



H Y P A	12351	WILEY	Dispatch: 30.6.17	CE: Wiley
Journal Code	Manuscript No.		No. of pages: 12	PE: Kamatchi E.

The Underrepresentation of Women in Prestigious Ethics Journals

MEENA KRISHNAMURTHY, SHEN-YI LIAO, MONIQUE DEVEAUX AND MAGGIE DALECKI¹

The main goal of this study is to determine whether women are underrepresented in prestigious ethics journals relative to their representation in the field of ethics. Our study proceeds in three steps. Step one: we estimate the percentage of women who specialize in ethics. Step two: we estimate the percentage of articles in prestigious ethics journals that are authored by women. Step three: we examine whether there is any difference between the percentage of women who specialize in ethics and the percentage of articles in prestigious ethics journals that are authored by women. We conclude that women are underrepresented in prestigious ethics journals relative to their representation in the field of ethics.

I. INTRODUCTION

Philosophy has a gender problem. “The gender problem” is, however, a bit of a misnomer, for it is not a single problem. Rather, it is a multifaceted set of problems that relate to the general underrepresentation of women in philosophy: in the historical canon, in the professoriate class, and at conferences (Feminist Philosophers 2009; Paxton, Figdor, and Tiberius 2012; Schwitzgebel 2015; Jennings 2016), and in upper-level undergraduate classrooms (Paxton, Figdor, and Tiberius 2012). Our article investigates one specific aspect of the gender problem that has received relatively little investigation: the underrepresentation of articles by women in top journals. We focus on journal publishing *not* because we think it is somehow the driving cause of women’s underrepresentation in the philosophy professoriate—a problem that surely has many contributing causes, from chilly professional climates and implicit bias in hiring and assessment of research, to job demands that are disadvantageous to women with caregiving responsibilities. Rather, we focus on the issue of journal publishing because we think that if women are underrepresented in top philosophy journals, then this, in and of itself, is a significant aspect of the gender underrepresentation

1 problem. Moreover, it is one that could be expected to have significant implications
2 for women's professional success in the discipline: journals constitute an important
3 currency of academic prestige, and are of the utmost importance for tenure and pro-
4 motion assessments.

5 Some recent discussion among philosophers of women's representation in presti-
6 gious journals, especially prestigious ethics journals, suggests a gender discrepancy
7 (Krishnamurthy 2014; Healy 2015; Krishnamurthy forthcoming; Schwitzgebel and
8 Jennings forthcoming). Eric Schwitzgebel and Carolyn Dicey Jennings report that
9 women authored only 13% of articles (32 out of 249) in "top five" generalist journals
10 in 2014–2015 (Schwitzgebel and Jennings forthcoming). Kathryn Norlock found that
11 between 2009–2014, women authors accounted for 17.5% of published papers in the
12 *Journal of Moral Philosophy*, and for 20% of published papers in *Ethics* (Norlock
13 2014). Similar numbers have been reported previously. In her study of seven leading
14 philosophy journals, Sally Haslanger found that women represented 22% of authors
15 of articles in *Ethics*, and a mere 13% in *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, in the period from
16 2002–2007 (Haslanger 2008). Thom Brooks, the editor of the *Journal of Moral Philo-*
17 *sophy* at the time, reported in the APA Newsletter that the average percentage of
18 women-authored papers in this journal between 2003–2009 was 22% (Brooks 2010,
19 16). And Henry S. Richardson, the editor of *Ethics*, reported that in 2007–2008
20 women-authored papers in *Ethics* were at 17% and in 2008–2009 were at 15%
21 (Richardson 2010, 19).²

22 Although this descriptive data suggests the existence of a gender *discrepancy* in
23 prestigious ethics journals—our area of focus—it does not suffice to answer the ques-
24 tion of whether women are *underrepresented* in prestigious ethics journals relative to
25 their numbers in the discipline. To establish whether these percentages of women-
26 authored publications reflect a gendered discrepancy, we need to compare the data
27 about women-authored papers with the *proportion* of women philosophers specializing
28 in ethics. Although previous discussions by Haslanger, Healy, Norlock, and Schw-
29 witzgebel and Jennings certainly suggest that women authors are underrepresented in
30 prestigious ethics philosophy journals, only this comparative information can help us
31 to establish conclusively whether there is a gender problem specific to journal pub-
32 lishing.

33 We are drawn to examine specifically whether a gender problem exists in relation
34 to ethics journals because, as we discuss later, conventional wisdom has it that
35 women are disproportionately likely to specialize in ethics (Haslanger 2009, 3; Schw-
36 witzgebel and Jennings forthcoming).³ (We use *ethics* as an inclusive term for diverse
37 subfields of moral, social, and political philosophy. Section II explains our opera-
38 tionalization of the term.) If it turns out that women authors are underrepresented in
39 prestigious ethics journals, a field in which they tend to specialize, then the gender
40 problem in philosophy publishing may be more widespread and pernicious than we
41 thought.

42 The main goal of this study is, therefore, to determine whether women are under-
43 represented in prestigious ethics journals relative to their representation in the field
44 of ethics. Our study proceeds in three steps. Step one: we estimate the percentage of

1 women who specialize in ethics. Step two: we estimate the percentage of articles in
 2 prestigious ethics journals that are authored by women. Step three: we examine
 3 whether there is any difference between the percentage of women who specialize in
 4 ethics and the percentage of articles in prestigious ethics journals that are authored
 5 by women. We conclude that, overall, female authors are underrepresented in presti-
 6 gious ethics journals relative to the proportion of women academics in the field of
 7 ethics.

10 II. STEP ONE: ESTIMATING THE PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN WHO SPECIALIZE IN ETHICS

11
 12 We used the faculty lists compiled for the Philosophical Gourmet Report (PGR) for
 13 the top 50 departments in the period of 2004–2014 to estimate the percentage of
 14 women who specialized in ethics. In part, this sampling choice was pragmatic: instead
 15 of having to go to many different department websites, the PGR faculty list already
 16 has the information in one place. In part, this sampling choice also reflects our socio-
 17 logical recognition that, unfortunately, the philosophical profession is prone to prestige
 18 bias: people who work in “top” departments are more likely to publish in
 19 “prestigious” journals. This being the case, if we still found women at these depart-
 20 ments to be underrepresented in prestigious journals, that would further strengthen
 21 our belief in the existence of underrepresentation more broadly. That is, if women in
 22 the most highly ranked departments are not publishing in the most prestigious jour-
 23 nals at a proportionate rate, it seems likely that women outside of this enclave are
 24 also not doing so.

25 We coded for gender on the basis of individuals’ first names. Where first names
 26 were gender ambiguous, we coded for gender on the basis of information found on
 27 the individual’s departmental webpages and CVs. We looked for photographs and
 28 pronouns used by the individuals to describe themselves.

29 We coded for area of specialization (AOS) in ethics in a sense that includes
 30 diverse subfields of moral, social, and political philosophy. We counted people as spe-
 31 cializing in ethics when they listed any of the following as an AOS or a research
 32 interest or when they published mostly in any of the following areas: ethics; norma-
 33 tive ethics; social philosophy; political philosophy; metaethics; moral psychology;
 34 feminist ethics; bioethics; environmental ethics; naturalistic ethics; applied ethics;
 35 ethical theory; academic ethics; ethics of technology; business ethics; nineteenth-cen-
 36 tury ethics; medical ethics; history of ethics; foundations of ethics; philosophy of law;
 37 moral philosophy; ancient ethics; Kantian ethics; history of political philosophy; Aris-
 38 totelian ethics.

39 We determined AOS by searching individuals’ departmental and/or personal web-
 40 pages. AOS was interpreted broadly to include not only what was explicitly listed as
 41 “area of specialization” but also what was sometimes listed as “research interests,”
 42 when no AOS was listed. In rare cases where no area of specialization or no research
 43 interests were listed, we deduced whether or not to count individuals as having an
 44 AOS of ethics based on the publications listed on their CVs online. The results are

Table 1
Women in philosophy, 2004–2014.

	All Specializations	Ethics Specializations
2004–2005	(181/947) 19.1%	(86/354) 24.3%
2006–2008	(190/982) 19.3%	(95/366) 26.0%
2009–2010	(222/1001) 22.2%	(108/380) 28.4%
2011–2012	(225/994) 22.6%	(108/377) 28.6%
2013–2014	(237/992) 23.9%	(106/363) 29.2%

summarized in Table 1. In section IV, we use this information on gender and specializations to investigate whether women are underrepresented in ethics journals.

Moreover, this information is valuable in itself as a snapshot of the profession, even when we acknowledge its limitation as a sample from only the “PGR Top 50” departments. For example, it enables us to assess the conventional wisdom that, within philosophy, women tend to specialize in ethics more than in other areas. On one disambiguation of this conventional wisdom, this means that the gender proportion of philosophers who specialize in ethics is not the same as that for philosophers who do not specialize in ethics. We can then use the data to assess whether the conventional wisdom, at least on this disambiguation, is true or not.

On a weighted average over the period surveyed, in a given year there are roughly 100 women and 266 men who specialize in ethics.⁴ By contrast, on a weighted average over the period surveyed, in a given year there are roughly 109 women and 508 men who do not specialize in ethics. There is a significant difference in the gender proportion of philosophers who specialize in ethics versus philosophers who do not specialize in ethics: $X^2(1) = 12.795$, $p < 0.001$, effect size *Cramer’s V* = 0.114.

III. STEP TWO: ESTIMATING THE PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN-AUTHORED ARTICLES IN ETHICS JOURNALS

To estimate the representation of women in prestigious ethics journals, we examined the table of contents of four prominent ethics journals—*Ethics*, *Philosophy & Public Affairs* (PPA), *Journal of Political Philosophy* (JPP), and *Journal of Moral Philosophy* (JMP)—for the period 2004–2014. We counted all articles, review essays, discussions, debates, survey articles, and introductions as “publications.” We also coded publications for gender on the basis of the author’s first name. When first names were gender-ambiguous, we coded for gender on the basis of information found on individuals’ departmental webpages and CVs. We looked at photographs and pronouns used by the individuals to describe themselves. We counted all articles as woman-authored articles if they had at least one woman author. (We recognize that this likely overestimates the number of women authors in ethics journals, and we discuss its implication in section V.) The results are summarized in Table 2. In section IV, we use this

Table 2
Women-authored articles in prestigious ethics journals, 2004–2014.

	Ethics	PPA	JPP	JMP
2004	(2/25) 8.0%	(2/14) 14.3%	(8/22) 36.4%	(6/18) 33.3%
2005	(6/22) 27.3%	(2/16) 12.5%	(6/23) 26.1%	(7/18) 38.9%
2006	(4/22) 18.2%	(3/16) 18.8%	(6/27) 22.2%	(3/19) 15.8%
2007	(7/23) 30.4%	(1/15) 6.7%	(6/24) 25.0%	(5/26) 19.2%
2008	(4/25) 16.0%	(6/16) 37.5%	(4/24) 16.7%	(4/19) 21.1%
2009	(4/22) 18.2%	(4/13) 30.8%	(8/24) 33.3%	(3/27) 11.1%
2010	(6/25) 24.0%	(3/12) 25.0%	(6/24) 25.0%	(5/25) 20.0%
2011	(4/21) 19.0%	(4/12) 33.3%	(4/23) 17.4%	(7/28) 25.0%
2012	(3/23) 13.0%	(1/10) 10.0%	(9/23) 39.1%	(3/24) 12.5%
2013	(5/24) 20.8%	(4/12) 33.3%	(7/23) 30.4%	(10/40) 25.0%
2014	(4/31) 12.9%	(1/11) 9.1%	(10/23) 43.5%	(7/29) 24.1%
Total	(49/263) 18.6%	(31/147) 21.1%	(74/260) 28.5%	(60/273) 22.0%

information on gender and publications to investigate whether women are underrepresented in ethics journals.

IV. STEP THREE: EXAMINING UNDERREPRESENTATION OF WOMEN ETHICISTS IN ETHICS JOURNALS

We used the data from sections II and III to compare the percentage of articles that are authored by women with the percentage of women who specialize in ethics. For all statistical analyses in this section, we treated each year as a data point for comparisons.⁵ In our analysis, we used paired-sample *t*-tests (reported as *t* statistics) primarily, and Wilcoxon signed-rank tests (reported as *T* statistics) as a secondary robustness check.⁶

The main goal of this study is to determine whether women are underrepresented in prestigious ethics journals relative to their representation in the field of ethics. The key analysis thus compares the mean proportion of women specializing in ethics in the 2004–2014 period, 27.1% ($SD = 2.0\%$), with the mean proportion of women-authored articles in prestigious ethics journals in the 2004–2014 period, 22.6% ($SD = 2.3\%$). We found a statistically significant difference between the proportion of women-authored articles in prestigious ethics journals and the proportion of women specializing in ethics: $t(10) = -5.067$, $p < 0.001$; $T = 2$, $p = 0.003$. Women who specialize in ethics are indeed underrepresented in prestigious ethics journals.

Just for context, we also compared the mean proportion of women in philosophy with all specializations in the 2004–2014 period, 21.2% ($SD = 1.9\%$), with the mean proportion of women-authored articles in prestigious ethics journals in the 2004–2014 period. We did not find a statistically significant difference: $t(10) = 1.739$, $p = 0.113$; $T = 19$, $p = 0.240$.

Table 3

Side-by-side view of percentages of women in philosophy and percentages of women-authored articles in prestigious ethics journals. Highlighted in gray is the key comparison, between the percentages of women specializing in ethics and the percentages of women-authored articles in prestigious ethics journals.

	% of women in philosophy	% of women-authored articles in prestigious ethics journals					
		All	In Ethics	Aggregated	Ethics	PPA	JPP
2004	19.1%	24.3%	22.8%	8.0%	14.3%	36.4%	33.3%
2005	19.1%	24.3%	26.6%	27.3%	12.5%	26.1%	38.9%
2006	19.3%	26.0%	19.0%	18.2%	18.8%	22.2%	15.8%
2007	19.3%	26.0%	21.6%	30.4%	6.7%	25.0%	19.2%
2008	19.3%	26.0%	21.4%	16.0%	37.5%	16.7%	21.1%
2009	22.2%	28.4%	22.1%	18.2%	30.8%	33.3%	11.1%
2010	22.2%	28.4%	23.3%	24.0%	25.0%	25.0%	20.0%
2011	22.6%	28.6%	22.6%	19.0%	33.3%	17.4%	25.0%
2012	22.6%	28.6%	20.0%	13.0%	10.0%	39.1%	12.5%
2013	23.9%	29.2%	26.3%	20.8%	33.3%	30.4%	25.0%
2014	23.9%	29.2%	23.4%	12.9%	9.1%	43.5%	24.1%

To further explore the dataset, we examined each of the four journals separately.⁷ First, we looked at *Ethics*. The mean proportion of women-authored articles in *Ethics* in the 2004–2014 period is 18.9% ($SD = 6.6\%$).⁸ We found a statistically significant difference between the proportion of women-authored articles in *Ethics* and the proportion of women specializing in ethics: $t(10) = -3.903$, $p < 0.001$; $T = 4$, $p = 0.007$.

Second, we looked at *Philosophy & Public Affairs*. The mean proportion of women-authored articles in PPA in the 2004–2014 period is 21.0% ($SD = 11.3\%$). We did not find a statistically significant difference between the proportion of women-authored articles in PPA and the proportion of women specializing in ethics: $t(10) = -1.875$, $p = 0.090$; $T = 15$, $p = 0.123$.

Third, we looked at *Journal of Political Philosophy*. The mean proportion of women-authored articles in JPP in the 2004–2014 period is 28.7% ($SD = 8.7\%$). We did not find a statistically significant difference between the proportion of women-authored articles in JPP and the proportion of women specializing in ethics: $t(10) = 0.579$, $p = 0.575$; $T = 26$, $p = 0.577$.

Fourth, we looked at *Journal of Moral Philosophy*. The mean proportion of women-authored articles in JMP in the 2004–2014 period is 22.4% ($SD = 8.3\%$). We did not find a statistically significant difference between the proportion of women-authored articles in JMP and the proportion of women specializing in ethics: $t(10) = -1.683$, $p = 0.123$; $T = 16$, $p = 0.147$.

V. GENERAL DISCUSSION

THE UNDERREPRESENTATION OF WOMEN IN PRESTIGIOUS ETHICS JOURNALS

Our study began with the question of whether women are underrepresented in prestigious ethics journals relative to their representation in the field of ethics. Our central finding is that, yes, overall, women are underrepresented in prestigious ethics journals.

We also explored whether underrepresentation appeared in any particular prestigious ethics journal. We did find that underrepresentation occurred in *Ethics*, which is perhaps the most prestigious of the journals we surveyed. But we did not find that underrepresentation occurred in *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, *Journal of Political Philosophy*, or *Journal of Moral Philosophy*.

Two familiar adages about statistical inference are worth emphasizing in this context. First, a statistically nonsignificant result is not itself evidence for the null hypothesis (Hoening and Heisey 2001). So, in this context, one should not interpret the nonsignificant results as indicating appropriate gender representation in *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, *Journal of Political Philosophy*, or *Journal of Moral Philosophy*. Second, the difference between statistically significant and nonsignificant may not be statistically significant: in comparing various results, it is a mistake to do so via their statistical significance versus nonsignificance as if there were a sharp difference between the two (Gelman and Stern 2006). So, in this context, though the underrepresentation was statistically significant for *Ethics* but not for *Philosophy & Public Affairs* and *Journal of Moral Philosophy*, there is no statistical difference among the three journals. However, there is a statistically significant difference between the proportions of women-authored articles in *Ethics* and in *Journal of Political Philosophy*.

We wanted to present these exploratory analyses to acknowledge the complexity of this phenomenon. Honest examinations of real-world phenomena rarely offer a cut-and-dried picture, especially given standard concerns about variation and sampling. Given how few articles each journal publishes per year, it is to be expected that there is considerable variation from year to year within any given journal. It is, for this reason, more difficult to draw any firm conclusions on the basis of the disaggregated data about particular journals. Nevertheless, we do want to emphasize the central finding: women are undoubtedly underrepresented in prestigious ethics journals as a whole.

In establishing the central finding, it is also worth emphasizing our overall conservative approach in this investigation. For example, in estimating the percentage of women-authored publications, we counted publications as woman-authored as long as there was one woman author. This no doubt overestimated the proportion of women authors in prestigious ethics journals. Thus, women are likely to be even more underrepresented than our findings suggest. For another example, our use of the PGR faculty list sample in estimating the percentage of women who specialize in ethics is also conservative. Over the periods investigated, we found percentages that range

1 from 24.3% to 29.2%. For comparison, Schwitzgebel and Jennings estimated the per-
2 centage of women specializing in value theory to be 34% (Schwitzgebel and Jennings
3 forthcoming). Furthermore, given the existence of prestige bias, women faculty in the
4 top 50 departments are even more likely than those outside of them to publish in
5 prestigious journals. This again makes it the case that women authors are perhaps
6 even more underrepresented across the field than our findings suggest.

9 POTENTIAL EXPLANATIONS AND QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

10
11 Our goal was to establish the existence of a phenomenon, namely, that of women's
12 underrepresentation in prestigious ethics journals. That leaves open the question of
13 what causes this phenomenon. We now outline some questions that we hope will be
14 addressed in future studies on this topic.

15 First, might some of the gendered discrepancy be caused by certain prestigious
16 journals in Anglo American analytic philosophy defining ethics too narrowly? By
17 comparison, we used a very broad definition of what counts as ethics in our study;
18 insofar as the editors of some prestigious journals do not share our broad criteria, they
19 may consider scholarship by women *we* are counting as ethics faculty/researchers as
20 ineligible for publication in their journals. This is certainly concerning. Of particular
21 concern is that prestigious ethics journals may view feminist social criticism and femi-
22 nist political philosophy, which is largely authored by women, as falling outside the
23 scope of their publications. This would not be surprising, as feminist scholarship in
24 other fields in philosophy, such as epistemology, has notably been sidelined from the
25 leading journals (see, for example, Rooney 2010). If this is also the case for feminist
26 ethics and feminist social/political philosophy, then this could contribute to the
27 underrepresentation of women authors in prestigious ethics journals, such as *Ethics*.

28 Second, what role might professional status play in women's underrepresentation?
29 Women's success with publishing in prestigious ethics journals may depend in part on
30 their professional status: women in continuing positions may be more likely to pub-
31 lish in prestigious ethics journals to a degree proportionate to their numbers in their
32 field. This is something that future studies should delve more deeply into, in order to
33 get a clearer sense of whether very junior members of our profession possibly face
34 structural barriers to publishing in prestigious journals. Our study did not differentiate
35 among assistant, associate, and full professors in determining the relative success of
36 women in journal publishing, but counted only those in tenure/tenure-track positions.
37 Yet this could potentially be significant, since there is substantial evidence that
38 women philosophers are clustered in the assistant and associate professor ranks, and
39 are dramatically underrepresented among full professors (Schwitzgebel and Jennings
40 forthcoming). A possible confounding factor here is the status or standing of (tenured
41 and tenure-track) women authors' home departments, since women are less likely to
42 become full professors in the most prestigious philosophy programs.⁹

43 The prospect that professional status and the standing of one's department may
44 affect one's success in publishing in prestigious ethics journals may strike some readers

1 as surprising or even scandalous, given that the four journals we studied have blind
2 review processes in place. However, as editors and reviewers of journal articles are
3 well aware, there are numerous ways in which the identity and institution of authors
4 may be revealed in the review process. It seems possible that such identification (for
5 example, by an associate or assigning editor) could work against women authors: in
6 Haslanger's study, for example, 84.5% of men versus only 72.5% of women reported
7 that their most influential publication was published through submission to a peer-
8 reviewed journal.¹⁰ It is possible that informal identification of authors could also dis-
9 advantage philosophers from less prestigious institutions—including those from non-
10 English speaking universities that are not well known outside their own countries. Of
11 possible significance here is the fact that at least some of the journals we studied
12 have a system of desk-rejection in place. Where the author's name and institution is
13 known by the editor(s) vetting articles for review or else desk-rejection, implicit bias
14 and favoritism can come into play. For example, it has been claimed that *Philosophy*
15 & *Public Affairs* publishes a preponderance of articles by philosophers at Oxford, Har-
16 vard, and Princeton (Leiter 2015), potentially reflecting the academic links of its editorial
17 members.

18 Third, what role might article type play in causing underrepresentation? Our study
19 is not fine-grained enough to tell us whether women might be represented differently
20 in relation to different types of journal publications. It does not control for different
21 types of journal publications, nor for invited versus noninvited articles. The common
22 view is that women tend to publish more in invited venues than other venues. It is
23 held that women are better at maintaining relationships and have a tendency to work
24 through informal networks, which in turn leads to a greater number of invited publi-
25 cations. This may be the commonly held view, but it has not been thoroughly inves-
26 tigated.

27 Fourth, what role might negative experiences with the review process itself, actual
28 or anticipated, play in the underrepresentation of women? Are women philosophers
29 simply opting not to send their work to the most prestigious journals (see also
30 Haslanger 2008, 215)? Do they opt out more often than men? If so, why? Liam Kofi
31 Bright suggests that, at least in the field of science and perhaps more generally,
32 women do opt out—or publish less than men—because “women concentrate on pro-
33 ducing high quality papers in response to an expectation that their work will receive
34 greater scrutiny. Whether or not this expectation is accurate, producing such work is
35 time consuming, so women then produce fewer papers overall” (Bright forthcoming).
36 There is evidence supporting this hypothesis in the field of economics: a recent study
37 found that among the top four economics journals, women-authored papers consis-
38 tently received more critical reviews, resulting in significantly protracted review pro-
39 cesses, delayed publication, and thus “lower research outputs” at a critical time in
40 their careers (Hengel 2016).¹¹ Determining whether women opt out of submitting to
41 top ethics journals for fear of excessively negative reviews, desk-rejection, or a pro-
42 tracted resubmission process is, however, difficult. This is chiefly because the journals
43 that we surveyed do not collect submission data.¹² So, an authors' survey or question-
44 naire might have to be used to more fully determine whether women have the

1 tendency to opt out of prestigious ethics journals. Among other things, this question
2 of “opting out” would presumably need to be considered in tandem with the question
3 (discussed above) of whether the editors and reviewers of top ethics journals view
4 feminist ethics and feminist social and political philosophy as unfitting subject matter
5 for these journals, and also whether reviewers chosen take a similarly dim view of
6 these topics. There is certainly evidence that mainstream prestigious ethics journals
7 do not publish much feminist work: Haslanger’s study of leading philosophy journals
8 between 2002–2007 found that *Philosophy & Public Affairs* published only four femi-
9 nist philosophy articles (out of 78), and *Ethics* published a mere three (out of 105
10 articles) (Haslanger 2008, 220). We need to know whether this is because of editorial
11 decisions, or feminist philosophers opting not to submit their work, or both.

12 The goal of this study was to determine whether women were underrepresented in
13 prestigious ethics journals, as a whole. We have shown that they were. This finding
14 raises many questions, some of which are about what leads to this underrepresenta-
15 tion. We hope that this preliminary work will stimulate a broader discussion of
16 women’s underrepresentation in prestigious ethics journals, and how it relates to
17 other aspects of the gender problem in philosophy.

20 NOTES

21
22 1. The authors are equal contributors. Krishnamurthy conceived of and designed the
23 study, Dalecki collected the data, Liao analyzed the data, Deveaux related the findings to
24 other studies of women in ethics, and everyone wrote the paper.

25 2. More recently, Richardson has noted that there has been a “marked” rise in
26 manuscripts submitted to *Ethics* in recent years “on issues of gender, sexual ethics and sexual
27 orientation, and race,” but that, given the low acceptance rate of the journal generally,
28 this rise “has as yet resulted in only a modest increase in number of articles we have pub-
29 lished in these areas” (Richardson 2016, 2). One might infer from this purported increase
30 (Richardson does not provide data here) that the journal has seen an uptick in the publi-
31 cation of articles by women, but our own survey does not bear this out.

32 3. We also examine one disambiguation of this conventional wisdom later.

33 4. The averages are weighted by year such that, for example, the numbers from the
34 (three-year) 2006–2008 period are given 1.5 times the weight of the numbers from the
35 (two-year) 2014–2015 period. We chose to use a difference-of-proportions test with the
36 weighted averages rather than, say, a regression analysis because the year-to-year numbers
37 are not independent, especially since in any given year there are likely to be relatively
38 few cases of faculty turnovers.

39 5. It is a conceptually difficult question whether the samples being compared are
40 independent or not. On the one hand, they are estimating quite different things: the pro-
41 portion of women-authored articles and the proportion of women in the profession, espe-
42 cially for the ethics specializations. On the other hand, there is obviously a relationship
43 between those two things. This conceptual difficulty ramifies into a difficulty of choosing
44 appropriate statistical tests for our substantive hypotheses. In this paper, we chose to treat

1 the samples as dependent and thus used paired-sample t-tests and Wilcoxon signed-rank
 2 tests on the respective proportions being estimated for the analyses.

3 6. We do this because our sample violates the normality assumption of paired-sample
 4 t-test. Although t-tests are generally relatively robust to violations of assumptions, the
 5 Wilcoxon signed-rank test—as its nonparametric equivalent—offers a helpful check on
 6 the robustness of the results. For both tests, we report the two-sided p-values and adopt
 7 the conventional statistical significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$.

8 7. Since there are four comparisons investigated, we used a Bonferroni correction to
 9 set the threshold for statistical significance at $p = 0.0125$ in order to maintain the conven-
 10 tional statistical significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$. We report uncorrected p-values in text.

11 8. Attentive readers will notice small discrepancies between the percentages
 12 reported here and the percentages reported in the “Total” row in Table 2. These dis-
 13 crepancies arise because, as noted, each year is treated as a data point for the analysis.
 14 Hence, the percentages reported here represent averages of the yearly proportion of
 15 women-authored articles in a journal. In contrast, the percentages reported in the
 16 “Total” row in Table 2 represent the proportion of women-authored articles in a journal
 17 for the entire 2004–2014 period. These small discrepancies are due to the fact that the
 18 total number of articles published in a journal does not stay exactly the same year after
 19 year. Although these discrepancies are small, and do not affect our analyses, we report
 20 both for completeness.

21 9. In their study, Schwitzgebel and Jennings found that “women were considerably
 22 less likely to have full professor rank in PGR-ranked PhD departments than assistant or
 23 associate rank” (Schwitzgebel and Jennings forthcoming); see also Haslanger 2008, 322.

24 10. Based on 1072 author replies to this question; see Haslanger 2009, 4.

25 11. Interestingly, this study also found that article abstracts by women in the leading
 26 four economics journals were better written than abstracts by male authors, which she sug-
 27 gests is because “referees apply higher standards to female-authored papers” (Hengel 2016,
 28 29).

29 12. We emailed the editors of all of the prestigious ethics journals surveyed here to
 30 see if they collected submission data. None of them did at the time of asking.

31 REFERENCES

- 32 Bright, Liam Kofi. Forthcoming. Decision theoretic model of the productivity gap. *Erken-*
 33 *ntnis*.
 34 Brooks, Thom. 2010. The view from the *Journal of Moral Philosophy*. *American Philosophical*
 35 *Association Newsletter on Feminism and Philosophy* 10 (1): 16–17.
 36 Feminist Philosophers. 2009. Gendered conference campaign, December 10. (accessed
 37 February 28, 2017). [https://feministphilosophers.wordpress.com/gendered-conference-](https://feministphilosophers.wordpress.com/gendered-conference-campaign/)
 38 [campaign/](https://feministphilosophers.wordpress.com/gendered-conference-campaign/)
 39 Gelman, Andrew, and Hal Stern. 2006. The difference between “significant” and “not sig-
 40 nificant” is not itself statistically significant. *The American Statistician* 60 (4): 328–31.
 41 Haslanger, Sally. 2008. Changing the ideology and culture of philosophy: Not by reason
 42 (alone). *Hypatia* 23 (2): 210–23.
 43
 44

- . 2009. Preliminary report of the survey on publishing in philosophy. Presented at the American Philosophical Association Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession Session, Eastern APA, December 2009. <http://www.mit.edu/~shaslang/papers/HaslangerPRSPP.pdf> (accessed February 28, 2017)
- Healy, Kieran. 2015. Gender and citation in four general-interest philosophy journals, 1993–2013. *Kieran Healy Blog*, February 25. <https://kieranhealy.org/blog/archives/2015/02/25/gender-and-citation-in-four-general-interest-philosophy-journals-1993-2013/> (accessed February 28, 2017).
- Hengel, Erin. 2016. Publishing while female: Gender differences in peer review scrutiny. Unpublished manuscript. http://www.erinhengel.com/research/publishing_female.pdf. (accessed February 28, 2017).
- Hoening, John M., and Dennis M. Heisey. 2001. The abuse of power: The pervasive fallacy of power calculations for data analysis. *The American Statistician* 55 (1): 1–6.
- Jennings, Carolyn Dicey. 2016. Women in philosophy 2004–2014: Which programs do best? *New Apps*, May 21. <http://www.newappsblog.com/2016/05/women-in-philosophy-2004-2014-which-programs-do-best.html#more> (accessed February 28, 2017).
- Krishnamurthy, Meena. 2014. Thoughts on the gender ratios of papers published in *Ethics* and the *Journal of Moral Philosophy*. *Philosopher*, August 25. <https://politicalphilosopher.net/2014/08/25/thoughts-on-the-gender-ratios-of-papers-published-in-ethics-and-the-journal-of-moral-philosophy/> (accessed April 28, 2017).
- . Forthcoming. Proportional representation of women in elite ethics journals: To quota or not to quota? *Public Affairs Quarterly*.
- Leiter, Brian. 2015. Editorial practices at *Philosophy & Public Affairs*. *The Leiter report*, March 23. <http://leiterreports.typepad.com/blog/2015/03/editorial-practices-at-philosophy-public-affairs.html> (accessed February 28, 2017).
- Norlock, Kathryn. 2014. Gender ratios of papers published in *Ethics* and the *Journal of Moral Philosophy*. *New Apps*, August 19. <http://www.newappsblog.com/2014/08/gender-ratios-of-papers-published-in-ethics-and-the-journal-of-moral-philosophy.html> (accessed February 28, 2017).
- Paxton, Molly, Carrie Figdor, and Valerie Tiberius. 2012. Quantifying the gender gap: An empirical study of the underrepresentation of women in philosophy. *Hypatia* 27 (4): 949–57.
- Richardson, Henry S. 2010. The triply anonymous review process at *Ethics*. *APA Newsletter*, 10 (1).
- . 2016. Editorial: changes at the journal. *Ethics* 127 (1): 1–5.
- Rooney, Phyllis. 2010. The marginalization of feminist epistemology and what that reveals about epistemology “proper.” In *Feminist epistemology and philosophy of science: Power in knowledge*, ed. Heidi Grasswick. New York: Springer.
- Schwitzgebel, Eric. 2015. Percentage of women at APA meetings, 1955, 1975, 1995, 2015. *The Splintered Mind*, November 17. <http://schwitzsplinters.blogspot.com/2015/11/percentage-of-women-at-apa-meetings.html> (accessed February 28, 2017).
- Schwitzgebel, Eric, and Carolyn Dicey Jennings. Forthcoming. Women in philosophy: Quantitative analyses of specialization, prevalence, visibility, and generational change. *Public Affairs Quarterly*.