

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS: GENDER STATISTICS—AND A CHANGE AT THE TOP**

[to be printed in the July, 2018 issue]

Although last year's call for proposals for becoming the editor of *Ethics* led many to assume that I must by now have long been sitting back and taking it easy, I'll actually remain in the saddle 'til the end of June. While my feelings about relinquishing this rewarding and demanding role are mixed, those about my successors are not. I am thoroughly delighted to announce that on July 1, 2018 the editorship of *Ethics* passes to Julia Driver and Connie Rosati, acting as co-editors. Each has long been doing a superlative job as an associate editor of the journal, generously devoting her time to evaluating papers and writing comments. I look forward to great things from the journal under their leadership.

I know that one of the things that they would like to do is to redouble the journal's efforts to attract work by female authors and authors of color. This editorial's further announcements pertain to the first of these two priorities. With the strong backing of Julia, Connie, and the other editors, I am implementing two steps designed indirectly to aid the cause of reducing gender imbalance in philosophy publishing. First, to increase transparency and general understanding, I here publish for the first time the statistics that we have been collecting, for our internal use, on the genders of our submitting authors and those of the authors whose papers we end up publishing. The second step is to improve the quality of this data so as to facilitate analyses using it. Our determinations of authors' genders have hitherto rested mainly on first names, occasionally supplemented by internet searches. We have added a required field in which each submitting author will be asked to indicate their gender however they like. By not imposing a list of categories, we will avoid forcing anyone to choose among options none of which they

accept and will collect, over time, a set of data that, I am told, will not only be more accurate than what we have been gathering but will also allow for answering the broadest range of queries. Because none of our editors ever sees personal information about any paper's authors until after the final decision—irrevocable rejection or acceptance—has been reached, it should not alarm anyone that we are collecting such data. Anyone who objects to offering any substantive answer to the gender question is free to answer “not applicable.”

These efforts to improve our statistics are motivated in part by our awareness that more and more productive work is being done to study the gender imbalance in philosophy publication. Recent work has well shown, for instance, that the proportion of articles by women published in top journals in philosophical ethics, including this one, is lower than the proportion of women working in this area of philosophy.<sup>1</sup> What the figures in Table 1 suggest is that a similar disproportion exists already at the level of our incoming submissions.<sup>2</sup> This is especially true of the discussion submissions. It seems, in other words, that our review process does not exacerbate this disproportion. These figures show that, on average, women submitting to this journal have as good a chance of having their articles accepted as do men. As Table 2 reveals, since our book reviews are commissioned, it has been possible for the Book Review Editor to see to it that the proportion of women authoring them is higher than the proportion of women in the profession. I am grateful to the Book Review Editor, Mark van Roojen, for attending to this. In the case of articles and discussions, where our commitment to triple-blind review precludes

---

<sup>1</sup> Meena Krishnamurthy, Shen-Yi Liao, Monique Deveaux, and Maggie Dalecki, “The Underrepresentation of Women in Prestigious Ethics Journals,” *Hypatia* 32 (2017): 928-39.

<sup>2</sup> For two reasons, Table 1 has not broken down the gender proportions of the published material by year: first, all of that information is publicly available for inspection in any case; and, second, publishing it side-by-side with the annual breakdown of submission data would encourage misleading attempts to compare submissions for a given year with publications for that same year, neglecting the fact that, with generally at least one revise-and-resubmit step and a roughly six-month production process, the typical lapse of time between submission and eventual publication is over a year. The ten-year averages offer a better perspective for comparing submission proportions with published proportions.

doing this, we obviously need to increase our efforts to encourage women philosophers to submit to this journal. We have begun to do so by making the journal more receptive to feminist work in ethics, political, and social philosophy, such as the first two articles in this issue. I am sure that my successors will find additional ways to pursue this aim. Indeed, I hope that Julia's and Connie's being at the helm will itself inspire more women to submit their papers to *Ethics*.

HENRY S. RICHARDSON

TABLE 1  
ARTICLES AND DISCUSSIONS BY AUTHORS' GENDERS 2008-2017

All Submissions by YEAR	MALE	Percentage	FEMALE	Percentage	MIXED	Percentage	NOT SURE	Percentage
2008	272	78.4	71	20.5	4	1.1	0	0
Original Articles	254	78.4	66	20.4	4	1.2	0	0
Discussions	18	78.2	5	21.8	0	0	0	0
2009	348	78.5	85	19.2	6	1.3	4	1
Original Articles	333	78.6	82	19.4	4	1	4	1
Discussions	15	75	3	15	2	10	0	0
2010	360	77.2	97	20.8	7	1.5	2	0.5
Original Articles	344	77.3	93	20.9	7	1.6	1	0.2
Discussions	16	76	4	19	0	0	1	5
2011	354	80.3	74	16.8	10	2.2	3	0.7
Original Articles	333	80.2	69	16.6	10	2.5	3	0.7
Discussions	21	80.8	5	19.2	0	0	0	0
2012	353	76.4	101	21.9	7	1.5	1	0.2
Original Articles	330	76.2	95	21.9	7	1.7	1*	0.2
Discussions	23	79.3	6	20.7	0	0	0	0
2013	434	78.2	109	19.6	9	1.7	3	0.5
Original Articles	404	77.5	105	20.1	9	1.8	3	0.6
Discussions	30	88.2	4	11.8	0	0	0	0
2014	416	74	133	23.7	10	1.8	3	0.5
Original Articles	393	73.3	130	24.3	10	1.9	3**	0.5
Discussions	23	88.5	3	11.5	0	0	0	0
2015	381	75.7	111	22.1	9	1.8	2	0.4
Original Articles	357	75.6	105	22.2	8	1.8	2***	0.4
Discussions	24	77.4	6	19.4	1	3.2	0	0
2016	384	74.6	112	21.7	16	3.1	3	0.6
Original Articles	359	74.5	105	21.8	15	3.1	3	0.6
Discussions	25	75.8	7	21.2	1	3	0	0
2017	401	73.8	120	22.1	9	1.7	13	2.4
Original Articles	372	72.8	118	23.1	8	1.6	13****	2.5
Discussions	29	90.7	2	6.2	1	3.1	0	0

AVERAGES FOR SUBMISSIONS, 2008-2017	MALE	Percentage	FEMALE	Percentage	MIXED	Percentage	NOT SURE	Percentage
Original Articles	3703	76.6	1013	20.9	87	1.8	34	0.7
Discussions	224	81.5	45	16.4	5	1.8	1	0.3

AVERAGES FOR PUBLISHED PAPERS, 2008-2017	MALE	Percentage	FEMALE	Percentage	MIXED	Percentage	NOT SURE	Percentage
Original Articles	158	77.1	41	20	6	2.9	0	0
Discussions	44	81.5	9	16.6	1	1.9	0	0

**NOTE:** This table counts two types of submission: original articles and discussion pieces. Here and in the following table, a submission is counted as “female” just in case all of its authors are female, a submission is counted as “male” just in case all of its authors are male, and papers with at least one female author and at least one male author are counted as “mixed” no matter what gender proportion holds among the submission’s authors. The vast majority of the submissions are single-authored.

\* 1 Female, 2 Not Sure  
 \*\* 1 Single Author,  
 1 (1M,1NS), 1 (1M, 2NS)  
 \*\*\* 1 Single Author,  
 1 (1M, 1 NS)  
 \*\*\*\* 7 Single Author,  
 1 (3M, 1 NS)  
 2 (1F, 1 NS)  
 3 (Multiple NS)

**TABLE 2****PUBLISHED BOOK REVIEWS BY AUTHORS' GENDERS, 2008-2017**

<b>YEAR</b>	<b>MALE</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>FEMALE</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>MIXED</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>2008</b>	16	<b>73</b>	6	<b>27</b>	0	<b>0</b>
<b>2009</b>	36	<b>64</b>	20	<b>36</b>	0	<b>0</b>
<b>2010</b>	37	<b>74</b>	12	<b>24</b>	1	<b>2</b>
<b>2011</b>	39	<b>87</b>	6	<b>13</b>	0	<b>0</b>
<b>2012</b>	34	<b>72</b>	13	<b>28</b>	0	<b>0</b>
<b>2013</b>	42	<b>76</b>	13	<b>24</b>	0	<b>0</b>
<b>2014</b>	29	<b>57</b>	21	<b>41</b>	1	<b>2</b>
<b>2015</b>	27	<b>63</b>	14	<b>32.5</b>	2	<b>4.5</b>
<b>2016</b>	18	<b>58</b>	13	<b>42</b>	0	<b>0</b>
<b>2017</b>	27	<b>63</b>	16	<b>37</b>	0	<b>0</b>