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1. Introduction

This report concerns the underrepresentation of women in philosophy. Clearly, there are other underrepresented groups in philosophy as well. However, the BPA/SWIP committee took the view that Russell and Wittgenstein. This is, of course, a feature not only of philosophy but of every other academic discipline. However, philosophy continues to be dominated by men in a way that many other disciplines—particularly in the arts and humanities—are not. For example, according to HESA data, only 35% of philosophy PhD students in the UK are female, compared to 61% in English and 53% in history. If you visit the website of almost any UK department of English, history or psychology, you are overwhelmingly likely to find a considerably higher proportion of female members of staff than in the philosophy department. The proportion of permanent post-holders in UK philosophy departments who are women stands at roughly 24%, despite the fact that roughly 46% of single and joint Honours undergraduates are women.

Things look different, of course, if we compare philosophy not with English, history and psychology, but with mathematics, physics and computer science. For example, the proportion of PhD students in mathematics the UK who are women is 28%. One important difference between the sciences on the one hand and philosophy on the other, however, is that the lack of women at all levels in the sciences has long been regarded, nationally, as a serious problem, and various organizations and initiatives exist to try to combat it.

There is, for example, Project Juno, an initiative set up by the Institute of Physics in 2007 to ‘recognise and reward departments that can demonstrate they have taken action to address the under-representation of women in university physics and to encourage better practice for both women and men’ (<http://www.iop.org/policy/diversity/initiatives/juno>). There is the Athena SWAN charter, which ‘recognises and celebrates good employment practice for women working in science, engineering and technology (SET) in higher education and research’ (<http://www.athensawan.org.uk/html/athena-swan>). Athena SWAN was started by the Royal Society in 2005, and is now run by the Equality Challenge Unit. And the Resource Centre for Women in SET, UKRC (<http://www.ukrc.org.uk>), funded by the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, provides a range of training opportunities and resources, again aimed exclusively at SET subjects.

The UK also lags behind other countries when it comes to addressing the issue of the underrepresentation of women in philosophy. In particular, the American Philosophical Association has a long-standing Committee on the Status of Women (currently producing a report on best practices for anonymous refereeing for journal editors). In addition, the recently established Women in Philosophy Task Force (unconnected with the APA but largely US-based) has undertaken a range of activities, including setting up the ‘What is it like to be a woman in philosophy’ blog (<http://beingawomaninphilosophy.wordpress.com>) and running a mentoring project (<http://www.philosophy.ku.edu/mentoring-project>). The Australasian Association of Philosophy produced a report, Improving the Participation of Women in the Philosophy Profession, in 2008, and since then has had a Standing Committee for Women in the Profession (see <http://aap.org.au/women>).

We believe it is now time for the UK philosophy community similarly to regard the underrepresentation of women in philosophy as a problem, and to work together to find and implement solutions to it. The BPA and SWIP are launching a national mentoring scheme for women in philosophy (see §5), but we do not have the resources of, say, the Institute of Physics, or even the AAP, and our ability to launch and sustain national initiatives is therefore limited.

What we can do, however, is attempt to persuade the philosophical community that there is a problem to be solved, to provide concrete, practical recommendations for individuals, departments and journal editors, and to ask you to implement as many of them as you can, in consultation with your colleagues, your students, and your institutions. These are the aims of this report.

1.1. What we would like you to do

First, we would, of course, like as many people as possible to read this report. Please disseminate it as widely as possible. If you are a Head of Department, you might consider sending the link to the PDF (<http://www.bpa.ac.uk/policies>) to your undergraduate and postgraduate students.

Second, we would like the report to prompt informal discussion amongst philosophers. We have only recently begun the task of trying to understand and alleviate the underrepresentation of women in philosophy, and even so this report contains only a sprinkling of the references to the literature in §3—there is much more wisdom to trying to rectify the situation.

Third, we would like Heads of Departments (and Deans and Heads of Schools and Programmes, etc.) to discuss the report, and to share their own personal experiences and ideas, and members of editorial boards to consider the proposals that are relevant to them.

Fourth, we would like everyone reading this report to take action to solve the problem. Some of the proposals we are making are quite simple and straightforward: for example, giving preference in hiring to women, including women in seminar lineups, I’ve started giving

Things look different, of course, if we compare philosophy not with English, history and psychology, but with mathematics, physics and computer science. For example, the proportion of PhD students in mathematics the UK who are women is 28%. One important difference between the sciences on the one hand and philosophy on the other, however, is that the lack of women at all levels in the sciences has long been regarded, nationally, as a serious problem, and various organizations and initiatives exist to try to combat it.

There is, for example, Project Juno, an initiative set up by the Institute of Physics in 2007 to ‘recognise and reward departments that can demonstrate they have taken action to address the under-representation of women in university physics and to encourage better practice for both women and men’ (<http://www.iop.org/policy/diversity/initiatives/juno>). There is the Athena SWAN charter, which ‘recognises and celebrates good employment practice for women working in science, engineering and technology (SET) in higher education and research’ (<http://www.athensawan.org.uk/html/athena-swan>). Athena SWAN was started by the Royal Society in 2005, and is now run by the Equality Challenge Unit. And the Resource Centre for Women in SET, UKRC (<http://www.ukrc.org.uk>), funded by the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, provides a range of training opportunities and resources, again aimed exclusively at SET subjects.

The UK also lags behind other countries when it comes to addressing the issue of the underrepresentation of women in philosophy. In particular, the American Philosophical Association has a long-standing Committee on the Status of Women (currently producing a report on best practices for anonymous refereeing for journal editors). In addition, the recently established Women in Philosophy Task Force (unconnected with the APA but largely US-based) has undertaken a range of activities, including setting up the ‘What is it like to be a woman in philosophy’ blog (<http://beingawomaninphilosophy.wordpress.com>) and running a mentoring project (<http://www.philosophy.ku.edu/mentoring-project>). The Australasian Association of Philosophy produced a report, Improving the Participation of Women in the Philosophy Profession, in 2008, and since then has had a Standing Committee for Women in the Profession (see <http://aap.org.au/women>).

We believe it is now time for the UK philosophy community similarly to regard the underrepresentation of women in philosophy as a problem, and to work together to find and implement solutions to it. The BPA and SWIP are launching a national mentoring scheme for women in philosophy (see §5), but we do not have the resources of, say, the Institute of Physics, or even the AAP, and our ability to launch and sustain national initiatives is therefore limited.

What we can do, however, is attempt to persuade the philosophical community that there is a problem to be solved, to provide concrete, practical recommendations for individuals, departments and journal editors, and to ask you to implement as many of them as you can, in consultation with your colleagues, your students, and your institutions. These are the aims of this report.

1 The “What people are doing” quotes are taken from whatitslike.wordpress.com/.
The data in this section have two sources. The BPA questionnaire data was collected by questionnaires from 38 departments, with each responding department providing a ‘snapshot’ in a given year: undergraduate, masters, and so on. While not all departments responded, the absolute numbers of staff and students are large enough for it to be unlikely that the sample is unrepresentative.

2.1. BPA questionnaire data

Table 1: Summary figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>% Women</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG single Honours</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG joint Honours</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women as % of UG students = 46%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught Masters (Philosophy)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught Masters: Interdisciplinary with significant philosophy input</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Masters</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women as % of Masters students = 37%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD intake</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD completions</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women as % of PhD students = 31%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual teaching</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary lecturer/teaching fellow</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary research staff</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women as % of temporary staff = 28%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women as % of permanent staff = 24%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary

The figures show a fairly steady decline in the proportion of women from over 45% at undergraduate level to under 20% at professorial level, with the largest drops occurring between undergraduate and Masters level (9 percentage points), and between Masters and PhD (6 percentage points).

It is worth noting that the figures for joint Honours (or rough equivalent) undergraduates are skewed by two very large programmes, Women thus make up over 50% of joint honours two programmes, and students on interdisciplinary programmes with a substantial philosophy element.

The fact that the staff level where women are under-represented is skewed may indicate a ‘glass ceiling’ effect.

Table 2: Admin roles in UK philosophy departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>% Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HoD</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Admissions</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG Admissions</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary

The absolute numbers are small here (as is usual with conclusions. Nonetheless, it does appear that women are under-represented in the roles of Director of Postgraduate Admissions Officer and Welfare Officer, and that they are under-represented in the roles of Director of Postgraduate Admissions Officer, Head of Department, Senior Lecturer, Reader and Professor.

2.2. HESA data

Table 3: First degree students in various subject areas, academic year 2008/09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>% Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Studies</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Masters students in various subject areas, academic year 2008/09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>% Female Students</th>
<th>% Male Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Studies</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3. Summary

There is a steady decline in the representation of women from undergraduate level (46%) to PhD level (19%) in philosophy, with the largest drops occurring at Master's level (71% to 37%) and then PhD level (down to 35%).

The HESA data suggests that the decline from undergraduate to PhD levels is not unique to philosophy (though the decline is steeper in philosophy than in English and history). One might reasonably assume that the decline from PhD through the different employment categories to professorial level is not unique to philosophy either.

Nonetheless, the fact that the decline is not unique to philosophy does not imply that there is no problem to be addressed. As we explained in §1, the sciences have long regarded the underrepresentation of women, at all levels, as a problem. That the arts and humanities have apparently been less concerned may due to the fact that, since women are not underrepresented—indeed are overrepresented—at undergraduate level, and since the decline from undergraduate to PhD level is less steep, they are still fairly well represented at higher levels too. Philosophy, however, more closely resembles the sciences than most humanities disciplines. Indeed, data from the US show that most sciences do better than philosophy for percentage of PhDs awarded to female candidates—only computer science, engineering, and philosophy do worse (Healey 2011)—to address the problem.
We do not fully understand why the proportion of women philosophers is so low. Some will insist that it is due to innate and unchangeable psychological differences between women and men. This is from a group that is negatively stigmatised in that context, and one's group membership is made salient. Importantly, victims of stereotype threat are often, though not always, unaware of their own anxiety and performance pressure.

What people are doing

3.1. Implicit bias

Recent psychological research has shown that most people—even those who explicitly and sincerely avow egalitarian views—hold 'implicit biases' against such groups as blacks, women, gay people, and so on, based on unconscious stereotypes of these groups. Even members of the 'targeted' group are susceptible to implicit bias (see e.g. Steinpreis et al. 1999; Vedantam 2005). Here is one striking manifestation of this:

**Women's CVs**

It is well established that the presence of a male or female name on a CV has a strong effect on how that CV is evaluated. This is true both inside and outside academia. Philosophers have not specifically been studied, but we do know that those academics most likely to be aware of the existence of unconscious psychological processes—psychologists—exhibit just this bias. In Steinpreis et al.'s US study, 238 academic psychologists (118 male, 120 female) evaluated a curriculum vitae randomly assigned a male or a female name. Both male and female participants gave the male applicant better evaluations for teaching, research, and service experience and were more likely to hire the male than the female applicant.

There has been no direct empirical research on stereotypes about gender and philosophy (though some is in progress at the University of Sheffield), but there is good reason to believe that philosophy is stereotyped as male. Sally Haslanger (2008: 213) writes:

As feminist philosophers have been arguing for decades, the familiar dichotomies with which Anglophone philosophy defines itself map neatly onto gender dichotomies—rational/emotional, objective/subjective, mind/body; ideas of philosophy—penetrating, seminal, and rigorous; and what we do—attack, target, and demolish an opponent, all of which frame philosophy as masculine and in opposition to the feminine.

In addition, analytic philosophy makes heavy use of logic. And there is an abundance of research showing that mathematics is stereotyped as male (e.g. Nosek et al. 2002).

If this is right, then philosophers will display both the biases against women that are standardly held in their culture and, additionally, biases against women in philosophy; and they will do so even if they do not consciously believe the stereotype. The result of this is that, whatever their own gender, philosophers are likely to unfairly downgrade the work of, wrongly ignore or mistakenly fail to encourage, women in philosophy at all career stages.

3.2. Stereotype threat

Rather than affecting the way that members of a stigmatised group are perceived or evaluated, stereotype threat affects the way that members of that group actually perform. Victims of stereotype threat underperform on the relevant tasks because they are unconsciously preoccupied by fears of performance from the stigmatised group improves dramatically—often to levels that are at least as high as the performance of the stigmatised group. This is from a group that is negatively stigmatised in that context, and one's group membership is made salient. Importantly, victims of stereotype threat are often, though not always, unaware of their own anxiety and performance pressure.

It is well established that the presence of a male or female name on a CV has a strong effect on how that CV is evaluated. This is true both inside and outside academia. Philosophers have not specifically been studied, but we do know that those academics most likely to be aware of the existence of unconscious psychological processes—psychologists—exhibit just this bias. In Steinpreis et al.'s US study, 238 academic psychologists (118 male, 120 female) evaluated a curriculum vitae randomly assigned a male or a female name. Both male and female participants gave the male applicant better evaluations for teaching, research, and service experience and were more likely to hire the male than the female applicant.

There has been no direct empirical research on stereotypes about gender and philosophy (though some is in progress at the University of Sheffield), but there is good reason to believe that philosophy is stereotyped as male. Sally Haslanger (2008: 213) writes:

As feminist philosophers have been arguing for decades, the familiar dichotomies with which Anglophone philosophy defines itself map neatly onto gender dichotomies—rational/emotional, objective/subjective, mind/body; ideas of philosophy—penetrating, seminal, and rigorous; and what we do—attack, target, and demolish an opponent, all of which frame philosophy as masculine and in opposition to the feminine.

In addition, analytic philosophy makes heavy use of logic. And there is an abundance of research showing that mathematics is stereotyped as male (e.g. Nosek et al. 2002).

If this is right, then philosophers will display both the biases against women that are standardly held in their culture and, additionally, biases against women in philosophy; and they will do so even if they do not consciously believe the stereotype. The result of this is that, whatever their own gender, philosophers are likely to unfairly downgrade the work of, wrongly ignore or mistakenly fail to encourage, women in philosophy at all career stages.

3.2. Stereotype threat

Rather than affecting the way that members of a stigmatised group are perceived or evaluated, stereotype threat affects the way that members of that group actually perform. Victims of stereotype threat underperform on the relevant tasks because they are unconsciously preoccupied by fears of
What people are doing

"Every chance I get, I point out to the people in charge of such things that it's not just the STEM subjects that have gender problems. I argue that they should look department by department—and consider extending their programmes to support women to philosophy (and other IPHWPMOIGSRSQMGWXLEXEVIIEWMP missed if one focuses on broad categories like "arts and humanities" or "social WGMIRGIW² %RH-XLMRO-´QWXEVXMRKXS make some headway.")

3.3. Sexual harassment

We do not have good data on the prevalence of sexual harassment in philosophy. But we do have a lot of very disturbing anecdotes about sexual harassment in philosophy, so much so that this discussion was spurred by anecdotes submitted to the blog What is it Like to be a Woman in Philosophy: <http://beingawomaninphilosophy.wordpress.com/>. Although there is considerable variation in how sexual harassment complaints are dealt with from institution to institution, it is clear that at least some institutions are brushing aside complaints of sexual harassment. It should not be difficult to see how both harassment, and a failure to deal adequately with it, may discourage women from continuing in philosophy. But the following testimonial (<http://beingawomaninphilosophy.wordpress.com/why-stay/>) helps to make it vivid:

I am about to start my PhD at an excellent Leiter ranked program. I have a BA and and MA from excellent schools. I have worked closely with ground breaking philosophers in my field. I have published, I have an excellent teaching resume, phenomenal letters of recommendation, and moreover I love my job. I am a good philosopher, and I am thinking about leaving philosophy.

I have been a secretary and a chauffeur. I have been disingenuously promised research assistantships and letters of recommendation, in return for dinner dates and car rides. I have been asked if I was married while my colleagues have been asked what they think. I have been told that I'm both cute and idiotic. I have passed on professional opportunities because I am a woman, and no one would believe that I deserved those opportunities—accepting would make me seem like a slut, since men make it on merit, and women make it in bed. So, ironically, I have been praised as professional for having passed on professional opportunities. I have been the lone woman presenting at the conference, and I have been the woman called a bitch for declining sexual relations with one of the institution's hosts. I think I have just about covered the gamut of truly egregiously atrocious sexist behaviour. So I just have this one question that I think I need answered: Is the choice between doing philosophy, and living under these conditions, or saving yourself, and leaving the discipline?

This is an open call for reasons to stay.

3.4. Why these barriers are unfair, and why their effects are bad for philosophy

We will assume here that there is no need to explain why sexual harassment is a bad thing, and we will focus instead on implicit bias and stereotype threat.

The effect of implicit bias is that work is not getting the mark it deserves, the best candidates are not being hired, and submitted papers are not being judged on their merits. The effect of stereotype threat is that people are performing less well than they are capable of solely because they are members of a group that is stigmatized, and are prone to experience unnecessarily high levels of stress. These effects are clearly unfair (though for argument on this topic see Saul, forthcoming).

They are also bad for philosophy. If implicit bias and stereotype threat are having the sorts of effects in philosophy that they have elsewhere, then:

• Women's work is being wrongly judged to be of lower quality than it actually is. This will lead to talented philosophers not being encouraged to continue, not getting grants, not getting jobs, not getting promoted, and not getting their work read.

Until we successfully do something about The philosophy being produced is likely environment. And that, needless to say, is not good for philosophy.
In this section, women who have been involved in initiatives designed to improve women philosophers' visibility, experiences, etc. describe in their own words what they and their colleagues have done, and what effects it has had.

The purpose of the group is to address the lack of gender diversity in the profession and by the sexist prejudices which many women experience and witness in the profession. This is an issue of mitigating the detrimental effects of gender imbalance.

The Cambridge 'Women in Philosophy' society began in 2010, when we (three female graduate students) decided to confront the gender imbalance in our departments. We aimed to promote women's participation and recognition in philosophy.

Firstly, we aim to discuss and celebrate the work that women are doing in philosophy. Historically, women have been underrepresented in academic philosophy, and the Cambridge Women in Philosophy society aims to change this by bringing together women and male faculty members to discuss issues surrounding the lack of women's visibility in the profession and the challenges faced by female philosophers.

Secondly, we provide networking opportunities for female philosophers working in diverse areas. Female graduate students often feel isolated and struggle to find their place in the academic community. The Women in Philosophy society aims to address this need by creating a supportive environment where women can connect and share their experiences.

Lastly, we work towards gaining a greater understanding of gender discrimination in philosophy courses, where reading lists feature very few female philosophers. This is an issue because female students often lack exposure to diverse perspectives and role models.

We have encouraged faculty to increase their reference to women as speakers at departmental seminars, and to make more frequent verbal references to women within their discipline. This can lead to an outsider syndrome, where women feel as though they do not belong, and as a result can become shy with participation. The Women in Philosophy society aims to deal with this by connecting female philosophers. Talking to other female philosophy students and realising how many of us have felt this way from time to time—in different rooms, at different talks—helps to alleviate this isolation.

We have also organised roundtable discussions featuring members of the academic staff, discussing facts about the presence of women in professional philosophy. We also organised a workshop detailing some instances of sexist behaviour they have encountered, which has helped to raise awareness and encourage more open and diverse discussions.

Of course, any analysis of the issues facing women in philosophy must be careful to avoid quick and dangerous stereotypes. Some of our female members have expressed feeling no dissatisfaction with, and even having a taste for, aggressive and rigorous critique. And this leads us to the larger question of how different methods and interpersonal styles do or do not advance the content of philosophy.
What people are doing

“I’d arranged to meet male colleagues A and B to talk about a paper I was writing. Halfway through our discussion, male colleague C joined us. C began a conversation with A about the central point several points to join this conversation, but each time C interrupted me. Throughout the conversation, he addressed all his questions and remarks directly to A, completely ignoring me. A then had to answer his phone, at which point C began the same process with B. Again, I was unable to join the conversation, even though it was my paper that was under discussion. This wasn’t an anomaly. I’m friends with C and we often talk socially, but C has never engaged me in a philosophical conversation and probably never will. So on this occasion I was feeling down. But as soon as C was momentarily distracted, A and B both remarked on his obvious and unacceptable sexism. A then suggested that we reconvene at a coffee shop across the road. We did, and it was great—not only because of the feedback I got on my paper, but because I felt valued and supported by my male colleagues.”

UCL: Committee for Widening Participation

Sarah Richmond

The UCL Department of Philosophy set up a Committee for Widening Participation (WP) late in 2010 after Sarah Richmond, inspired by what she had heard at the November conference in Cardiff on Underrepresented Groups in Philosophy, proposed it at a staff meeting. There are six of us on the committee, plus an external advisor in the form of Helen Beebee. We chose the ‘WP’ title in order to associate ourselves with the advertised commitment of UCL to WP issues, and to make it clear that we take our remit to include the position not only of women, but also of the other groups whose participation in the Department is at present disproportionately low: in particular, members of ethnic minorities, and people from disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds.

We meet termly. Our two meetings to date have shown that there are numerous issues in relation to which the WP perspective is relevant and where, we hope, it will influence policy. We have begun monitoring student admissions and performance (at u/g and p/g levels), and the placement in jobs of our graduate students, according to gender and (where we have the data) ethnic and socio-economic categories. Members of staff have agreed to check teaching materials to make sure that, where relevant, work by women philosophers is included and to encourage a wide range of students to participate actively in seminars. Anonymity will be increased in relation to the Graduate admissions process, and visits to local state sixth forms are planned, possibly with the assistance of undergraduate ‘ambassadors’. The Department has discussed the matter of images, especially in relation to stereotype threat. The Pyke photos on our seminar room walls will stay in place for now, but photos are being added to the website and other publicity materials to increase the range of people depicted. We are drafting policy recommendations for future staff appointments. The enthusiasm shown by a large number of colleagues has been gratifying and we are hopeful that signs of WP progress will soon be apparent. It is however clear that it will take time for the Department to become significantly more inclusive, and patience is required.

Further information about the scheme and how to participate, will appear on the BPA and SWIP websites in due course.
• Double-check the women’s applications for postgraduate study to make sure that they haven’t been downgraded due to implicit bias. (Obviously this is only either possible or appropriate where anonymous procedures haven’t been used.)

• Be aware that most people (whatever their sex, and whatever their political commitments) are more likely to notice men attempting to contribute to discussion than women. (This is probably partly due to expectations/implicit bias, and partly due to women participating more hesitantly.) Make an effort to notice and to call on women. (See Bartky 1990: 91, Sadker and Sadker 1995.)

• Communicate the phenomenon of stereotype threat, and the fact that it may be a cause of any anxiety they experience, to women students. In addition, make sure they are aware that you have high expectations for them, but that you think they are perfectly capable of meeting these expectations (Steele 2010: 159-164). This helps with stereotype threat. Finally, encourage them to try some of the further methods described in ‘For those who may be suffering from stereotype threat’ below.

• Encourage women to consider postgraduate study. In fact, encouraging all promising final year students to consider postgraduate study has the effect of increasing the percentage of women continuing (Saul forthcoming).

• Ensure that women staff are involved in postgraduate recruitment. Remember, the single biggest drop in the representation of women in the UK occurs between undergraduate and Masters levels.

• Make sure that you have women, both staff and students, at your Open Days.

• Encourage women PhD students to take advantage of the SWIP/BPA mentoring scheme (see §5).

• Have women as lecturers, put women on reading lists, do anything you can to make students aware that there are women philosophers. To get more women as lecturers and as postgraduate students, follow the suggestions under ‘Staffing’, below. When you discuss women philosophers in lectures, try using photographs as part of a PowerPoint presentation. Images are especially effective in combating implicit bias and stereotype threat, and they also help to make it clear that a woman is being discussed.

Why?
• Because doing this will help to break down the stereotype that philosophy is male, thus reducing both stereotype and implicit bias (Blair 2002, Kang and Banaji 2006).

• Because their exclusion may be due to implicit bias—studies have shown that women’s names leap to mind less easily, and that women have to accomplish more than men to be seen as equally accomplished (see for example the CV case mentioned in §3). Good women are very likely being overlooked where they shouldn’t be.

6.2 For staffing
• Make sure that women in your department are not disproportionately carrying a disproportionate share of the pastoral care in your department, and that their administrative work isn’t disproportionately focused on teaching. These sorts of jobs are stereotyped as female. Unlike, say, PG or Research Director, they may also have high expectations for them, but that you think they are perfectly capable of meeting these expectations (Steele 2010: 159-164). This helps with stereotype threat. Finally, encourage them to try some of the further methods described in ‘For those who may be suffering from stereotype threat’ below.

• Communicate the phenomenon of stereotype threat, and the fact that it may be a cause of any anxiety they experience, to women students. In addition, make sure they are aware that you have high expectations for them, but that you think they are perfectly capable of meeting these expectations (Steele 2010: 159-164). This helps with stereotype threat. Finally, encourage them to try some of the further methods described in ‘For those who may be suffering from stereotype threat’ below.

• Make sure that women in your department are not disproportionately carrying a disproportionate share of the pastoral care in your department, and that their administrative work isn’t disproportionately focused on teaching. These sorts of jobs are stereotyped as female. Unlike, say, PG or Research Director, they may also have high expectations for them, but that you think they are perfectly capable of meeting these expectations (Steele 2010: 159-164). This helps with stereotype threat. Finally, encourage them to try some of the further methods described in ‘For those who may be suffering from stereotype threat’ below.

• Make sure that women staff are involved in postgraduate recruitment. Remember, the single biggest drop in the representation of women in the UK occurs between undergraduate and Masters levels.

• Make sure that you have women, both staff and students, at your Open Days.

• Encourage women PhD students to take advantage of the SWIP/BPA mentoring scheme (see §5).

• Have women as lecturers, put women on reading lists, do anything you can to make students aware that there are women philosophers. To get more women as lecturers and as postgraduate students, follow the suggestions under ‘Staffing’, below. When you discuss women philosophers in lectures, try using photographs as part of a PowerPoint presentation. Images are especially effective in combating implicit bias and stereotype threat, and they also help to make it clear that a woman is being discussed.

Why?
• Because doing this will help to break down the stereotype that philosophy is male, thus reducing both stereotype and implicit bias (Blair 2002, Kang and Banaji 2006).

• Because their exclusion may be due to implicit bias—studies have shown that women’s names leap to mind less easily, and that women have to accomplish more than men to be seen as equally accomplished (see for example the CV case mentioned in §3). Good women are very likely being overlooked where they shouldn’t be.

How?

Provide funding, if possible, for women and men to attend the SWIP/BPA mentoring workshop, to be announced in the next year.

Investigate resources that may be on offer at your institution to combat underrepresentation of women. For example, see the Women’s Works (<http://women.aap.org.au/papers>—AAP has a searchable database of papers by women that are suitable for undergraduate teaching, Women’s Works (<http://women.aap.org.au/papers>—AAP has a searchable database of papers by women that are suitable for undergraduate teaching), or see for example the CV case mentioned in §3). Good women are very likely being overlooked where they shouldn’t be.

Try to increase the number of women on your staff.

Because doing this will help to break down the stereotype that philosophy is male, thus reducing both stereotype and implicit bias (Blair 2002, Kang and Banaji 2006).

Because their exclusion may be due to implicit bias—studies have shown that women’s names leap to mind less easily, and that women have to accomplish more than men to be seen as equally accomplished (see for example the CV case mentioned in §3). Good women are very likely being overlooked where they shouldn’t be.

Many of these suggestions are taken from Women's Works (<http://women.aap.org.au/papers>).
Put multiple women on the appointment panel if possible to reduce stereotype threat. Stereotypes tend to emphasize stereotypically female traits that are not as impressive (niceness, attention to detail) over more impressive stereotypically male traits, such as originality and ambitiousness (Madera et al. 2009, Ruth 2010).

Don’t allow decisions to be made just on the basis of an overall feel—all too easily affected by bias. Instead, insist on a more detailed evaluation: e.g. how were the arguments in the presentation? How significant was the paper? How good were the responses to questions? How much teaching ability was shown? This improves decision-making quite generally, but also helps to block the influence of bias.

Try for as many data points as possible when making a decision: any one thing (e.g. letters of reference) might have been influenced by implicit bias, or stereotype threat.

6.3. For research
- Try to make sure you include women as conference speakers, in anthologies, etc.

Why?
- Because doing this will help to break down the stereotype that philosophy is male, thus reducing both stereotype and implicit bias (Blair 2002, Kang and Banaji 2006).
- Because their exclusion may well be due to implicit bias—women’s names are likely to leap to mind less easily, and women have to accomplish more than men to be seen as equally accomplished (Saul forthcoming). Good women are very likely being overlooked where they shouldn’t be.

How?6
- Realise that the first names you think of are overwhelmingly likely to be male. This is exactly what work on implicit bias would predict. So if you want some female names, you’ll need to work a little harder. You might ask around a bit. Or you might look at the papers cited by some of the men you’ve thought of to find some women who work in the area. Neither of these is ideal, though, since the same biases will make it harder for others to think of women, or to remember to cite them. Perhaps a better idea is to search for your topic on the Philosopher’s Index, Phil Papers (<http://www.philpapers.org>) or Women’s Works (<http://women.aap.org.au/papers>), and see what women have written on it.

- Studies have shown that women often need to have done a lot more to be considered success-

6 This discussion draws heavily from this blog post: <http://feministphilosophers.wordpress.com/2011/03/26/how-to-avoid-a-gendered-conference>.

6.4. For journal editors
- As far as possible, practise both anonymous and double-blinded editing. Anonymous editing is important (65% of papers without making use of it rejected; 42% of papers switching to anonymous review, the representation of women authors increased by 30% (Budden et al.).
- In study of ‘prestige bias’, researchers resubmitted previously-published papers to top psychology journals that did not practise anonymous review, the paper reviewing processes at Analysis Trust. What people are doing
- Because doing this will help to break down the stereotype that philosophy is male, thus reducing stereotype threat. Studies have shown that women often need to have done a lot more to be considered success-

6.5. For those who may be suffering from stereotype threat
- All of the following techniques have been shown to reduce stereotype threat.
- Remind yourself that stereotype threat may be a source of any anxiety you are experiencing (Lee and Schunn 2010).
- Spend some time reflecting on counter-stereotypical examples. You may well be setting the bar higher for women. So if you want some female names, you’ll need to work a little harder. You might ask around a bit. Or you might look at the papers cited by some of the men you’ve thought of to find some women who work in the area. Neither of these is ideal, though, since the same biases will make it harder for others to think of women, or to remember to cite them. Perhaps a better idea is to search for your topic on the Philosopher’s Index, Phil Papers (<http://www.philpapers.org>) or Women’s Works (<http://women.aap.org.au/papers>), and see what women have written on it.

- Studies have shown that women often need to have done a lot more to be considered success-

6 This discussion draws heavily from this blog post: <http://feministphilosophers.wordpress.com/2011/03/26/how-to-avoid-a-gendered-conference>.

Don’t wait till the last minute to invite a popular reason that women declined conference invitations, according to a poll on Feminist implicit bias. Prevents-women-from-accepting-conferences>

Offer childcare at your conference. (For discussions of how to do this, go here: <http://feminist-philosophers.wordpress.com/category/childcare-at-conferences>

Bear in mind that letters of reference are likely to contain elements of gender stereotyping. Studies have shown that women’s references tend to emphasise stereotypically female traits that are less easily, and women have to accomplish more than men to be seen as equally accomplished (Saul forthcoming).

Try to make sure you include women as conference speakers, in anthologies, etc.

Why?
- Because doing this will help to break down the stereotype that philosophy is male, thus reducing both stereotype and implicit bias (Blair 2002, Kang and Banaji 2006).
- Because their exclusion may well be due to implicit bias—women’s names are likely to leap to

How?6
- Realise that the first names you think of are overwhelmingly likely to be male. This is exactly what work on implicit bias would predict. So if you want some female names, you’ll need to work a little harder. You might ask around a bit. Or you might look at the papers cited by some of the men you’ve thought of to find some women who work in the area. Neither of these is ideal, though, since the same biases will make it harder for others to think of women, or to remember to cite them. Perhaps a better idea is to search for your topic on the Philosopher’s Index, Phil Papers (<http://www.philpapers.org>) or Women’s Works (<http://women.aap.org.au/papers>), and see what women have written on it.

- Studies have shown that women often need to have done a lot more to be considered success-

6 This discussion draws heavily from this blog post: <http://feministphilosophers.wordpress.com/2011/03/26/how-to-avoid-a-gendered-conference>.

6.4. For journal editors
- As far as possible, practise both anonymous and double-blinded editing. Anonymous editing is important (65% of papers without making use of it rejected; 42% of papers switching to anonymous review, the representation of women authors increased by 30% (Budden et al.).
- In study of ‘prestige bias’, researchers resubmitted previously-published papers to top psychology journals that did not practise anonymous review, the paper reviewing processes at Analysis Trust. What people are doing
- Because doing this will help to break down the stereotype that philosophy is male, thus reducing stereotype threat. Studies have shown that women often need to have done a lot more to be considered success-

6.5. For those who may be suffering from stereotype threat
- All of the following techniques have been shown to reduce stereotype threat.
- Remind yourself that stereotype threat may be a source of any anxiety you are experiencing (Lee and Schunn 2010).
- Spend some time reflecting on counter-stereotypical examples. You may well be setting the bar higher for women. So if you want some female names, you’ll need to work a little harder. You might ask around a bit. Or you might look at the papers cited by some of the men you’ve thought of to find some women who work in the area. Neither of these is ideal, though, since the same biases will make it harder for others to think of women, or to remember to cite them. Perhaps a better idea is to search for your topic on the Philosopher’s Index, Phil Papers (<http://www.philpapers.org>) or Women’s Works (<http://women.aap.org.au/papers>), and see what women have written on it.

- Studies have shown that women often need to have done a lot more to be considered success-

6 This discussion draws heavily from this blog post: <http://feministphilosophers.wordpress.com/2011/03/26/how-to-avoid-a-gendered-conference>.
• Focus on your membership of social groups that are not negatively stigmatized in philosophy—people with good ‘A’ level grades or who are getting high grades for their coursework, people who have been accepted onto a good postgraduate programme, people funded by the AHRC for their PhDs, etc. (Steele 2010: 170).

• Join the BPA/SWIP mentoring scheme (see §5).

6.6. For everyone

• Make sure that your university’s policies on harassment and student/faculty relationships are clearly communicated to both staff and students.

• Take any concerns about harassment very seriously, and follow your university’s policies. Seek guidance, if needed, from university authorities.

• Create an atmosphere in which harassing behaviour is clearly unacceptable. If sexist, racist or homophobic comments are made, speak up. One of the most damaging things is for such comments to go unremarked upon. For guidance on speaking up in such situations, you may find it useful to consult this website on ‘bystander training’: <http://web.mit.edu/bystanders/assessing/>.

• Suggest any papers, books or book chapters by women that you know of, which are suitable for undergraduate teaching, for inclusion on the AAP’s Women’s Works database; see women.aap.org.au/papers.

• If you are a member of staff, investigate your institution’s policy and procedures relating to gender equality. Is there a university-level committee for equality and diversity? If so, what do they do? Has the university got an Athena SWAN ‘Bronze’ award? (This requires commitment to various principles, as evidenced by action, not all of which are aimed at the sciences.) If not, you could ask why. If they are, you could ask to see a copy of the application; this should contain a lot of information about its policies and procedures. (There are links to the applications on the Athena SWAN website, but very few of them work.) The list of University Bronze award holders is at <http://www.athenaswan.org.uk/html/athena-swan/awards/current-award-holders>.

• If you are a student, ask your student rep to table this report at a staff-student committee meeting, and ask your Head of Department to do the same at a departmental meeting.

• Be on the look-out for things that you can do to improve the climate for women, and don’t just assume that other people are thinking of this. Don’t make the mistake, for example, of assuming that someone else will be making sure your seminar series isn’t all-male.
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