

Final Analysis of CPA Equity Survey Responses

Background: The CPA Equity Survey was conducted through Survey Monkey in April 2008. An email was sent to the secretaries or administrative assistants of Canadian philosophy departments (or to the chair in the case of smaller departments) asking them to forward the email to all faculty members (both regular and sessional), postdoctoral fellows and graduate students in their department. The forwarded email contained a link to the survey. The survey opened on April 11 and closed on May 9. Two reminders were sent before the closing date. At this point we had 156 English respondents and 34 French respondents. At the Congress in May 2008, some members reported that they never had received or heard about the survey. We decided to reopen the survey in the Fall. The survey reopened on September 19 and closed on October 9. A reminder was sent before the closing date. In the end we had 252 English respondents and 58 French respondents for a total of 310. The demographic information of the respondents is attached.

To date, the Equity Committee has released two sets of preliminary analysis of the survey responses, available here: <http://www.acpcpa.ca/documents/2009%20Report.pdf> and http://www.acpcpa.ca/documents/equity_data_q1-En.pdf. For this early work – the creation of the survey and the first reportage of its results – we are very grateful the following former members of the Equity Committee: Christine Daigle, Jason Blahuta, Jennifer Epp, Kevin Gray, Karen Houle, Marie-Ève Morin and Christinia Landry.

Despite the hard work of these colleagues, the final analysis of the survey results was delayed by limited resources, turnover in the Equity Committee membership, and inexperience with survey analysis methods among the committee members. Finally, in 2012, Kate Norlock (Trent) generously provided a research assistant trained in survey analysis and statistics to conduct the final analysis of the responses. This r.a., Meagan Lacroix, produced the following report under the supervision of Professor Norlock. The Equity Committee is very grateful to Ms. Lacroix and Dr. Norlock for bringing this important project to a close.

In brief, Ms. Lacroix's analysis reveals that in Canadian Philosophy departments, equity issues (and perceptions of same) tend to divide up along gender lines, with further divisions occurring by rank. In general, more women than men and more graduate students than tenured faculty reported problems. While there is, in general, less satisfaction with departmental and institutional climate among women and graduate students, their dissatisfaction is not as acute as might have been feared. Moreover, evidence suggests that almost all of the identifiable trends would be ameliorated by visible, well-known, accessible policy. The survey shows that the Equity Committee should continue work on gender issues in the discipline and should attend more closely to equity among graduate students. And, CPA members more generally are urged to help make policies within their own institutions more transparent and accessible.

May 2013

Coding Key for Equity Survey

The following is a summary of the shortened names given to the questions in the survey. These shortened names are used in “Findings for Equity Survey” and are also used in the statistical output. The new variable name appears in caps and in bold, while the original question appears beside it. In addition, answers to each question were recoded to have a numerical value. These recodes appear in brackets next to the original answer.

Tell us about yourself and your current position

AGE: To which age group do you belong: 20-29(1); 30-39 (2); 40-49 (3); 50-59 (4); 60-69 (5); 70+ (6)

(ACSTATUS): Which of the following best describes your academic situation: Graduate student (1); postdoctoral fellow (2); part-time adjunct (3); full-time adjunct (4); tenure-track (5); tenured (6); emeritus (7)

GENDER/ ORIENTATION: What is your gender/sexual orientation: female (1); male (2); trans (3); bisexual (1); heterosexual (2); gay/lesbian (3)

CITIZENSHIP: What is your citizenship status : Canadian (1); permanent resident (2); non-Canadian (3)

LANGUAGE: What is your mother tongue: English (1); French (2); other (3)

ETHNICITY: How would you describe your race/ethnicity: Arab/West Asian (1); Black (2); Chinese (3); Japanese (4); Korean (5); Filipino (6); South Asian (7); South East Asian (8); Latin American (9); White/Caucasian (10); Aboriginal (11); Multiple (12); Other (13)

RELIGION: How would you describe your religious affiliation: Agnostic (1); Animist (2); Atheist (3); Buddhist (4); Christian (5); Hindu (6); Jewish (7); Muslim (8); Sikh (9); Unaffiliated (10); Other (11)

MARITAL: What is your marital status: Single (never married) (1); Married (2); Common-law (3); divorced (4); separated (5); widowed (6)

CHILDREN: Do you have any children: yes (1); no (2)

The Climate in Your Department

CLIMATE_1a-g: Have you ever experienced or are you aware of any form of discrimination or sexual harassment in your department: racial/ethnic (a); religious (b); age (c); disability (d); gender/sexuality (e); sexual harassment (f); other (g). “I have experienced” = 1; “I am aware of” = 2.

CLIMATE_2a: Have you ever brought any kind of equity-related concern to the attention of someone acting in an official capacity at your University?: yes (1); no (2).

CLIMATE_2b: If yes, where did you raise your equity-related concern?: Department’s chair (1); Dean (2); human resources office (3); human rights office (4; note: this option not available in French version of the survey); ombudsperson (5); other (6).

CLIMATE_2c: If you have brought such a concern to your department, was your department overall: receptive (1); somewhat receptive (2); indifferent (3); somewhat hostile (4) hostile (5).

CLIMATE_2d: Where those concerns addressed in a satisfactory manner? Yes (1); no (2); too soon to tell (3)

CLIMATE_3a: Have you ever thought about raising an equity concern but not done so? Yes (1); no (2)

CLIMATE_3b: Why? Check all that apply: I didn’t know where to bring my concern (1); I didn’t think that it was my place to do so (2); I feared I would be ostracized by my department (3); I didn’t think that speaking up would have any positive effect for the persons concerned (4); Other (5)

CLIMATE_4: Are there any obvious safe spaces or resources in your university for GLBT or questioning students? Yes (1); no (2); don’t know (3).

CLIMATE_5: Are there any obviously available places in your university for use by nursing moms? Yes (1); no (2); don’t know (3).

CLIMATE_6: Do you consider such spaces important? Yes (1); no (2)

CLIMATE_8: Overall, would you say that the climate in your department is: positive (1); somewhat positive (2); neutral (3); somewhat negative (4); negative (5)

The policies in your department

POLICY_1a: Does your department have policies regarding discrimination and harassment? Yes (1); no (2); don’t know (3).

POLICY_1b: If yes, are these policies put into practice? Yes (1); no (2); don't know (3).

POLICY_1c: According to you, are these policies adequate? Yes (1); no (2)

POLICY_2a: Does your department have a policy regarding the use of gender-neutral language? Yes (1); no (2); don't know (3).

POLICY_2b: If yes, is the policy widely disseminated and put into practice? Yes (1); no (2)

POLICY_2c: Is the principle of gender-neutral language supported by most members of your department? Yes (1); no (2)

POLICY_3a: Does your department have a long-term equity plan? Yes (1); no (2); don't know (3).

POLICY_3b: Do you think it is adequate? Yes (1); no (2)

POLICY_4a: Does your department apply the principle according to which Canadian citizens and permanent residents ought to be given priority in hiring for tenure-track positions? Yes (1); no (2); don't know (3).

POLICY_4b: Is the principle supported by most members of your department? Yes (1); no (2)

Impact of equity-related factors on your career

IMPACT_1a: How long did you take to complete your doctorate after you received your first degree? Shorter than average (1); average (2); longer than average (3)

IMPACT_1b: Do you think your time to completion was affected by your gender or by other equity –related factors? Yes (1); no (2)

IMPACT_2a: How long do you expect to take to complete your doctorate after you received your first degree? Shorter than average (1); average (2); longer than average (3)

IMPACT_2b: Do you think your time to completion is affected by your gender or by other equity –related factors? Yes (1); no (2)

IMPACT_3a-d: Are you concerned about the effect that your (possible) parental plans may have on your capacity...: to remain in philosophy (a); to be competitive in the academic job

market (b); to gain tenure (c); to be granted promotion (d). Very = 1; somewhat = 2; not at all = 3; already tenured/promoted = not in data files

IMPACT_4a-d: Are you concerned about the effect that the (actual or eventual) care of an elder may have on your capacity...: to remain in philosophy (a); to be competitive in the academic job market (b); to gain tenure (c); to be granted promotion (d). Very = 1; somewhat = 2; not at all = 3; already tenured/promoted = not in data files

IMPACT_5a: Have you ever requested any of the following for equity-related reasons? Reduced teaching load (1); tenure clock extension (2); reduced or part-time appointment (3); leave of absence (4)

IMPACT_5b: How was your request received? Favorably (1); somewhat favorably (2); neutrally (3); somewhat unfavorably (4); unfavorably (5)

IMPACT_5c: Was your request granted? Yes (1); no (2); too soon to tell (3).

Research and teaching in your department

RESEARCH_2a: Are there occasions when you have to justify and defend that what you do is “real philosophy” to a greater degree than others in your department? Yes (1); no (2)

RESEARCH_2b: Do you think this is affected by equity-related factors? Yes (1); no (2).

RESEARCH_3a: Do you feel that your specialization is supported within your department? Yes (1); no (2).

RESEARCH_3b: Do you think this is affected by equity-related factors? Yes (1); no (2)

Summary of Findings

- 1) **CLIMATE_2a and GENDER:** Bringing up an equity concern and gender are not independent. More women and fewer men bring up equity concerns than would be expected.
- 2) **CLIMATE_2a and ACSTATUS:** Bringing up an equity concern and academic status are not independent. More tenured faculty and fewer graduate students bring up equity concerns than would be expected.
- 3) **CLIMATE_2b:** The majority of respondents said they raised their equity concern to the department chair or the Dean. Participants also described their equity concerns. Out of 52 responses, 24 cited gender/sexuality-based discrimination as their main concern. These concerns were mainly from females, however two reports were from males in response to discrimination from females. The next most common equity concern involved discrimination based on rank within the department (ex: tenured-track vs. tenured). Sexual harassment was also commonly reported.
- 4) **CLIMATE_2c and d:** The majority of participants found their department to be receptive or somewhat receptive to their equity concerns. Thirteen participants found their department to be hostile or somewhat hostile. Of the latter, concerns were not addressed in a satisfactory manner. Of the former, concerns were addressed satisfactorily.
- 5) **CLIMATE_3a and GENDER:** Not raising an equity concern (CLIMATE_3a) and gender are not independent. More women and fewer men have equity concerns which they are not raising. While women raise more concerns than would be expected (CLIMATE_2a), there are also concerns which they are not raising as well.

- 6) **CLIMATE_3a and ACSTATUS:** Not raising an equity concern and academic status are not independent. More tenured-faculty and fewer graduate students have equity concerns which are not being raised.
- 7) **CLIMATE_3b:** The most common reason for not bringing up an equity concern was “I didn’t think that speaking up would have any positive effect for the person concerned”. This was followed by “I feared I would be ostracized by my department”, followed by “other”. Of the respondents who indicated “other”, the most common reason for not bringing up an equity concern was that they had just “given up” or were “exhausted of trying to change things”.
- 8) **IMPACT_3:** Women and graduate students are the most concerned with how possible or actual parental plans may affect their career path. Women appear to be most concerned with upward mobility (gaining tenure, being granted a promotion). Graduate students are most concerned with their competitiveness in the academic job market. When asked to elaborate, equity-related factors were not reported as a main concern or contributing factor.
- 9) **IMPACT_4:** No significant findings
- 10) **IMPACT_5a, b, and c:** Requesting a leave of absence was the most commonly reported equity-related request, followed by reduced teaching-load. Most requests were reported to be received favorably and were granted.
- 11) **CLIMATE_8:** The majority of participants believe the climate in their department is positive or somewhat positive. Slightly more females than males said their department climate is negative. In addition, more graduate students said their department climate was negative compared to any other academic status group.

- 12) **POLICY_1a, b, and c:** The majority of participants reported that discrimination and harassment policies exist within their department, are put into practice, and are adequate. More respondents reported not knowing whether policies existed or were put in place compared to those saying there were no policies that existed or were put in place. Only 29 (out of 117) believed their department's policies were inadequate. Participants elaborated on their department's policies. Many noted that policies are instituted by the university as a whole and not the department. Regular training and advertisement of policies also appears to be an important component to their implementation and acceptance.
- 13) **CLIMATE_8 and POLICY_1b and c:** Participants reporting a negative departmental climate also reported that no discrimination and harassment policies were put in practice and that existing policies were inadequate. The opposite was true of those reporting a positive department climate.
- 14) **POLICY_2a, b, and c:** Results of POLICY_2a were unclear due to the forced-choice criteria not being enabled on the survey. The majority of participants indicated that gender-neutral language policies exist within their department and are supported by most members of the department.
- 15) **POLICY_3a and b:** A roughly equal number of participants reported that long-term equity plans exist or do not exist within their department. Elaboration on these policies indicated that these mostly involve an increase in the hiring of women (with some mention of "quota systems") and an increase in the hiring of visible minorities. These increases appear to be done by actively encouraging more women and visible minorities

to apply for positions in the department, and using gender and ethnicity as a “tie-breaker” in the hiring process.

16) **POLICY_4a and b:** The majority of participants indicated that yes, their department does apply the principle according to which Canadian citizens and permanent residents ought to be given priority in hiring for tenure-track positions.

Survey Findings

CLIMATE_2a *“Have you ever brought up any kind of equity-related concern to the attention of someone acting in an official capacity at your University?”*

Question: Who is bringing up equity-related concerns?

A chi-square test of independence was performed for the variables GENDER (male, female, trans) and CLIMATE_2a to determine if gender is independent of bringing up an equity concern. It was found that these two variables are not independent ($\chi^2(2) = 7.66, p < .05$). More women and fewer men bring up equity-related concerns than would be expected if these two variables were independent.

A chi-square test of independence was performed for the variables ETHNICITY and CLIMATE_2a. Because the majority of participants completing the survey were white/Caucasian, there were not enough observed frequencies among other ethnicities in the sample to generate meaningful results.

A chi-square test of independence was performed for the variables ACSTATUS (academic status) and CLIMATE_2a. A significant chi-square was found ($\chi^2(7) = 19.36, p < .05$), indicating that these two variables are not independent. Fewer graduate students are raising equity concerns than would be expected, while the opposite is true of tenured faculty.

Refer to Appendix A for a summary of the statistical output.

CLIMATE_2b *“If yes, where did you raise your equity-related concerns?”*

Question: Where are equity concerns being taken?

Because participants were able to make multiple selections, answers were tallied rather than analyzed using a chi-square test. It was found that 41 concerns were brought to the department chair, 21 to the dean, 8 to human resources, 10 to human rights, 5 to an

ombudsperson, and 27 to another party. *It should be noted that there was no “Human Rights Office” section in the French data set.* Of the respondents who reported bringing their equity concerns to “another party”, unions ($N = 5$) and equity offices ($N = 3$) were the most commonly cited other party.

CLIMATE_2: *“What were your concerns? Please describe.”*

Question: What are the most commonly cited equity-related concerns?

Comments regarding equity concerns were analyzed for the English speaking participants only. Sixty-seven participants reported having brought an equity concern to the attention of someone acting in an official capacity (CLIMATE_2a) however only 52 commented on what these concerns were. Of all the comments, there were 24 reports of gender/sexuality-based discrimination. Complaints were mostly made by females in regards to discrimination made by males, however, two reports concerned discrimination of males by females. The most commonly cited accounts of gender/sexuality-based discrimination included disparaging sexist comments or actions, and a lack of women in philosophy.

Nine reports involved discrimination based on rank within the department (e.g. being part-time faculty vs. full-time, tenure-track vs. tenure). Discrimination was reported to take on the form of unfair treatment regarding the amount of work assigned (being assigned too much or too little), and classes permitted to teach (example: not being permitted to teach graduate level courses, though the respondent was qualified).

Nine reports were of sexual harassment. Again, these were mostly reported by females. One case of sexual harassment of a male by a female was reported.

Four reports were made of age-related discrimination, 6 of racial discrimination, 2 of disability-related discrimination, and 2 of religious discrimination. Several of the reports made did not clearly fall into any of the categories.

Overall, it appears that gender-based discrimination, sexual harassment, and “professional/status-based” discrimination are the most commonly reported equity-related concerns. It should be noted that “status” or “professional” discrimination does not appear as an option for question CLIMATE_1 “Have you ever experienced or are you aware of any form of discrimination or sexual harassment in your department?” Future equity surveys may benefit by including professional/status-based discrimination as an option.

CLIMATE_2c and d: *“If you have brought such a concern to your department, was your department overall...” “Were those concerns addressed in a satisfactory manner?”*

Question: Overall, how are departments reacting to equity-concerns being raised? Are proper actions being taken?

Descriptive statistics were analyzed. It was found that the majority of respondents found their department to be either receptive or somewhat receptive to their equity-concerns. Six respondents indicated their department was somewhat hostile, and 7 stated their department was hostile. All of those reporting a hostile or somewhat hostile response also reported that their concerns were not addressed in a satisfactory manner (CLIMATE_2d). Participants reporting a receptive response by their department also reported that their concerns were addressed in a satisfactory manner. See Appendix B for a summary of the descriptive statistics.

CLIMATE_2d Continued: *“Describe the steps taken and tell us why you were or weren’t satisfied”*

Thirty-six participants responded. Of these, 11 were satisfied with how their concerns were addressed, 16 were dissatisfied, and 11 were neither. Of the responses indicating satisfaction, 4 concerns were gender-related, 3 of sexual harassment, 2 professional discrimination, 1 racial discrimination, and 1 was not clear. Of those indicating dissatisfaction, 7 were gender-related, 4 were sexual harassment, 3 were age-related, 2 professional, 2 racial, 1 religious, and 3 not clear. Of those that were neither, 2 issues were gender, 2 professional, 1 sexual, 1 age, and 3 not clear. Overall, gender-discrimination issues are the most common being addressed, both satisfactorily and otherwise. Reasons for participant's satisfaction or dissatisfaction varied greatly.

CLIMATE_3a: *“Have you ever thought about raising an equity concern but not done so?”*

Question: What groups of people are more likely to not raise the equity concerns that they have?

To investigate whether bringing up equity concerns is related to gender, a chi-square test of independence was performed on the variables GENDER and CLIMATE_3a. A significant chi-square was found ($\chi^2(2) = 13.46, p < .001$). This indicates that gender and bringing up an equity concern are not independent. As can be seen in Appendix C, more females and fewer males have equity concerns which are not being raised. This is not what could be expected if these two variables were independent. These results are in slight contrast to what was found regarding question CLIMATE_2a. More women bring up equity concerns compared to men. However, these results suggest that while women bring up more concerns, there are also many concerns which are not being brought to attention.

To investigate whether bringing up equity concerns is related to academic status, a chi-square test of independence was performed on the variables ACSTATUS and CLIMATE_3a. A significant chi-square was found ($\chi^2(7) = 16.22, p < .05$). Fewer graduate students and more

tenured faculty have equity-related concerns which they are not bringing up, contrary to what should be expected. Again, these results somewhat contrast what was found with CLIMATE_2a. While more tenured faculty bring up equity concerns, it seems there are many concerns which are not being brought up as well. See Appendix C for a summary of the statistical output.

CLIMATE_3b: *“Why have you not brought up your concern? Check all that apply”*

Question: What reasons do people have for not bringing up an equity concern?

Results were tallied to determine the most common reasons for not bringing up an equity concern. Of the reasons for not bringing up equity concerns, “I didn’t think that speaking up would have any positive effect for the person concerned” was the most commonly reported (N = 49). After that, “I feared I would be ostracized by my department” was the next most common reason (N = 30), followed by “other” (N = 23), “I didn’t think it was my place to do so” (N = 15), and “I didn’t know where to take my concern” (N = 12). Of the respondents who indicated “other”, the most common reason for not bringing up an equity concern was that they had just “given up” or were “exhausted of trying to change things”.

IMPACT_3: *“Are you concerned about the effect that your (possible) parental plans may have on your capacity...”*

Question: Who is concerned about the impact of possible parental plans, and what is it that they are concerned about?

To investigate the relationship between GENDER and IMPACT_3, chi-squares were again performed.

Summary:

- 1) Gender and “to remain in philosophy”: not significant
- 2) Gender and “to be competitive in the academic job market”: not significant

- 3) Gender and “to gain tenure”: significant. More women said parental plans would affect their ability to gain tenure (N = 25) than men (N = 8).
- 4) Gender and “to be granted a promotion”: significant. More women think parental plans will effect ability to be granted a promotion (N = 23) than men (N = 8).
- 5) ACSTATUS and “to remain in philosophy”: no results because not enough responses in all cells. Most responses were among graduate students. Fifteen responded “very”, 25 “somewhat” and 13 “not at all”. A great number of tenure-track respondents also said “not at all” for this question (N = 16). All other cells did not exceed 10.
- 6) ACSTATUS and “to be competitive in the academic job market”: Most respondents were graduate students. Twenty-two responded “very”, 26 “somewhat”, and 6 “not at all”. Most graduate students are concerned about the effect of parental plans on their ability to remain competitive in the academic job market.
- 7) ACSTATUS and “to gain tenure”: Similar results were found. Most respondents were graduate students, and many indicated either “very” or “somewhat” to this question. The next greatest number of respondents were tenure-track faculty, most of whom indicated “somewhat” or “not at all”.
- 8) ACSTATUS and “to be granted a promotion”: A more even spread was found among graduate students for this question. Eighteen graduate students said “very”, 19 said “somewhat”, and 12 said “not at all”.

Overall, these results suggest that women and graduate students are the most concerned about how parental plans may affect their career path. Women appear to be most concerned with upward mobility (gaining tenure, being granted a promotion). Graduate students are most concerned with their competitiveness in the academic job market. Tenure-track faculty, in

contrast, are mostly confident that their parental plans will not negatively affect their careers. See Appendix D for a summary of the statistical output.

IMPACT_3 (Elaborate)

The vast majority of respondents stated that becoming a parent has an adverse effect on academic productivity, ability to publish, and ability to be promoted. Respondents also noted that mobility becomes an issue. No participants indicated that these difficulties were due to poor policies in their department. One participant noted that there should be an “ease-in” option for new mothers coming back to work. Another participant stated that the adverse effects of parenting on career is more apparent for women than men. More common statements were that the decision to have a family falls on the individual, and so the responsibility to balance work and family also falls on them. Dissatisfaction with departmental policies does not appear to be an issue.

IMPACT_4: *“Are you concerned about the effect that the (actual or eventual) care for an elder may have on your capacity...”*

Question: Who is concerned about the impact of elder-care, and what is it that they are concerned about?

- 1) Gender and “to remain in philosophy”: not significant
- 2) Gender and “to be competitive in the academic job market”: not significant
- 3) Gender and “to gain tenure”: not significant
- 4) Gender and “to be granted a promotion”: not significant

No significant differences were found between gender and career concerns due to actual or eventual care of an elder. Visual inspection of the frequency tables shows that for both genders,

the majority of responses were “not at all”, followed by “somewhat”. The impact of eldercare on academic career does not seem to be an issue for the majority.

5) ACSTATUS and “to remain in philosophy”: Of the graduate students who responded, the majority responded “somewhat” and “not at all” (N = 20 and 21, respectively). A number of tenure-track and tenured faculty responded “not at all” (N = 15 and 14, respectively). Very similar results were found for the questions “to be competitive in the academic job market”, “to gain tenure”, and “to be granted a promotion”.

Overall, the actual or eventual care of an elder and the impact this may have on academic career does not seem to be a large concern to the majority of respondents. See Appendix E for a summary of the statistical output.

IMPACT_4 (Elaborate)

The majority of respondents acknowledge that the eventual care of an elder may affect their level of academic productivity and competitiveness. However, only one respondent (out of 26) addressed equity concerns as an issue, stating that “men should begin to shoulder their fair share of the responsibility”. Overall, participants appear to “accept” the consequences that caring for an elder may have on their career.

IMPACT_5a: *“Have you ever requested any of the following for equity-related reasons?”*

Question: What equity-related requests are being made?

Answers were tallied and it was found that requesting leave of absence was the most commonly reported equity-related request (N = 21). This was followed by reduced teaching load (N = 13), “other” (N = 11), reduced or part-time appointment (N = 9), and tenure clock extension (N = 7). Of those indicating “other”, maternity leave or requests due to parental obligations was most commonly reported (N = 4). Twenty-three respondents elaborated on their reasons for

making an equity-related request. Of these, most respondents again indicated parental obligations as the main reason (N = 10). Requests due to health-related reasons were the next most commonly reported (N = 4).

IMPACT_5b and c: *“How was your request received? Was your request granted?”*

Question: How are equity-related requests being perceived and are they commonly granted?

A frequency table was generated to investigate the number of requests being favorably and unfavorably received, as well as to see how many of these requests were granted. It was found that of the 41 respondents making requests, 34 of these requests were received favorably or somewhat favorably by their department. Six participants indicated their requests were received unfavorably or somewhat unfavorably, and 1 participant said their request was received neutrally.

Thirty-six of the 41 requests were granted (IMPACT_5c). These requests ranged from being received favorably to somewhat unfavorably (IMPACT_5b). Three requests were denied. These requests were reported to be received unfavorably.

Overall, most equity-related requests are received favorably and are granted. Because of the small sample of participants indicating that their request was received unfavorably or was not granted, it was not possible to determine if gender, ethnicity, or other factors played a role. See Appendix F for a summary of the results.

CLIMATE_8: *“Overall, would you say that the climate of your department is...”*

Question: How do people perceive the climate in their department?

A frequency table was generated to determine how respondents feel about the climate in their department. Two-hundred and forty-three participants responded. Of these, 114 said their

department climate was positive, while 31 believed their department climate to be negative or somewhat negative.

The relationship between GENDER and CLIMATE_8 was also investigated. Nineteen percent of women responding to question CLIMATE_8 viewed their department climate as negative or somewhat negative. Only 7% of men viewed their department this way. It appears that a greater percentage of the female respondents feel their department is negative.

A frequency table was generated for the variables CLIMATE_8 and ACSTATUS. It was found that 14% of the graduate students who responded to CLIMATE_8 viewed their department as negative or somewhat negative. Tenured faculty had the next highest percentage at 11%. Generally the results of this frequency table show that for each academic-status category, most reported that their department has a positive environment.

Overall, the majority of respondents feel their department has a positive climate. More women reported experiencing negative or somewhat negative department climates, compared to men. As well, more graduate students reported experiencing negative departmental climates, compared to all other academic-status groups. These results are consistent with the other findings of this survey, however it is unclear whether these differences are statistically significant. See Appendix G for a summary of all statistical output.

POLICY_1a, b, and c: *“Does your department have policies regarding discrimination and harassment? If yes, are these policies put into practice? According to you, are these policies adequate? Please elaborate.”*

The majority of participants reported that discrimination and harassment policies exist within their department (POLICY_1a; N = 143 out of 236), are put into practice (POLICY_1b; N = 85 out of 167), and are adequate (POLICY_1c; N = 88 out of 117). More respondents reported

not knowing whether policies existed compared to those reporting that no policies existed (POLICY_1a; N = 70 vs. 23, respectively). Likewise, more participants reported not knowing whether departmental policies were put into practice compared to those saying that no policies were put into practice (POLICY_1b; N = 73 vs. 9, respectively). Twenty-nine (out of 117) participants believed their departmental policies were inadequate.

The relationship between perceived departmental climate (CLIMATE_8) and the presence and adequacy of departmental policies was investigated. Eighty-two percent of those reporting a negative or somewhat negative climate in their department also reported that departmental policies were not being put into practice (POLICY_1b). Conversely, the majority of those reporting a positive or somewhat positive climate also reported that policies in their department *were* put into practice. In addition, more participants stating their department's policies were adequate (POLICY_1c) also felt their department's climate was positive. The opposite was found for those reporting inadequate policies. Overall, it appears that a relationship may exist between the practice and adequacy of discrimination/harassment policies, and the perception of positivity within the department. While it is not clear whether these findings are of statistical significance, a clear trend can be demonstrated. See Appendix H for a summary of the statistical output.

Participants were asked to elaborate on their department's policies. Fifty-one participants responded. The majority of participants noted that the policies followed by their department are instituted by the university as a whole. Twelve responses indicated that departmental or university-instituted policies were put in place and enforced. Two of these responses indicated that regular "training" and education on discrimination and harassment policies was an important part to having policies accepted and enforced by staff. Twenty-five responses were neutral or

indicated no awareness of what departmental policies were in place. Some respondents suggested more widespread advertisement of departmental policies to help bring awareness and attention to the policies put in place. Twelve responses were more clearly negative regarding existing departmental policies. These respondents indicated that policies were often circumvented, not taken seriously, or “just there for looks”. Overall, ensuring that discrimination and harassment policies are widely known and advertised may be an important component to their enforcement.

POLICY_2a, b, and c: *“Does your department have a policy regarding the use of gender-neutral language? If yes, is the policy widely disseminated and put into practice? Is the principle of gender-neutral language supported by most members of your department?”*

Because the majority of participants selected multiple responses for question POLICY_2a, responses were tallied individually rather than investigated using a frequency table. *Note: When asking “yes or no” type questions, multiple-selection options should not be enabled. This makes data more interpretable.*

When asked if their department had policies regarding the use of gender-neutral language, 39 participants responded “yes”, 82 “no”, and 110 “don’t know”. Because many participants responded *both* “yes” and “don’t know” or *both* “no” and “don’t know”, the meaning of these results are not clear.

Participants were asked if the policy of gender-neutral language was widely disseminated and put into practice (POLICY_2b). Of the 52 respondents, 33 answered “yes”, and 19 “no”. When examining the relationship between GENDER and POLICY_2b, it was found that roughly the same number of women and men believed these policies to be put or not put into practice.

When asked if gender-neutral language policies were supported by members of their department (POLICY_2c), 72 respondents indicated “yes”, and 18 “no”. Again, the distribution

of these responses were roughly the same for men and women. Slightly more women said these policies were not widely accepted, compared to men (N = 12 women, 5 men). See Appendix I for a summary of all statistical output.

Participants were asked to comment on the issue of gender-neutral language. Fifty-four participants responded. Of these, roughly 17 respondents indicated clear support within their department for the principle of gender-neutral language, while 6 participants indicated that it is not supported in their department. All other responses were unclear. Nine participants stated that they themselves do not support the principle of gender-neutral language, claiming it to be “unnecessary” or “useless”. Approximately 4 participants indicated that they are in favor of these policies and believe they should be put in practice. Some participants indicated that the concept of gender-neutral language is unclear to them. A more clear definition of “gender-neutral” may be useful for future surveys.

POLICY_3a and b: *Does your department have a long-term equity plan? Do you think it is adequate?*

Forty-two participants indicated that “yes”, their department does have a long-term equity plan, while 45 said “no”, and 146 “I don’t know” (POLICY_3a). Participants were asked to elaborate on their department’s long-term equity plans. Thirty participants responded. Of these, the majority indicated that equity plans within their department mainly concern an increase in the hiring of women and visible minorities. More specifically, participants indicated a “quota” or “female to male ratio” system within their department that must be met. No quota was indicated for people of visible minorities. Women and visible minorities are actively sought out and encouraged to apply to positions within the department. Many participants suggested that the preferential hiring of women and visible minorities is used as a “tie-breaker” between other non-

minority candidates with similar qualifications who are competing for the same position. One participant of this survey expressed concern that these hiring practices lead to the appointment of under-qualified applicants. However, two other participants asserted that only the most qualified candidate is hired.

Participants were asked whether their department's long-term equity plans are adequate or inadequate (POLICY_3b). Thirty-eight participants believed plans to be adequate, while 25 said they are inadequate. The relationship between perceived adequacy of these equity plans (POLICY_3b) and GENDER was also investigated. Of those who believed their department's long-term equity plans to be inadequate, 19 were female, while only 6 were male. Conversely, 25 males believed their department's plans to be adequate, while only 12 women felt this way. Participants were also asked to elaborate on the adequacy of their department's equity plans. Twenty-five participants responded. The majority of respondents reported on the *inadequacy* of their department's equity plans specifically. Approximately five responses indicated that while the number of women in their department has increased, the number of visible minorities remains low. Four participants stated that the number of women being hired in their department remains inadequate. Participants noted that a possible explanation may be the lack of females entering graduate studies in Philosophy. Two participants noted that while the number of women in their department has increased, this has led to discrimination against males/male applicants, as well as the hiring of "unqualified women". See Appendix J for a summary of the statistical output.

POLICY_4a and b: *"Does your department apply the principle according to which Canadian citizens and permanent residents ought to be given priority in hiring for tenure-track positions? Is this principle supported by most members of your department?"*

One-hundred and fifteen participants selected “yes”, their department does apply this principle, while 26 selected “no” and 90 “I don’t know”. Sixty-six participants said that this principle is supported by most members of their department (POLICY_4b), while 46 indicated “no”, the policy is not supported. Participants were asked to comment and 58 responded. Common responses were: 1) the participant is personally in favor of this principle; 2) the participant is not in favor; 3) their department follows this principle in hiring practices; 4) their department does not follow this principle; 5) their department views Canadians or Canadian-educated applicants as inferior philosophers; and 6) The candidate with the highest qualifications will be hired, regardless of nationality. Overall, the distribution of these responses was fairly even. No one response dominated. See Appendix K for a summary of the statistical output.