caballero, Jackson & Brown, 2019; Swers, 2019). In addition, studies of legislative politics and political parties that incorporate literature featured in this review should not be understood as the responsibility of already-marginalized scholars. What all scholars and teachers “in the pipeline” learn about intersectional inequalities will shape the trajectory of citation practices and disciplinary recognition.

Finally, recent social changes in political institutions generate many exciting new research questions for scholars of gender and politics to address with intersectional approaches. The 116th U.S. Congress began its first session in 2019 as the most diverse in history, with 117 of its members identifying as nonwhite, 127 identifying as women, and ten identifying as gender queer (Cohen, Rundlett & Wellemeyer, 2019). How will this unprecedented diversity among U.S. elected representatives affect the substantive representation of minority group interests? How will it challenge or change institutional structures of party leadership or individual partisan identities? How are changing structures of partisanship – in interaction with gender, race, class, and sexuality – supporting or undermining hegemonic power relations in politics? By joining intersectional perspectives on inequality with feminist institutionalist approaches to structures of power operation both formally and informally, researchers in both sociology and political science can contribute to identifying fruitful paths to more inclusive politics.

REFERENCES

- Acker, J. (1992). Gendered institutions: From sex roles to gendered institutions. *Contemporary Sociology*, 21, 565-569. DOI:10.2307/2075528
- Addams, J. (1920). *Democracy and social ethics*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Ahrens, P., Celis, K., Childs, S., Engeli, I., Evans, E., & Mügge, L. (2018). Politics and gender: Rocking political science and creating new horizons. *European Journal of Politics and Gender*, 1, 3-16. <https://doi.org/10.1332/251510818X15294172316891>
- Aldrich, J. (2011). *Why parties? A second look*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Alexander-Floyd, N. (2012). Disappearing acts: Reclaiming intersectionality in the social sciences in a post-Black feminist era. *Feminist Formations*, 24, 1-25. DOI:10.1353/ff.2012.0003
- Armstrong, E., Gleckman-Krut, M., & Johnson, L. (2018). Silence, power, and inequality: An intersectional approach to sexual violence. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 44, 99-122. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073117-041410>
- Asian Pacific American Institute for Congressional Studies. (2019). AAPI elected officials. Retrieved from <https://apaics.org/resources/aapi-elected-officials/>.
- Bacchi, C. (1999). *Women, policy and politics: The construction of policy problems*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Baldez, L. (2006). The pros and cons of gender quota laws: What happens when you kick men out and let women in? *Politics & Gender*, 2, 102-109. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X06221019>

- Barnes, T., & Beaulieu, E. (2019). Women politicians, institutions, and perceptions of corruption. *Comparative Political Studies*, 52, 134-167. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414018774355>
- Barnes, T., & Cassese, E. (2017). American party women: A look at the gender gap within parties. *Political Research Quarterly*, 70, 127-141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912916675738>
- Beckwith, K., & Cowell-Meyers, K. (2007). Sheer numbers: Critical representation thresholds and women's political representation. *Perspectives on Politics*, 5, 553-565. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S153759270707154X>
- Bernstein, E. (2010). Militarized humanitarianism meets carceral feminism: The politics of sex, rights, and freedom in contemporary antitrafficking campaigns. *Signs*, 36, 45-71. <https://doi.org/10.1086/652918>
- Bittner, A., & Goodyear-Grant, E. 2017. Sex isn't gender: Reforming concepts and measurements in the study of public opinion. *Political Behavior*, 39, 1019-1041. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-017-9391-y>
- Bjarnegård, E., & Kenny, M. (2016). Comparing candidate selection: A feminist institutionalist approach. *Government and Opposition*, 51, 370-392. <https://doi.org/10.1017/gov.2016.4>
- Bolzendahl, C. (2014). Opportunities and expectations: The gendered organization of legislative committees in Germany, Sweden, and the United States. *Gender & Society*, 28, 847-876. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243214542429>
- Bratton, K., Haynie, K., & Reingold, B. (2006). Agenda setting and African American women in state legislatures. *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy*, 28, 71-96. https://doi.org/10.1300/J501v28n03_04
- Breckinridge, S. (1938). Social workers in the courts of Cook county. *Social Service Review*, 12, 230-250. <https://doi.org/10.1086/632224>
- Britton, D. (1997). Gendered organizational logic: Policy and practice in men's and women's prisons. *Gender & Society*, 11, 796-818. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089124397011006005>
- Brown, N., & Gershon, S. (2016). *Distinct identities: Minority women in U.S. politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Brush, L. (2003). *Gender and governance*. Lanham: AltaMira Press.
- Caballero, G., Jackson, J., & Brown, N. (2019). Self as community: An interview with Dr. Nadia Brown. *The Legislative Scholar*, 3(2), 17-19.

Cammisa, A., & Reingold, B. (2004). Women in state legislatures and state legislative research: Beyond sameness and difference. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 4, 181-210.
DOI:10.1177/153244000400400204

Campbell, D., & Wolbrecht, C. (2006). See Jane run: Women politicians as role models for adolescents. *The Journal of Politics*, 68, 233-247. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2508.2006.00402.x>

Carastathis, A. (2016). *Intersectionality: Origins, contestations, horizons*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Carbado, D. (2013). Colorblind intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 38, 811-845. <https://doi.org/10.1086/669666>

Carew, J. (2016). How do you see me?: Stereotyping of Black women and how it affects them in an electoral context. In N. Brown & S.A. Gershon (Eds.), *Distinct identities* (95-115). New York: Routledge.

Celis, K., Erzeel, S., Mügge, L., & Damstra, A. (2014). Quotas and intersectionality: Ethnicity and gender in candidate selection. *International Political Science Review*, 35, 41-54.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512113507733>

Center for American Women and Politics. (2019a). Facts. *Rutgers University Eagleton Institute of Politics*. Retrieved from <http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/facts>.

Center for American Women and Politics. (2019b). Milestones for women in American politics. *Rutgers University Eagleton Institute of Politics*. Retrieved from <https://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/facts/milestones-for-women>.

Center for American Women and Politics. (2018). The Chisholm effect: Black women in American politics 2018. *Rutgers University Eagleton Institute of Politics and Higher Heights*. Retrieved from http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/sites/default/files/resources/chisholm_effect_black_women_in_politics.pdf

Center for American Women and Politics. (2017). Mission and history. *Rutgers University Eagleton Institute of Politics*. Retrieved from http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/about_cawp/history-and-mission.

Chappell, L., & Waylen, G. (2013). Gender and the hidden life of institutions. *Public Administration*, 91, 599-615. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2012.02104.x>

Childs, S., & Hughes, M. (2018). “Which men?” How an intersectional perspective on men and masculinities helps explain women’s political underrepresentation. *Politics & Gender*, 14, 282-287. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X1800017X>

Cho, S., Crenshaw, K., & McCall, L. (2013). Toward a field of intersectionality studies: Theory, applications, and praxis. *Signs*, 38, 785-810. DOI:10.1086/669608

Choo, H.Y., & Ferree, M. (2010). Practicing intersectionality in sociological research: A critical analysis of inclusions, interactions and institutions in the study of inequalities. *Sociological Theory*, 28, 29-49.

Clayton, A., & Zetterberg, P. (2018). Quota shocks: Electoral gender quotas and government spending priorities worldwide. *The Journal of Politics*, 80, 916-932.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/697251>

Cohen, M., Karol, D., Noel, H., & Zaller, J. (2008). *The party decides: Presidential nominations before and after reform*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Cohen, R., Rundlett, M., & Wellemeyer, J. (2019). 116th Congress breaks records for women, minority lawmakers. *The Hill*, January 9. Retrieved from
<https://thehill.com/homenews/house/424449-116th-congress-breaks-records-for-women-minority-lawmakers>.

Collins, P.H. (2000)[1990]. *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment* (2nd ed). New York: Routledge.

Collins, P.H., & Bilge, S. (2016). *Intersectionality*. Malden, MA: Polity.

Collins, P.H., & Chepp, V. (2013). Intersectionality. In L. Weldon, G. Waylen, K. Celis, & H. Kantola (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook on gender and politics* (57-85). New York: Oxford University Press.

Cook, E., Thomas, S., & Wilcox, C. (1994). *The year of the woman: Myths and realities*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Connell, R. (1987). *Gender and power: Society, the person and sexual politics*. Cambridge: Polity.

Craig, M., & Richeson, J. (2017). Hispanic population growth engenders conservative shift among non-Hispanic racial minorities. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 9, 383-392. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617712029>

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43, 1241-1299. DOI:10.2307/1229039

Dahlerup, D. (2018). *Has democracy failed women?* Malden, MA: Polity.

Davis, K. (2008). Intersectionality as buzzword: A sociology of science perspective on what makes a feminist theory successful. *Feminist Theory*, 9, 67-85.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700108086364>

Deegan, M.J. (1988). W.E.B. Du Bois and the women of Hull-House, 1895-1899. *The American Sociologist*, 19, 301-311. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02691827>

Diamond, I. (1977). *Sex roles in the state house*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

DiMaggio, P., Evans, J., & Bryson, B. (1996). Have Americans' social attitudes become more polarized? *American Journal of Sociology*, 102, 690-755. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/230995>

Dittmar, K. (2018). There is more than one gender story to tell in election 2018. *Gender Watch 2018*. Retrieved from <http://www.genderwatch2018.org/one-gender-story-tell-election-2018>.

Dubrow, J. (2013). Why should we account for intersectionality in quantitative analysis of survey data? In V. Kallenberg, J. Meyer, & J. Müller (Eds.), *Intersectionality und Kritik* (161-177). Wiesbaden: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-93168-5_8

Duverger, M. (1955). *The political role of women*. Paris: UNESCO.

Elder, L. (2012). The partisan gap among women state legislators. *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy*, 33, 65-85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1554477X.2012.640609>

English, A., Pearson, K., & Strolovich, D. (2018). Who represents me? Race, gender, partisan congruence, and representational alternatives in a polarized America. *Political Research Quarterly*, 72, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912918806048>

Ferree, M. (2012). *Varieties of feminism: German gender politics in global perspective*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Ferree, M., Khan, S., & Morimoto, S. (2007). Assessing the feminist revolution: The presence and absence of gender in theory and practice. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Sociology in America: A History* (438-479). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Filler, N. (2018). Intersectional perspectives on Asian Pacific American activism and movement building. *Politics, Group, and Identities*, 6, 466-475. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21565503.2018.1494010>

Fiorina, M., & Abrams, S. (2008). Political polarization in the American public. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11, 563-588. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.11.053106.153836>

Franceschet, S., & Piscopo, J. (2008). Gender quotas and women's substantive representation: Lessons from Argentina. *Politics & Gender*, 4, 393-425. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X08000342>

Freeman, J. (1986). The political culture of the Democratic and Republican parties. *Political Science Quarterly*, 101, 327-356. DOI:10.2307/2151619

- Freeman, J. (1975). *The politics of women's liberation: A case study of an emerging social movement and its relation to the policy process*. New York: David McKay Company.
- Fox, R., & Lawless, J. (2010). If only they'd ask: Gender, recruitment, and political ambition. *The Journal of Politics*, 72, 310-326. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381609990752>
- Fraser, N. (1989). Talking about needs: Interpretive contests as political conflicts in welfare-state societies. *Ethics*, 99, 291-313. <https://doi.org/10.1086/293067>
- Garcia-del Moral, P., & Korteweg, A. (2012). The sexual politics of citizenship and reproductive rights in Ireland: From national, international, supranational and transnational to postnational claims to membership. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 19, 413-427. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506812466580>
- Geva, D. (2019). Daughter, mother, captain: Marine Le Pen, gender, and populism in the French National Front. *Social Politics*, 26, 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxy039>
- Glenn, E. (2002). *Unequal freedom: How race and gender shaped American citizenship and labor*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Green, D., Palmquist, B., & Schickler, E. (2002). *Partisan hearts and minds: Political parties and the social identities of voters*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hancock, A. (2007). When multiplication doesn't equal quick addition: Examining intersectionality as a research paradigm. *Perspectives on Politics*, 5, 63-79. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065>
- Haney, L., & March, M. (2003). Married fathers and caring daddies: Welfare reform and the discursive politics of paternity. *Social Problems*, 50, 461-481. DOI:10.1525/sp.2003.50.4.461
- Harnois, C. (2015). Race, ethnicity, sexuality, and women's political consciousness of gender. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 78, 365-386. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0190272515607844>
- Hawkesworth, M. (2005). Engendering political science: An immodest proposal. *Politics & Gender*, 1, 141-156. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X0523101X>
- Hawkesworth, M. (2003). Congressional enactments of race-gender: Toward a theory of race-gendered institutions. *American Political Science Review*, 97, 529-550. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055403000868>
- Heatherington, M. (2001). Resurgent mass partisanship: The role of elite polarization. *American Political Science Review*, 95, 619-631. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055401003045>
- Hirano, S., & Snyder, J. (2007). The decline of third-party voting in the United States. *The Journal of Politics*, 69, 1-16. DOI:10.1111/j.1468-2508.2007.00490.x

- Hobson, B., Michel, S., & Orloff, A. (1994). Introduction. *Social Politics*, 1, 1-3.
- Hughes, M. (2013). The intersection of gender and minority status in national legislatures: The minority women legislative index. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 38, 489-516. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lsq.12025>
- Hughes, M. (2013). Diversity in national legislatures around the world. *Sociology Compass*, 7, 23-33. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12010>
- Hughes, M. (2011). Intersectionality, quotas, and minority women's political representation worldwide. *American Political Science Review*, 105, 604-620. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055411000293>
- Htun, M. (2004). Is gender like ethnicity? The political representation of identity groups. *Perspectives on Politics*, 2, 439-458. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592704040241>
- Htun, M., & Ossa, J. (2013). Political inclusion of marginalized groups: Indigenous reservations and gender parity in Bolivia. *Politics, Groups, and Identities*, 1, 4-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21565503.2012.757443>
- Htun, M., & Weldon, S.L. (2018). *The logics of gender justice: State action on women's rights around the world*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2000). The developmental theory of the gender gap: Women's and men's voting behavior in global perspective. *International Political Science Review*, 21, 441-463. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512100214007>
- Inter-Parliamentary Union. (2018). Women in National Parliaments. Retrieved from <http://archive.ipu.org/wmn-e/world.htm>.
- Iyengar, S., & Westwood, S. (2015). Fear and loathing across party lines: New evidence on group polarization. *American Journal of Political Science*, 59, 690-707. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12152>
- Jacobsen, C., & Stenvoll, D. (2010). Muslim women and foreign prostitutes: Victim discourse, subjectivity, and governance. *Social Politics*, 17, 270-294. DOI:10.1093/sp/jxq011
- Jaquette, J. (1974). *Women in Politics*. New York: Wiley.
- Kantola, J., & Nousiainen, K. (2009). Institutionalizing intersectionality in Europe. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 11, 459-477. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616740903237426>
- Kaufmann, K., & Petrocik, J. (1999). The changing politics of American men: Understanding the sources of the gender gap. *American Journal of Political Science*, 43, 864-887. DOI:10.2307/2991838

- Kenney, S. (2010). Mobilizing emotions to elect women: The symbolic meaning of Minnesota's first woman Supreme Court justice. *Mobilization: An International Journal*, 15, 135-158.
- Kenney, S. (1996). New research on gendered political institutions. *Political Research Quarterly*, 49, 445-466. DOI:10.2307/448883
- Kenworthy, L., & Malami, M. (1999). Gender inequality in political representation: A worldwide comparative analysis. *Social Forces*, 78, 235-268. DOI:10.2307/3005796
- King, D. (1988). Multiple jeopardy, multiple consciousness: The context of a Black feminist ideology. *Signs*, 14, 42-72. <https://doi.org/10.1086/494491>
- Kirkpatrick, J. (1974). *Political woman*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kunovich, S., & Paxton, P. (2005). Pathways to power: The role of political parties in women's national representation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 111, 505-552. DOI:10.1086/444445
- Kuperberg, R. (2018). Intersectional violence against women in politics. *Politics & Gender*, 14, 685-690. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X18000612>
- Lipset, S. (1960). *Political man: The social bases of politics*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Lopata, H., & Thorne, B. (1978). On the term "sex roles." *Signs*, 3, 718-721. <https://doi.org/10.1086/493523>
- Lorber, J. (1994). *Paradoxes of gender*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Mackay, F., Kenny, M., & Chappell, L. (2010). New institutionalism through a gender lens: Towards a feminist institutionalism? *International Political Science Review*, 31, 573-588. DOI:10.1177/0192512110388788
- Mackay, F., Monroe, S., & Waylen, G. (2009). The feminist potential of sociological institutionalism. *Politics & Gender*, 5, 253-262. DOI:10.1017/S1743923X09000208
- Martin, P.Y. (2004). Gender as a social institution. *Social Forces*, 82, 1249-1273. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2004.0081>
- Matland, R., & Studlar, D. (1996). The contagion of women candidates in single-member district and proportional representation electoral systems: Canada and Norway. *The Journal of Politics*, 58, 707-733. DOI:10.2307/2960439
- Matthews, M., & Lively, K. (2017). Making volunteer-based democracy "work": Gendered coping strategies in a citizen legislature. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World*, 3, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023117705535>

McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs*, 30, 1771-1800.
DOI:10.1086/426800

Mershon, C., & Walsh, D. (2016). Diversity in political science: Why it matters and how to get it. *Politics, Groups, and Identities*, 4, 462-466. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21565503.2016.1170703>

Mügge, L., & Erzeel, S. (2016). Double jeopardy or multiple advantage? Intersectionality and political representation. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 69, 499-511. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pa/gsv059>

Nash, J. (2011). Home truths on intersectionality. *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism*, 23, 445-470.

National Association of Latino Elected Officials. (2019). Latino elected officials in America. Retrieved from http://www.naleo.org/at_a_glance.

Norris, P. (2006). The impact of electoral reform on women's representation. *Acta Politica*, 41, 197-213. DOI:10.1057/palgrave.ap.5500151

O'Brien, D. (2015). Rising to the top: Gender, political performance, and party leadership in parliamentary democracies. *American Journal of Political Science*, 59, 1022-1039.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12173>

O'Connor, J., Orloff, A., & Shaver, S. (1999). *States, markets, families: Gender, liberalism and social policy in Australia, Canada, Great Britain and the United States*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

O'Dea Schenken, S. (1999). *From suffrage to the Senate: An encyclopedia of American women in politics, Vol. 1:A-M*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, Inc.

Olcott, J. (2017). *International women's year: The greatest consciousness-raising event in history*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Orloff, A., Ray, R., & Savci, E. (2016). Perverse politics? Feminism, anti-imperialism, multiplicity. *Political Power and Social Theory*, 30, 1-17. DOI:10.1108/S0198-871920160000030006

Parreñas, R. (2001). Transgressing the nation-state: The partial citizenship and "imagined (global) community" of migrant Filipina domestic workers. *Signs*, 26, 1129-1154.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/495650>

Paxton, R., & Hughes, M. (2013). Bringing gender ~~back~~ in. *States, Power and Societies*, 18, 1-4.

Paxton, P., Hughes, M., & Green, J. (2006). The international women's movement and women's political representation, 1893-2003. *American Sociological Review*, 71, 898-920.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240607100602>

- Pitkin, H. (1967). *The concept of representation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.
- Ramírez, R., & Burlingame, C. (2016). The unique career path of Latina legislators, 1990-2010. In N. Brown & S. Gershon (Eds.), *Distinct identities: Minority women in U.S. politics* (201-217). New York: Routledge.
- Reingold, B. (2008). Women as officeholders: Linking descriptive and substantive representation. In C. Wolbrecht, K. Beckwith, & L. Baldez (Eds.), *Political women and American democracy* (128-147). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Ridgeway, C. (2011). *Framed by gender: How gender inequality persists in the modern world*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Risman, B. (2004). Gender as a social structure: Theory wrestling with activism. *Gender & Society*, 18, 429-450. DOI: 10.1177/0891243204265349
- Ritter, G. (2008). Gender as a category of analysis in American political development. In C. Wolbrecht, K. Beckwith, & L. Baldez (Eds.), *Political women and American democracy* (12-30). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Romero, M. (2017). Reflections on “The Department is Very Male, Very White, Very Old, and Very Conservative”: The Functioning of the Hidden Curriculum in Graduate Sociology Departments. *Social Problems*, 64, 212-218. <https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spx004>
- Roychowdhury, P. (2016). Over the law: Rape and the seduction of popular politics. *Gender & Society*, 30, 80-94. DOI: 10.1177/0891243215613482
- Sanbonmatsu, K. (2016). Officeholding in the 50 states: The pathways women of color take to statewide elective executive office. In N. Brown & S. Gershon (Eds.), *Distinct identities: Minority women in U.S. politics* (171-186). New York: Routledge.
- Schwindt-Bayer, L. (2006). Still supermadres? Gender and the policy priorities of Latin American legislators. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50, 570-585. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2006.00202.x>
- Scott, J. (1986). Gender: A useful category of historical analysis. *The American Historical Review*, 91, 1053-1075. DOI:10.2307/1864376
- Skocpol, T., & Williamson, V. (2012). *The Tea Party and the remaking of Republican conservatism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, D. (1974). Women’s perspective as a radical critique of sociology. *Sociological Inquiry*, 44, 7-13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.1974.tb00718.x>

Smooth, W. (2011). Standing for women? Which women? The substantive representation of women's interests and the research imperative of intersectionality. *Politics & Gender*, 7, 436-441. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X11000225>

Stacey, J., & Thorne, B. (1985). The missing feminist revolution in sociology. *Social Problems*, 32, 301-316. DOI:10.2307/800754

Strolovitch, D., & Crowder, C. (2018). Respectability, anti-respectability, and intersectionally responsible representation. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 51, 340-344. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096517002487>

Swain, K., & Lien, P. (2017). Structural and contextual factors regarding the accessibility of elective office for women of color at the local level. *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy*, 38, 128-150.

Swers, M. (2019). How do we get more women to study legislative politics? *The Legislative Scholar*, 3(2), 10-12.

Tolleson-Rinehart, S., & Carroll, S. (2006). "Far from ideal:" The gender politics of political science. *American Political Science Review*, 100, 507-513. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055406062368>

Tripp, A. forthcoming. *Why do non-democratic leaders adopt women's rights? Comparing the Maghreb and the Middle East*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tripp, A. (2006). The evolution of transnational feminisms: Consensus, conflict and new dynamics. In M. Ferree & A. Tripp (Eds.), *Global feminism: Transnational women's activism, organizing, and human rights* (51-78). New York: NYU Press.

Verloo, M. (2006). Multiple inequalities, intersectionality and the European Union. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13, 211-228. DOI: 10.1177/1350506806065753

Viebeck, E. (2018). Diversity on stark display as House's incoming freshmen gather in Washington. *The Washington Post*, November 13. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/powerpost/diversity-on-stark-display-as-houses-incoming-freshmen-gather-in-washington/2018/11/13/87ef9a5c-e783-11e8-bbdb-72fdbf9d4fed_story.html?utm_term=.aea8fc5c55e2.

Walby, S. (1988). Gender politics and social theory. *Sociology*, 22, 215-232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038588022002004>

Weldon, S.L. (2018). Power, exclusions and empowerment: Feminist innovation in political science. *Women's Studies International Forum*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2018.05.014>

Whittier, N. (2016). Carceral and intersectional feminism in Congress: The Violence Against Women Act, discourse, and policy. *Gender & Society*, 30, 791-818.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243216653381>

Williams, C. (2013). The glass escalator, revisited: Gender inequality in neoliberal times. *Gender & Society*, 27, 609-629. DOI: 10.1177/0891243213490232

Wolbrecht, C. (2008). What we saw at the revolution: Women in American politics and political science. In C. Wolbrecht, K. Beckwith, & L. Baldez (Eds.), *Political women and American democracy* (1-11). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.