Changing the Ideology and Culture of Philosophy: Not by Reason (Alone)

Sally Haslanger

Department of Linguistics and Philosophy
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

1. Introduction

I've been thinking about this presentation for months, and have been trying to figure out what I could say that would be constructive. In beginning to write up my comments, I've found, however, that there is a deep well of rage inside of me. Rage about how I as an individual have been treated in philosophy; rage about how others I know have been treated; and rage about the conditions that I'm sure affect many women and minorities in philosophy, and have caused many others to leave. Most of the time I suppress this rage and keep it sealed away. MIT is my fifth job in philosophy and it is the first department I've felt at home in and broadly respected by my colleagues. Until I came to MIT in 1998, I was in a constant dialogue with myself about whether to quit philosophy, even give up tenure, to do something else. In spite of my deep love for philosophy, it just didn't seem worth it. And I am one of the very lucky ones. One of the ones who has been successful by the dominant standards of the profession. In fact, if it hadn't been for Abby Stewart, my co-panelist, who convinced me when I was on the philosophy faculty at the University of Michigan to move part of my line to Women's Studies and to identify myself primarily as a feminist theorist rather than a philosopher, I would not be in the academy today. Whatever the numbers say about women and minorities in philosophy, numbers don't begin to tell the story. Things may be getting better in some contexts, but they are far from acceptable.

2. Outright discrimination

It is important to acknowledge that the situation for women in philosophy has been changing over the past several decades and every woman's experience is different. I come to the issue as someone who was in graduate school at Berkeley between 1979-1985. The cohort who came into the profession at that time and has moved through the ranks at the normalized pace are full professors. But the rank of full professors is broad and there are many women, such as my wonderful colleague Judith Thomson, who came through in an era in which the situation was very different from and, to my mind, much worse than mine. I believe, however, that there are trends that have continued throughout my time in the profession, because I see evidence of them today.

If we want to know why there aren't more women of my cohort in philosophy, the reason is that there were very few of us and there was a lot of outright discrimination. I think a lot of philosophers aren't aware of what women in the profession deal with, so let me give some examples. In my year at Berkeley and in the two years ahead of me and two years behind me, there was only one woman each year in a

class of 8-10. The women in the two years ahead of me and the two years behind me dropped out, so I was the only woman left in five consecutive classes. In graduate school I was told by one of my teachers that he had "never seen a first rate woman philosophy and never expected to because women were incapable of having seminal ideas." I was the butt of jokes when I received a distinction on my prelims, since it seemed funny to everyone to suggest I should get a blood test to determine if I was really a woman. In a seminar in philosophical logic on theories of truth I was asked to give a presentation on a historical figure when none of the other (male) students were, later to learn that this was because the professor assumed I'd be writing a thesis on the history of philosophy. When I was at Penn as a junior faculty member and told a senior colleague that I was going to be married (to another philosopher, Stephen Yablo, then at UM), his response was, "Oh, I'm so sorry we'll be losing you." This was in 1990.

I mention these anecdotes (and there are many more!) not in order to gain your sympathy, or because I think they are especially egregious, but because this sort of thing still happens all the time. When I was at the University of Michigan in the mid-90's there were three consecutive graduate student classes with no women. When this was raised as an issue, the majority of faculty hadn't even noticed it. In many departments women find themselves solos on faculties or in graduate school cohorts. Virtually all minorities in philosophy find themselves solos. Surviving as a solo is a painful and difficult process I'll talk about a bit more below.

Moreover, blatant discrimination has not disappeared. I've witnessed plenty of occasions when a woman's status in graduate school was questioned because she was married, or had a child (or took time off to have a child so was returning to philosophy as a "mature" student), or was in a long-distance relationship. For some reason, this never seems to be an issue for men. I know many women who have interests and talents in M&E who have been encouraged to do ethics or history of philosophy. I've been contacted as recently as this year by graduate student women's groups and individual women to help them strategize about problems they are facing as women in their programs, problems that include alleged sexual harassment, hostile or chilly climate, and various sorts of unfairness. I am contacted by Deans who are in the process of re-evaluating tenure decisions of women (and minorities) to comment on norms and practices in philosophy that seem to have disadvantaged the tenure candidate in question. And I never cease to be amazed.

My point here is that I don't think we need to scratch our heads and wonder what on earth is going on that keeps women out of philosophy. In my experience it is very hard to find a place in philosophy that isn't actively hostile towards women and minorities, or at least assumes that a successful philosopher should look and act like a (traditional, white) man. And most women and minorities who are sufficiently

qualified to get into grad school in philosophy *have choices*. They don't' have to put up with this mistreatment. Many who recognize that something about choices is relevant have "explained" to me that women choose not to go into philosophy because they have other options that pay better or have more prestige. This may be true for some, but this doesn't sound like the women I know who have quit philosophy (and it sounds a lot more like the men I know who have quit).   Women, I believe, want a good working environment with mutual respect. And philosophy, mostly, doesn't offer that.

3. Unconscious bias, schemas

Abby Stewart's presentation introduced the notion of schemas and the psychological literature on schemas. I'd like to develop this. Schemas provide the currently most compelling model for understanding unconscious bias (Valian 1998). There are a variety of different ways to explicate the idea of a schema, and the psychological literature does not consistently employ a precise concept of the sort a philosopher might demand. However, the basic idea of a schema is:

> …a mental construct that, as the name suggests, contains in a schematic or abbreviated form someone's concept about an individual or event, or a group of people or events. It includes the person's or group's main characteristics, from the perceiver's point of view, and the relationship among those features." (Valian 1998, 104).

Valian also sometimes characterizes a schema as a "small-scale intuitive hypothesis." Schemas do work somewhat like hypotheses in that:

> They give rise to expectations. They interpret behavior in ways that are consistent with the schema rather than inconsistent with it. They supply explanations where data are missing or ambiguous. They direct the search for new information. They make subtyping a likely way of handling exceptions. (Valian 1998, 106)

However, I think calling them hypotheses is potentially misleading, since it suggests that schemas have a propositional form and are consciously accessible for debate and refutation. Schemas are (at least often) more primitive than hypotheses and are more like a patterned set of dispositions in response to one's circumstances. Schemas are also typically inter-subjective in a way that an individual's hypothesis is not. I prefer to think of schemas as intersubjective patterns of perception, thought and behavior, embodied in individuals as a shared cluster of open-ended dispositions to see things a certain way or to respond habitually in particular circumstances. Schemas encode knowledge and also provide scripts for interaction with each other and our environment. (See Haslanger forthcoming.)

Problems arise when schemas clash. Valian uses the example of women in the military (Valian 1998, 122-3). The schema for women has us assume that women are life-giving and nurturing as opposed to life-taking and aggressive. The schema for the military, of course, has us assume that troops are life-taking and aggressive. In cases like this, it is difficult to accept anything that seems to be an instance of both schemas. The deeper the schemas, the more difficult it is to tolerate a conflicting case.

Schema clashes are resolved in a number of ways (Valian 1998, Ch. 6). For example:
- Disappear the difficult cases, by
    - Making them illegal or procedurally impossible (women not allowed in the military or, now, in combat);
    - Don't ask, don't tell (might this be relevant to women in undergraduate classes: we don't ask them to be majors and they don't tell us they are interested in pursuing a career in philosophy);
    - Ignore them.
    - Force them out by subtle (or not so subtle) pressure.
- Find ways to pretend that false assumptions of the schemas are preserved. (Recall that when I did well in grad school there was a temptation to handle this by joking that I was probably a man after all.)
- Allow exceptions to the rule (tokenism), but maintain barriers to limit access.
- Slow change of the schemas….

In Anglophone contexts over the last couple of centuries (at least) the ordinary schemas for women and philosophy clash. As feminist philosophers have been arguing for decades, the familiar dichotomies around which philosophy defines itself map neatly onto gender dichotomies, e.g., rational/emotional, objective/subjective, mind/body, and ideals of philosophy, e.g. penetrating, seminal, rigorous, and what we do, e.g., attack, target, demolish an opponent, frame it as masculine and in opposition to the feminine. These ideals and dichotomies are not only gendered, but are also relevant in considering challenges philosophers of color face; like women, non-Whites are often perceived through schemas that represent them as less rational, more identified with nature and the body, than Whites. Even if one consciously rejects these assumptions, they may continue to work at the level of schemas. Remember, schemas are a tool for understanding *unconscious* bias. As a result, it is not surprising that we find the strategies mentioned above employed in philosophy to deal with instances of the clashing schemas.

Where might we look for the impact of schemas?

There are a variety of studies in psychology and economics in which identical term papers, cv's and the like, are presented to subjects with characteristic male or female, Black or White names attached. The results show that evaluators—regardless of sex—respond differently, depending on whether the name is a man's or woman's, or is associated with Blacks or Whites. (Bertrand and Mullainathan 2004; Goldin and Rouse 2000; Steinpreis, et al 1999.) This, plausibly, is an example of schemas at work. Understandably we interpret information believed to be about women differently from how we interpret the same information when it is believed to be about a man. But in the workplace this tendency can constitute evaluation bias. (An annotated bibliography on evaluation bias, compiled by NSF ADVANCE at the University of Michigan is available at http://www.mit.edu/sgrp, by following the link: "Materials concerning women and minorities in philosophy.")

Psychological research (Valian 1998, Ch. 14) has shown that schemas are more likely to govern evaluation when:

- The response is quick, rushed, or given insufficient time for consideration.
- Full attention is not given to the task.
- Decisions are not held accountable.
- The individual being evaluated is a member of a group that is a significant minority in the field, with the tipping point somewhere around 25-30%.
- The evaluator is unaware of common errors concerning reasoning about the group so does not correct for them.

Such evaluation bias is potentially relevant to admission to graduate school, applications for jobs and fellowships, teaching evaluations (Superson 1999), and tenure and promotion decisions. These sites for bias are important and we need to gather further data on the profession to determine whether and to what extent gender schemas are playing a role in women's success.

But, one might think, past graduate school, the publication record of candidates is what matters most. Rarely are there two candidates who are exactly equivalent. The better candidate's CV, for example, has more articles in peer-reviewed journals. However, drawing on data concerning the gender of authors in seven highly rated philosophy journals over the past five years, I'd like to suggest, that given the current state of things in philosophy, we should consider the possibility that there is evaluation bias even in the peer-review process. Based on the limited data I've gathered (e.g., I don't have data on submission), I'm not in a position to argue that evaluation bias *is* playing a role in publication in philosophy. Rather, I offer the data to make two points. First, the numbers suggest that women are under-represented in what, by some standards, are considered "top" non-specialized journals (and in at least a couple somewhat specialized ones), and we should investigate why the numbers are so low. Second, *if* women's work is not

being fairly evaluated for publication, this would provide a vivid example of how deep evaluation bias can be. If women's CV's are not being fairly evaluated in comparison with men's, and if the work they produce that provides lines on a CV is also not being fairly evaluated, then there is a double disadvantage: your work is unfairly judged, so it is harder to be published in prestigious journals, but even when you succeed in establishing equivalent credentials to a man, your CV is "read" as inferior. The same accumulation of disadvantage is relevant to the situation of minorities in philosophy as well.

This is not to say that we should put our thumb on the scale for women (and minorities) and not judge the credentials of all candidates based on a sincere evaluation of their merits. It does mean, however, that even if there is due care in making decisions at one stage, this may not be enough because there may have been insufficient care at an earlier stage. We must root out bias at every stage.

Data[1]

Appendix 1 to this paper includes a table that summarizes data on the gender of authors of articles and discussions (not including book reviews) over the past five years in *Ethics, Journal of Philosophy, Mind, Nous Philosophical Review, Philosophy and Public Affairs, Philosophy and Phenomenological Research.*

Appendix 2 includes a table indicating the Editors and Associate Editors of the seven journals surveyed.

Appendix 3 includes a table that indicates the number of men and women tenured or tenure-track faculty in the "top 20" graduate departments in the country as ranked by the Leiter report.

The data mostly speaks for itself, though there are a few things worth noting.

First, there are, of course, many other excellent journals that are not included in the data. My goal was to begin with what are considered the high ranking journals by the dominant analytic paradigm, the journals that hold the most power within the profession.   Given that some schools have a list of "preferred" peer reviewed journals that plays a role in evaluating cases for tenure and promotion, we should be especially attentive to the statistics for such journals.

Second, in many ways the overview numbers don't give the full picture. For example, considering only "articles" over the past five years, and excluding "discussions," **95.5%** of those in *Mind* were by men.

Third, it may be that women do not submit work to these journals in large numbers. But if that is so we need to know that and ask why. Below I will raise the issue of stereotype threat; under stereotype threat individuals look for low-risk strategies. But low-risk strategies may also bring low rewards. If women avoid submitting work to the journals that distribute prestige, then this is a problem.

Fourth, although there are, on average, 19% women in the top 20 graduate departments, only the journal *Ethics* comes close to this number of articles by women over the past five years. If, as is commonly suspected, more women specialize in ethics and history of philosophy than in other fields (it would be good to get data to confirm or disconfirm this suspicion), even this achievement by *Ethics* cannot be counted as a clear success.[2]

Fifth, although in philosophy it is often thought that women "just aren't as interested" in philosophy of mind, philosophy of language and such, this does not sit well with the fact that women seem to be doing well in linguistics, cognitive psychology and cognitive science more generally. For comparison, we looked at data from two journals in related areas, again considering main articles over the past five years and the result was:

Mind and Language: 26.5% articles by women

Linguistics and Philosophy: 24.4% articles by women

We didn't collect data on the representation of women faculty in top departments in these fields. A more thorough study should make such comparisons.

Sixth, it is appalling to me that there is so little feminist work published in the journals examined, even in journals focused on ethics and political philosophy. Note that there has been more work on race and racism published in these journals over the past five years (though very little of this), than work on feminism. Given the numbers of women philosophers working on feminism, this is striking. Jennifer Saul has told me that she sees a pronounced difference in the responses she gets from journals to her work in philosophy of language compared to her feminist work. In philosophy of language her papers are always sent out to referees; her feminist submissions, however, are routinely sent back without having been considered by a reviewer. What is going on here?

I was not in a position to gather data systematically on the peer review process at the seven journals considered. However, I was able to collect some information through web access to the journal's webpage and by contacting members of a few of the editorial boards. Based on this, it is clear to me that there is a wide variation among philosophy journals in how "blind" the review process is. For example, according to a member of the editorial board of the *Journal of Philosophy: "*JP doesn't do blind reviewing at all and it doesn't send papers to outside referees, but does almost all reviewing in house." The website for *Analysis* says:

> All papers are initially read by the Editor. Some are accepted, perhaps after amendment or resubmission, by the Editor himself and a proportion are then sent out to referees. When papers are sent on, the referees receive "blinded" versions of the papers if copies are sent in that form.

And referees' reports are sent on to the authors if the referees agree, though in the interests of speed referees may give brisk verdicts for the Editor's eyes only. (*Analysis – Journal Information*)

(I was also told an anecdote about a prestigious journal at which a student was hired to make the "first cut" before papers were "blinded.") *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, however, seems to have a thoroughly blind referee process whereby a managing editor "blinds" all papers before sending them on to the Editor. The Editor rejects a substantial number without sending them to referees, but referees do not know the author of the papers they review unless they see it published in the journal.

Given the fact that schemas are more likely to have a bearing on evaluation when decisions are "brisk" and when they are not held accountable, more research needs to be done on the refereeing policies *and practices* of journals in the profession.

4. Anti-feminist "consensus"

The virtual absence of feminist philosophy in the journals considered stands in stark contrast to the acceptance of feminist work in other humanities and social sciences. Philosophy is, and is generally perceived to be, reactionary in this respect. Given that many departments require (or at least encourage) women to teach feminist philosophy classes, there are a significant number of women who are qualified to publish feminist work. (Although some men teach feminist philosophy, the majority who do so are women, and it is a problem for women on the job market who *don't* have an interest in feminism what to say if they are asked (as they often are) if they would be willing to teach a feminist philosophy course).

Can schemas help us understand the attitudes in the profession toward feminist philosophy? As we saw before, the schema for philosophy presents it as hyper-rational, objective, masculine. The schema for feminist philosophy surely associates it with women and femininity and codes it as emotional, political, and non-objective. Again we have a conflict of schemas that makes it difficult for philosophy and feminism to seem compatible. (Note that I'm not arguing that the lack of feminist philosophy in the seven journals considered demonstrates a bias against feminist philosophy. We don't know, for example, whether feminist work is submitted to these journals (probably not much is). The evidence for my claim that there is an anti-feminist bias in philosophy comes from many sources, including personal experience and reports by others. The journal data is just another sign that something is wrong.)

5. Climate, social norms

If philosophy is governed by a gender/race schemas, then it makes sense that this affects the climate.
- Philosophy departments often are hyper-masculine places. They are:

- o Competitive, combative, (non-nurturing)[3];
- o Highly judgmental,
- o Oriented towards individual accomplishment, individual intelligence, agency,
- o Hostile to femininity.
- It is a familiar joke that (male) philosophers are poorly socialized. Women, socially, are responsible for maintaining good social dynamics. Because successful social interaction is very difficult in philosophy departments, women are either burdened by this sense of responsibility, or are alienated by the atmosphere where ordinary social norms are not recognized.

It is difficult for women to feel "at home" in a hyper-masculine environment since it requires sublimating potentially important aspects of identity; because some of the specific elements of masculinity that are emphasized in philosophy are also associated with Whiteness, the same is true for minorities. Those women and minorities succeed who are good at adjusting to or managing dysfunctional social environments, or who can conform to a milieu governed by certain masculine norms. Of course, climate is also an issue for men who aren't comfortable with the dominant norms (or with the breakdown of social norms).

6. "Stereotype Threat" and "Solo Status"

In contexts where there are strong masculine gender (and race) schemas at work, stereotype threat becomes an issue for women and minorities. Substantial research in psychology (e.g., Steele 1997, Maass and Cadinu 2003) has shown that:

> …negative stereotypes are in part responsible for the underperformance of minority members in stereotype-relevant domains. More specifically, those tasks for which negative association exists between the task domain and the minority group will represent a threat for minority members; their preoccupation with inadvertently confirming the stereotype will in turn lead to a decrease in performance. (Maass et al, 2003, 244)

In addition to minority status in a negatively stereotyped domain, predictors for stereotype threat include:
- Strong identity with domain,
- Strong identity with social group under threat,
- Sense of internal control over performance,
- [possibly] "high stigma consciousness".

This suggests that individuals in philosophy who identify as women (or as non-White), have a strong investment in philosophy, and also identify as agents responsible for their cognitive performance (as is encouraged by the norms of the profession (see previous section)), are highly susceptible to stereotype

threat. In effect, their performance will be affected by awareness of the stereotypes at work in the context.

Although there is some controversy over how stereotype threat works, the mechanisms seem to include:

- Anxiety,
- Intrusive thoughts,
- Shift towards caution (in response to expected evaluation bias),
- Decreased performance expectancy, i.e., agents expect less of themselves,
- Disengagement.

Even in cases where there is little or no stereotype threat, there are effects similar to stereotype threat when an individual is a "solo" in a group, i.e., if they are the only member of their social group (Sekaquaptewa and Thompson 2002, Sekaquaptewa and Thompson 2003). Solo status has been shown to have an impact both on learning and performance. An important point to note is that the effects of solo status are situational: when solos are in non-solo contexts the effects disappear. This shows that it is not a chronic deficit.

In my experience, solo status often results in my feeling tongue-tied and "stupid," even to this day. I watch myself unable to follow an argument or clearly articulate my question on an utterly familiar topic. We all know what it is like to struggle with complex ideas when "struck dumb" with anxiety. What is less evident is how gender and race imbalance creates contexts in which it is more difficult for women and minorities to perform up to their potential. People are unlikely to want to pursue fields in which they regularly feel "stupid," where they can tell that they are under-performing. But given the combination of stereotype threat and, all too often, solo status, this is likely a familiar experience for women and people of color in philosophy.

The good news is that there are actions that can diminish stereotype threat (Maass and Cadinu 2003, 268-270):

- Provide counter-stereotypical information, i.e., evidence that the stereotype doesn't hold, or introduce a counter-stereotypical role model.
- Activate alternative group identification that is not negatively stereotyped, e.g., avoid activating gender or race identification in evaluation context and encourage identification with other (not negatively-stereotyped) categories.
- Avoid casting evaluation as testing ability in the stereotyped domain – logic tests do not capture logical intelligence!

- Encourage incremental view of intelligence, i.e., intelligence is malleable and can expand with hard work.

7. Recommendations:

1. We need more data on various issues. This is important both to develop plausible accounts of gender and race bias in philosophy so we know what we're dealing with, and also because data-gathering encourages self-monitoring and allows us to hold institutions accountable.
   - Pipeline: number of women and minorities in majors, grad programs and at every rank.
   - Journals: gender (and race?) breakdown of submissions, percent of submissions sent to referees, given revise & resubmit, accepted, published.
   - Referee policies for journals: how blind are they?
   - Neighboring disciplines.

2. We need to disrupt the bias against feminism. Established feminists should:
   - Submit work to mainstream journals.
   - Use the term 'feminism'/'feminist' in our writing.
   - Reference feminist work; urge mainstream colleagues to read and reference feminist work in their areas.
   - Challenge false assumptions about feminist work; encourage forums for educating mainstream colleagues/students.
   - Encourage men to teach/write on feminism??

3. Disrupting schemas
   - Do not disappear, ignore, or redescribe women and minorities in philosophy! Become visible, make others visible.
   - Make the schemas for gender, race, class, and philosophy explicit and defuse them.
   - Don't acquiesce in the masculinization of philosophy spaces. Find ways to discourage anti-social behavior. Encourage a sense of belonging.
   - Broaden the philosophical understanding of intelligence.

4. Organize!
   - Establish contexts where women philosophers and philosophers of color are in the majority.
   - Establish contexts where feminist philosophy and philosophy of race is valued.
   - Establish systems for accountability and support.
   - Learn about broader institutional (college/university/nationwide) resources that may be useful.

References

Analysis – Journal Information, http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/submit.asp?ref=0003-2638&site=1, May 1, 2007.

Bertrand, Marianne and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2004. "Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination." *American Economic Review* 94(4): 991-1013.

_____. 2005. "Implicit discrimination." *American Economic Review* 95(2): 94-98.

Goldin, C. and C. Rouse. 2000. "Orchestrating impartiality: The impact of "blind" auditions on female musicians." *American Economic Review*. 90: 715-741.

Lord, C. G. and Saenz, D. S. 1985. "Memory deficits and memory surfeits: Differential cognitive consequences of tokenism for tokens and observers." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 49: 918-926.

Maass, Anne and Mara Cadinu. 2003. "Stereotype threat: When minority members underperform." *European Review of Social Psychology* 14: 243-275.

Sekaquaptewa, Denise, and Mischa Thompson. 2002. "The differential effects of solo status on members of high- and low-status groups." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 28: 694-707.

_____. 2003. "Solo status, stereotype threat, and performance expectancies: Their effects on women's performance." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 39: 68-74.

Steele, C. M. 1997. "A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape the intellectual identities and performance of women and African-Americans." *American Psychologist* 52: 613-629.

Steinpreis, R.E., K.A. Anders and D. Ritzke. 1999. "The impact of gender on the review of the curricula vitae of job applicants and tenure candidates: A national empirical study." *Sex Roles* 41(7/8): 509-528.

Superson, Anita. 1999. "Sexism in the classroom: The role of gender stereotypes in the evaluation of female faculty," in the *APA Nesletter on Feminism and Philosophy*, 99(1): 46-51.

Valian, Virginia. 1998. *Why So Slow? The Advancement of Women*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Appendix 1

Representation of Women in 7 Philosophy Journals, 2002-07

Overview[1]					
Journal	#authors	#female	%female		
Ethics	114	22	19.30		
Jphil	120	16	13.33		
Mind	141	9	6.38		
Nous	155	18	11.61		
Phil Review	63	7	11.11		
PPR	212	26	12.26		
PPA	93	13	13.98		
Overall	898	111	12.36		
Journal	#articles	#feminist	%feminist	#race	%race
Ethics	105	3	2.86	3	2.86
Jphil	113	0	0.00	2	1.77
PPA	78	4	5.13	3	3.85
Overall	296	7	2.36	8	2.70
NB: Mind, Nous, Phil Review and PPR did not publish any articles with feminist or race content in the past five years (as far as I can tell.)					

---

[1] Full data for the seven journals is available at: http://web.mit.edu/sgrp by following the link to: "Materials concerning women and minorities in philosophy"

Editors and Associate Editors for 7 Philosophy Journals, Spring 2007

	Editor	Assoc. Ed, Advisory Ed.		
		Total #	#female	
Ethics	John Deigh	9	2	
Journal of Philosophy	see below *	n/a	n/a	
Mind	Thomas Baldwin	3	0	
Nous	Ernest Sosa	13	1	
Philosophical Review	Nick Sturgeon, Brian Weatherson	14	3	**
PPR	Ernest Sosa	56	9	***
PPA	Charles Beitz	5	2	****
TOTAL		100	17	

*Faculty of Columbia Philosophy edit: Bernard Berofsky, Akeel Bilgrami, John Collins, Arthur C. Danto, Kent Greenawalt, Patricia Kitcher, Philip Kitcher, Isaac Levi, Wolfgang Mann, Mary Mothersill, Frederick Neuhouser, Christopher Peacocke, Carol Rovane, Achille C. Varzi, + 4 male consulting editors.

**Editors rotate between faculty at Cornell, currently Sturgeon and Weatherson. Assoc. Editors constituted by the rest of the dept: Richard Boyd, Andrew Chignell, Matti Eklund, Gail Fine, Carl Ginet, Harold Hodes, T. H. Irwin, Michelle Kosch, Scott MacDonald, Richard W. Miller, Michele Moody-Adams, Sydney Shoemaker, Henry Shue, Nicholas Silins.

***No Assoc. Eds. Numbers are for Editorial Board.

****Plus 5 male advisory editors

Appendix 3

Gender Ratios in Tenure-Track Positions in Philosophy Departments
Ranked 1-20 by 2006

		Leiter #'s	%	Confirm Women	Confirm Total	%	Full Women	Tenured Assoc Women	Untenured Assoc/Asst Women
1	**NYU**	2/18	11%	2	18	11%	1		1
2	**Rutgers**	4/29	13%	4	29	13%	2	2	
3	**Princeton**	4/19	21%	4	21	19%		1	3
4	**U. Michigan**	1/22	4%	1	22	4%	1		
5	**U. Pittsburgh**	4/29	13%	3	20	15%		1	2
6	**Stanford**	7/24	29%	6	24	25%	1	1	4
9	**Harvard**	5/17	29%	4	16	25%	4		
9	**MIT**	2/11	18%	2	11	18%	2		
9	**UCLA**	3/17	17%	3	17	17%	1	1	1
10	**Columbia**	8/22	36%	8	22	36%	4		4
11	**UNC**	3/22	13%	3	22	13%	2		1
12	**Berkeley**	4/16	25%	3	16	18%	2	1	
13	**U. Arizona**	6/21	28%	6	21	28%	1	3	2
14	**Notre Dame**	5/41	12%	6	42	12%	2	2	2
15	**UT-Austin**	2/27	7%	2	27	7%	2		
16	**Brown**	3/13	23%	3	13	23%	2	1	
17	**Cornell**	3/14	21%	3	14	21%	2	1	
18	**USC**	3/19	15%	3	19	15%	1	2	
19	**Yale**	6/17	35%	6	17	35%	4	1	1
20	**UCI**	4/21	19%	4	21	19%	3		1
			19.5%	**76**	**412**	**18.7%**	**37**	**17**	**22**

NOTES

[2] Thanks to Marilyn Friedman for pointing this out in discussion at the APA Panel convened by the Committee on the Status of Women at the Central APA 2007 where I first presented this data.

[3] A prospective graduate student at MIT this year was told by another department trying to recruit her (!) that in their program "it's survival of the fittest".