Methodology for Second Wave Survey of Women's Representation in U.S. Philosophy Graduate Programs

Gregory R. Peterson and Zayna Hustoft[1]

Summary

This survey provides data on representation of women faculty in 98 U.S. philosophy programs that provide graduate instruction in philosophy. Its intent is to serve as a second wave survey of departments conducted by Dr. Nicole Hassoun in 2015 (Hassoun and Conklin 2015). As with Dr. Hassoun's original survey, the survey data is based primarily on information found on philosophy department websites, but it differs from the original survey in providing subsequent feedback from department heads, a brief period for open comment, and inclusion of nonbinary faculty. The survey is intended to reflect representation for the Fall 2019 semester by rank, and it is not intended to reflect subsequent staffing changes.

Survey Scope

The survey includes philosophy departments with graduate programs from 98 universities in the United States that were previously surveyed and analyzed by Nicole Hassoun and colleagues (Hassoun and Conklin 2015; Conklin, Artamonova, and Hassoun 2019).

These are as follows:

Arizona State University
Baylor University
Boston College
Boston University
Bowling Green State University
Brown University
Carnegie-Mellon University
Catholic University of America
City University of New York Graduate Center
Columbia University
Cornell University
DePaul University
Duke University
Duquesne University-
Emory University
Florida State University

[1] Gregory R. Peterson is Professor of Philosophy and Religion and Director of the Ethics Lab at South Dakota State University. Zayna Hustoft is a Student Lab Assistant in the Ethics Lab at South Dakota State University. We express our thanks to Katrina England (Ph.D. candidate, Philosophy Program at Binghamton University) for help with the initial stage of coding, to Eric Schwitzgebel who has served as consultant to the project, and to Nicole Hassoun who provided oversight and direction.

Fordham University
Georgetown University
Harvard University
Indiana University, Bloomington
Johns Hopkins University
Loyola University-Chicago
Marquette University
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Michigan State University
New School University
New York University
Northwestern University
Ohio State University
Pennsylvania State University
Princeton University
Purdue University
Rice University
Rutgers University
Saint Louis University
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Stanford University
SUNY Albany
SUNY Binghamton
SUNY Buffalo
SUNY Stony Brook
Syracuse University
Temple University
Texas A&M University
Tulane University
UC Santa Cruz
University of Arizona
University of Arkansas
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Davis
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, Riverside
University of California, San Diego
University of California, Santa Barbara
University of Chicago
University of Cincinnati
University of Colorado, Boulder
University of Connecticut

University of Dallas
University of Florida
University of Georgia
University of Hawaii-Manoa
University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana
University of Illinois, Chicago
University of Iowa
University of Kansas
University of Kentucky
University of Maryland, College Park
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
University of Memphis
University of Miami
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
University of Missouri, Columbia
University of Nebraska
University of New Mexico
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
University of Notre Dame
University of Oklahoma
University of Oregon
University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh
University of Rochester
University of South Carolina
University of South Florida
University of Southern California
University of Tennessee-Knoxville
University of Texas, Austin
University of Utah
University of Virginia
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin, Madison
Vanderbilt University
Villanova University
Washington University, St. Louis
Wayne State University
Yale University

Collection

Collection proceeded in four phases. In phase 1, two independent coders collected information regarding faculty title and gender during the period of November-December 2019. Coders worked in separate locations in consultation with a supervising faculty. Departmental websites served as the initial and primary source of information. Website organization varied considerably by university, and in many cases data collection involved search of departmental sub-pages and individual faculty pages. In cases where information was still missing, coders would also check other university pages if readily available.

In phase two (January-February 2020), the supervising faculty cross-checked the data collected by the two, independent coders. In cases where collected data conflicted between the two datasets, the supervising faculty re-checked the departmental websites to resolve the discrepancy. Conflicts could involve misidentification or miscategorization of faculty title, failure to include gender identification, or both. In the great majority of cases, errors were minor, readily apparent, and subject to correction. In a few cases, it was apparent that staffing changes had occurred in the period between coding and re-checking. These typically involved lecturers and adjuncts who were hired or who departed between fall and spring semesters. In such cases when the correct fall count could not be determined, the current spring semester count was used.

In nine cases, title or gender could not be determined by inspection of university websites. In those cases, faculty were contacted by email in February 2019 to secure the relevant information. Contact of faculty was approved by the Institutional Review Board of South Dakota State University. Of the 9 faculty, 5 responded with the requested information. The remaining faculty were designated as "unclassified" at this stage.

Phase three was then conducted between May-August 2020. In this phase, an email was sent to department heads, providing them with the collected anonymous count data by rank for their department and offering them an opportunity to correct any apparent errors, with the instruction that any changes must be based on publicly available sources. Exceptions to the requirement of publicly available data was made in the following cases: cases where information could at least be partially verified, cases concerning faculty still listed as emeritus on the departmental web page but who were in fact deceased, clarifications of whether administrators (e.g., University Deans, Presidents) were in fact functioning members of the department, and clarifications concerning which titles signified tenure-track, adjunct, and lecturer status. Except as noted, the expectation of public documentation implies that the survey does not implement all changes recommended by department heads. If a department head recommended a change, this was taken as a strong motivation to further research sources to support the change, including referencing of fall 2019 course schedules where these were available.

A fourth phase was conducted in November 2020. During this phase public notification was made via the Demographics in Philosophy Project Twitter feed (@PhilosophyData) and the Demographics in Philosophy Project Facebook feed (@PhilosophyData), and opportunity was provided to review and submit corrections and recommendations for the dataset.

Coding

Total #: The total number of faculty in the department (all genders). This total excludes emeritus faculty

Total # women: The total number of women faculty in the department. This total excludes emeritus faculty.

Total % Women: The percentage of women faculty in the department (not including emeritus faculty)

Total # TT: The total number of faculty traditionally counted as tenure-track (all genders): This includes faculty listed as (Full) Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor. This count excludes Visiting Professors, Emeritus Professors, Adjuncts, and Lecturers.

TT Women: The total number of women faculty traditionally counted as tenure-track. This includes faculty listed as (Full) Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor. This count excludes Visiting Professors, Emeritus Professors, Adjuncts, and Lecturers

% TT Women: The percentage of female tenure-track faculty. This includes faculty listed as (Full) Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor. This count excludes Visiting Professors, Emeritus Professors, Adjuncts, and Lecturers

Total Full: The total number of full professors (all genders)

Full Women: The number of women faculty listed as full professors in the department

% Full Women: The percentage of full professors who are women faculty in the department

Total Assoc: The total number of associate professors (all genders)

Assoc Women: The number of women faculty listed as associate professors in the department

% Assoc Women: The percentage of associate professors who are women faculty in the department

Total Assist: The total number of assistant professors (all genders)

Assist Women: The number of women faculty listed as assistant professors in the department

% Assist Women: The percentage of assistant professors who are women faculty in the department

Total Visit: The total number of visiting professors in the department (all genders) excluding those identified as post-docs

Visit Women: The number of women faculty listed as visiting professors in the department, excluding those identified as post-docs

% Visit Women: The percentage visiting professors in the department who are women faculty, excluding those identified as post-docs

Total Emer: The total number of emeritus faculty (all genders)

Emer Women: The number of women emeritus faculty

% Emer Women: The percentage of emeritus faculty who are women faculty

Total Adj: The total number of faculty categorized as adjuncts (all genders)

Adj Women: The number of women faculty categorized as adjunct

% Adj Women: The percentage of adjunct faculty who are women faculty

Total Lect: The total number of faculty categorized as lecturers (all genders)

Lect Women: The number of women faculty categorized as lecturer

% Lect Women: The percentage of lecturers who are women faculty

Full NB: Full professors who publicly identify as nonbinary or use alternative gender pronouns (e.g., "They")

Associate NB: Associate professors who publicly identify as nonbinary or use alternative gender pronouns (e.g., "They")

Assistant NB: Assistant professors who publicly identify as nonbinary or use alternative gender pronouns (e.g., "They")

Visit NB: Visiting professors who publicly identify as nonbinary or use alternative gender pronouns (e.g., "They")

Emer NB: Emeritus professors who publicly identify as nonbinary or use alternative gender pronouns (e.g., "They")

Adj NB: Adjunct professors who publicly identify as nonbinary or use alternative gender pronouns (e.g., "They")

Lec NB: Lecturers who publicly identify as nonbinary or use alternative gender pronouns (e.g., "They")

Uncounted faculty: These are faculty who were listed on a departmental website but for whom full information (either title or gender) was lacking.

Title Classification

Tenure-Track: Faculty who are categorized as "Professor," "Associate Professor," or "Assistant Professor" are counted as tenure-track. Faculty with appointments of Teaching Professor (e.g., "Assistant Teaching Professor") were labeled as tenure track or as lecturer depending upon institution and feedback from department heads.

Full professor included faculty listed as "Professor" and faculty with certain titles such as "Distinguished Professor" that implied full professor status.

Associate and Assistant Professor: These labels were reserved for presumptively full-time faculty who specifically held these titles. Faculty explicitly listed as "Part-Time Assistant Professor" were classed as lecturers and not included as tenure track faculty.

Visiting Professor: All faculty with the title of "Visiting" were classed as "Visiting Professor," with the exception of those faculty explicitly listed as "Post-Doc" or "Post-Doctoral" or listed under a heading such as "Post-Doctoral Faculty." The label of Visiting Professor took precedence over all other labels,

and visiting faculty were not included under other categories. For example, someone listed as “Visiting Assistant Professor” would be classed as “Visiting Professor” but not included in the “Assistant Professor” count.

Emeritus Faculty: This classification included all faculty listed as “emeritus.” It did not include retired faculty who were not listed as emeritus, and retired faculty were not otherwise included in the count. The title of emeritus was understood to take precedence over all other titles which were not otherwise included in the count. For example. An “emeritus professor” (i.e. “emeritus full professor”) was counted only as an emeritus professor and not included in the list of full professors.

Adjunct Professor: The category of adjunct was largely limited to two cases: faculty explicitly holding the title of “Adjunct” and faculty who held a title indicating contingent status and who were indicated on the website to hold primary employment at another institution.

Lecturer: A wide variety of titles currently exist for contingent faculty. A partial sampling includes the following:

Teaching Assistant Professor	Part-time Instructor	Senior Lecturer
Teaching Associate Professor	Senior Instructor	Specialist
Part-Time Assistant Professor	Pro-Tem Instructor	Special faculty
Instructor	Lecturer	Teaching professors
Faculty of the practice	Term faculty	Academic specialist

As a category, lecturer excluded tenure-track faculty (Full Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor), faculty with the explicit title adjunct, and faculty whose primary employment was at another institution. Faculty who were listed as “Visiting Professor” and also as lecturer were not included as lecturers but listed only as Visiting Professors. As already noted, faculty with the title of “Teaching Professor” were listed either as tenure track by rank or as lecturer, depending upon the institution and department head feedback. Lecturers and adjuncts were generally assumed to not be graduate students unless indicated otherwise; individuals explicitly listed as graduate students were not included in the survey.

Faculty in administrative positions

We provide no separate list or count of administrative titles, endowed chairs or honorifics. Faculty holding administrative positions such as department head, director of graduate studies, and dean were included as long as they were listed as departmental faculty on the web page, in which case they would have been listed according to their faculty rank (e.g., Full Professor). This assessment was then revised based on department head input, and in a few cases administrators were removed from the survey based on information from the department head that the administrator played no functional role in the department. Philosophy faculty in administrative roles (e.g., the director of an ethics center) were not included if they were listed separately from departmental faculty, implying status as affiliated faculty.

Excluded Categories and Ambiguities in classification

The survey did not include “Affiliated” or “Associated” faculty whose title indicated a position in another department of the university. For instance, a psychology professor listed as “affiliated faculty” would not be listed. Faculty explicitly listed as “post-doc” or “post-doctoral” or under a heading indicating

postdoctoral status were not included. Joint faculty were included if the faculty held a titled position in philosophy (e.g., associate professor of philosophy) and were unexceptionally listed with other members of the department.

The survey does not provide data on fractional or part-time appointments. Thus, each faculty counts as one and not more (or less) than one. Faculty with part-time or fractional appointments (such as may be the case with joint positions) are fully included if they are found to be listed as members of the department.

The exclusion of post-doctoral faculty was based on the effort to be consistent with the 2015 wave of data. Although we did decide to include faculty labeled as visiting, we recognize that the distinction may be arbitrary and classification as visiting vs. post-doctoral may also vary by institution. In addition, the visiting label is used for a wide variety of purposes, and it may include both teaching faculty fresh out of graduate school and advanced researchers. The category of visiting professor may thus be of limited use.

The collection of titles under "Lecturer" created the greatest challenge for coding. We decided to include both part-time and full-time contingent faculty, and the range of titles currently employed by universities created considerable challenges in determining proper classification. Input from Department heads was particularly valuable on this issue, and most of the corrections made to the data in response to the survey of department heads concerned proper classification and status of contingent faculty.

Although there are important distinctions between full-time and part-time contingent faculty, including considerations of voting rights in a department, the data does not distinguish these categories for contingent faculty.

Gender Classification:

As with Hassoun and Conklin (2015), faculty were classed by identifying gender specific pronouns (e.g., "he" and "him" vs. "she" and "her") used in faculty pages and by gender-typical names when explicit gender identification was absent. Faculty whose profiles explicitly used nonbinary pronouns ("They") or who explicitly listed as nonbinary were classed as nonbinary. In cases where gender or rank could not be inferred based on this methodology, individual faculty were contacted for clarification. We recognize that use of gender typical names as a proxy for gender identity in the absence of pronoun identifiers may introduce errors in the data, since gender identity may not match gender typical names. Comparison with department head reports provides a partial corrective to this source of error. Seventy-five departments responded to our survey. Across these programs, only one gender coding error out of a total of 2803 counted faculty could be attributable to using gender-typical names as a proxy.

We note that self-report survey provides a superior methodology for assessing the full range of gender identity in the field as a whole, provided that such a survey is sufficiently robust and representative. Since the goal of this survey was to provide information on the department level, and since self-report surveys typically have low response rates, this avenue was not available. Nevertheless, we welcome efforts to develop more comprehensive self-report surveys and other efforts to provide a better picture of the full range of gender diversity in the profession as a whole.

Relation to Previous Efforts and Limitations:

This wave of data builds on but is also in important respects different from previous collections. The first phase of collection closely follows the 2015 wave of data collected by Hassoun and Conklin (2015), the methodology for which is explained on the Women in Philosophy website (http://women-in-philosophy.org/about.php). Their survey built on prior work by Sally Haslinger (2013) and Julie C. Van Camp (2015), but it also differed in some substantive details, most notably in its effort to provide information on gender-representation for each faculty category. The distinctions between tenure-track and non-tenure track, categorization of lecturers, and the exclusion of affiliated faculty and post-docs follows Hassoun and Conklin. The one difference was the inclusion of visiting faculty not classified as post-docs. Approach to gender classification utilizing gender-specific pronouns and gender typical names also follows Hassoun and Conklin. The current survey differs from prior surveys in three important respects. First, it utilized a systematic survey of philosophy program department heads to provide a check on accuracy, and, second, it also utilizes a social media based survey to provide a further check on accuracy. Finally, it introduces a nonbinary category to represent faculty who are gender-nonconforming. In addition, the diversity of faculty categories and the diversity of titles and departmental approaches to representing data on website necessitated a significant number of fine-grained judgments, and this may lead to differences from prior surveys and other contemporary efforts.

Despite the many precautions taken to ensure accuracy, we acknowledge that, as with any data collection effort, this collection has limitations and may in places be subject to minor errors, including errors in judgment. It should be emphasized that the current data is a "rough snapshot," as the data was collected over several months.

Finally, although our survey does include a category for nonbinary philosophers, we feel it important to recognize the presence of transgender, queer, and non-traditional gendered philosophers within the field of philosophy whose specific identities are not fully represented in this survey. The current effort is limited, since it focuses primarily on women in philosophy and aims to replicate as closely as possible prior methodologies for purposes of comparison. We encourage future endeavors to more fully represent the range of gender diversity in the field.

References

Haslanger, Sally. 2013. "Survey of Earned Doctorates % Women." APA Committee on the Status of Women. http://www.apaonlinecsw.org/data-on-women-in-philosophy.

Conklin, Sherri Lynn, Irina Artamonova, and Nicole Hassoun. 2019. "The State of the Discipline: New Data on Women Faculty in Philosophy." *Ergo, an Open Access Journal of Philosophy* 6 (20200427). https://doi.org/10.3998/ergo.12405314.0006.030.

Hassoun, Nicole and Sherri Conklin. 2015. "Data on Women in Philosophy." Retrieved from http://women-in-philosophy.org.

Van Camp, Julie C. 2015. Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty Women at 98 U.S. Doctoral Programs in Philosophy. Retrieved from https://web.csulb.edu/~jvancamp/doctoral_2004.html.