

for the Society for Women *Against* Philosophy (I'm current president of the Society for Women's Advancement in Philosophy), to have a fellow graduate student joke that everyone knows feminist philosophy isn't "real philosophy" and that everyone knows you don't like "real" or "hard" philosophy (and to be reminded that it's a *joke* when your face relays the frustration, insecurity, and embarrassment you are trying so hard to hide), to look out at the front rows of your department's colloquium events and witness the male porcelain people-scape that currently dominates your department's faculty composition, to be reassured by more than one of your colleagues that you do have a good shot of getting into your dream school (only to be informed of the depressing source of their intuitive revelation: "Mary, you're a female *and* a minority").

Despite the dozen (often unintended) daily cuts, I have managed to make a happy, professional home for myself, and have worked closely to build power bases with those faculty and peers that I know support me and my concern over diversity and department climate issues, to become a chief recruiting officer for the department, to found its first Minorities and Philosophy Chapter, and to work relentlessly to promote a more genuine culture of inclusiveness for future recruits. My point? Whether you are one measly graduate student (or the chair of your department, or a divisional president of the APA, or the first philosopher to learn how to blog well enough to start ranking departments), you don't need to enlist an army to significantly impact the direction of the field. You can effectively begin to employ the empowerment-based rationale in your own daily effort to address the diversity problem in the field, in the thoughtful and intentional one-on-one discussions you *choose* to engage in with your students and colleagues.

To conclude, I submit this empowerment-based approach to allies in the philosophy community as a potentially promising strategy to employ (in conjunction with other, similarly motivated efforts) in order to solve the diversity problem. For it, unlike the integration rationale or the diversity rationale, explicitly prioritizes the effort to improve philosophy's methodological and epistemological standing via the affirmation of the value of the experiential insights and expertise of philosophy's women, minority, and nontraditional practitioners, while simultaneously working to undermine the taken for granted legitimacy of traditional, *prima facie* problematic, power bases in the profession.

NOTES

1. Treating the establishment of such a measure as a priority is consistent with Sally Haslanger's recommendations for data collection in order to hold institutions accountable for efforts taken to integrate underrepresented social groups into the profession. See Sally Haslanger, "Changing the Ideology and Culture of Philosophy: Not By Reason (Alone)," *Hypatia* 23, no. 2 (2008): 210–23.
2. Charles W. Mills, *Blackness Visible: Essays on Philosophy and Race* (Cornell: Cornell University Press, 1998).
3. *Ibid.*, 27.
4. *Ibid.*, 28.
5. *Ibid.*
6. *Ibid.*

7. Again, I regard this sort of effort as consistent with a number of Haslanger's recommendations concerning the disruption of traditional power bases and the forging of new ones (e.g., do not ignore or re-describe women and minorities in philosophy, but make them visible, make the schemas for gender, race, class, and philosophy explicit and defuse them, establish contexts where women philosophers and philosophers of race are valued, and establish contexts where feminist philosophy and philosophy of race are valued).
8. Robert Fullinwider, "Affirmative Action," *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2013 Edition). <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/affirmative-action/>.
9. *Ibid.*
10. I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for drawing my attention to these concerns with the empowerment-based approach as it stands in its current form.

Best Practices for Fostering Diversity

Amy Olberding
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Sherri Irvin
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Stephen Ellis
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Our department at University of Oklahoma has, like many others, become increasingly aware of philosophy's need to recruit and retain members from presently underrepresented demographic groups.¹ We recognize that the discipline lags behind many, even in the STEM disciplines, in the diversity of its demographic profile.² Moreover, we share the worry of many that the discipline's lack of diversity may be due in part to factors such as implicit bias and stereotype threat operating at multiple stages in students' and job candidates' trajectory toward professional academic employment. In an effort to render our hiring processes as fair as possible, we recently revised our procedures to address these issues. The basic outline of our process remains the same: A search committee reviews dossiers in order to narrow the search to 10–15 particularly promising candidates for closer scrutiny; this closer look allows us to select 3–5 top candidates for final consideration.³ Our new procedures were developed to make this winnowing process both more fair and more effective. In what follows, we outline our amended process in the hope that it may be of use to other departments and, more importantly, may stimulate additional conversation about how to improve the profession.

CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

The revision of our search processes is framed by two important principles. First, we take as a given that we all are prey to implicit biases.⁴ Our faculty recognize that even where we are well-meaning and committed to egalitarian principles and to fair evaluation of candidates, we nonetheless operate under the influence of biasing schemas that may influence our estimations of a candidate's skills, fitness, or philosophical acumen.⁵ In addition to operating with biases common to the population at large—biases that will conform to general schemas regarding, for example, race or disability status—we likely operate under more profession-particular

biases. As Sally Haslanger has argued, perceptions about who will be readily recognized as a *philosopher* are prey to a host of historically and culturally embedded schematic associations linking philosophy with the white and male.⁶ Perhaps most basically, we are likely to implicitly associate “what a philosopher looks like” with what philosophers in fact currently and overwhelmingly *do* look like—that is, white, heterosexual, non-disabled, and male.

Second, we recognize that the performance of a job candidate within a search is malleable. What we as a hiring department do and the conditions for candidate performance we establish can influence how well a candidate will perform. Implicit bias is relevant here as well: such biases can, for example, inform whether questions directed at a candidate are, either in tone or content, generously charitable or unsympathetically skeptical, and thus consequently steer whether a candidate appears at ease and comfortable or guarded and defensive. More globally, we recognize that stereotype threat is an abiding risk for candidates from underrepresented groups. Stereotype threat, in brief, is a phenomenon in which a person underperforms relative to his or her abilities owing to his or her membership in a group stereotyped as being less agile or able at the task at hand.⁷ Insofar as philosophers are schematized as white, heterosexual, non-disabled, and male, those with elements of social identity outside this schema may be subject to stereotype threat that leads to underperformance. This risk will, moreover, be aggravated where stereotypes are rendered especially salient by group demographics. A candidate in “solo status,” one who has a social identity distinct from that of her interlocutors, will be more prey to stereotype threat, to performance inhibiting psychological responses induced by her outsider status relative to the group.⁸

In accord with these assumptions regarding implicit bias and stereotype threat, in revising our hiring procedures we aimed to minimize the operation of implicit bias in our evaluation of candidates and to engineer conditions favorable to strong performance for all of our candidates. While we seek, in what follows, to articulate in brief how the desiderata we adopted feature in the logic of particular procedures and practices, it bears emphasizing that the utility of these procedures and practices considerably depends on a department’s enjoying a collective sense of resolve and attention. Faculty need not agree over myriad issues that may bear on a search, but accord regarding general principles and shared adherence to the practices that seek to enact these principles within the search is crucial.

I. COMPOSING THE JOB ADVERTISEMENT

While most of our recommendations attach to the process of evaluating candidates, the job advertisement itself can be useful in encouraging a diverse pool of applicants. One strategy for this is simply to include in the advertisement a statement that reflects a department’s welcoming orientation toward a variety of approaches to philosophy. This may be particularly important for departments in which the current faculty research areas are more homogenous, for such a statement can signal candidates whose work resides outside the prevailing approaches within the department that their applications are nonetheless welcomed. Likewise, where a department may have interests in underrepresented areas

of philosophy that are not a formal part of the advertised AOS, signaling these interests in the advertisement can be helpful. One of our worries is that there may be areas of philosophy that are so underrepresented or marginalized within the discipline that candidates with interests in these areas may feel it prudent to conceal or minimize their interests. Consequently, alerting candidates that in addition to the advertised AOS, the department would additionally welcome an AOC or teaching interest in, for example, philosophy of race, feminist philosophy, or Asian philosophies is a way to promote the job and department to candidates who otherwise may not apply or might minimize their presentation of interests in underrepresented areas.

Structuring the job advertisement itself to send signals to diverse candidates can also importantly send signals to the department itself. In devising the advertisement, the department will necessarily engage in reflection about its desires for the hiring search. Collective affirmation that the department does encourage diverse approaches to or areas of philosophy can set the stage for the search, helping to orient faculty toward goals that include diversity. Likewise, once the advertisement is drafted and published, it operates as a formal commitment that can serve to remind faculty of their own collective aims and guide their subsequent reflections on candidates’ dossiers. Just as an advertised AOS functions in part to constrain a search by articulating in advance what the department’s interest is and should be, so too signals toward diversity interests can open a search by articulating imperatives that favor keeping diversity in view throughout the search.

As a final note, the department may wish to request within the advertisement that candidates submit anonymized versions of their writing samples, with an explanation that the department uses bias-reducing procedures as it conducts its searches. (See section II.F below for further discussion.) This will signal a commitment to fairness, make it possible for committee members to access anonymized samples from the beginning of the evaluation process, and eliminate the work of anonymizing the writing samples of finalists.

II. REVIEWING CANDIDATES’ DOSSIERS

Our department judges the vetting of dossiers to be the principal activity of our searches. The reasons for this include the fact that the dossier contains the most complete body of data about the candidate, reflects the candidate’s own judgment about how to present herself, and, compared to other elements in a search at least, is less likely to stimulate evaluations influenced by nebulous social factors that may arise when meeting candidates in person. Consequently, many of our hiring procedures focus on just this element of the search, seeking to reduce the potential for implicit bias to feature in our evaluation of dossiers.

A. Pacing

Some of our procedures regarding the vetting of dossiers are quite straightforward and simple. Because haste in reading can increase the likelihood of implicit bias (Valian 1998, ch. 14), we take steps to maximize the time available for review of dossiers. In our job posting, we set a sufficiently early deadline for receipt of application materials that the department can reasonably pace its work. Likewise, since

our search committee members are responsible for the initial screening of candidates, we adopt an informal policy of protection from other service for search committee members in order to maximize the time they have available for careful review of application documents. Finally, our department has a standing Recruiting and Diversity Committee whose members are available to the search committee throughout the search to assist and advise as needed. The committee assists by performing specific tasks, discussed below, best handled by faculty not directly involved in the search. By handling a number of process questions related to the search, the Recruiting and Diversity Committee guards the time of the search committee. More generally, the Recruiting and Diversity Committee serves as a resource should questions within its ken arise.

B. Establishing Criteria

A key desideratum in efforts to address implicit bias is developing clear job criteria and applying these to all candidates as uniformly as possible. Where criteria for a job are nebulous, informal, or unclearly weighted, they are more likely to shift as a reader proceeds from application to application.⁹ For example, the dossier of a candidate whose social identity intersects positively with a reader's implicit biases may incline the reader to weight the areas of the candidate's strengths more heavily; where negative implicit bias toward a candidate is activated, a reader may unconsciously discount those areas in which the candidate exhibits particular strengths.¹⁰ Having explicit, clearly articulated criteria more effectively prevents irregularity in how candidates' qualifications are evaluated and weighted. Consequently, we develop hiring criteria *before* ever reading candidates' materials and have these criteria on hand as reading of the materials proceeds, using them as a continuous check and reminder to encourage uniform review.

Criteria should of course be tailored to individual departmental needs. There are, however, some general criteria that we find useful in most searches. Some are quite basic—for example, evidence that the Ph.D. is completed or near completion, the candidate's expertise satisfies the AOS specified in the job advertisement, and the candidate's AOC areas are relevant or important to the department—but are nonetheless quite important to include for they guard against steering a search away from what the department, prior to its consideration of individual candidates, established as its goals in hiring. In addition to these, other criteria may include quality of the writing sample, evidence of research strength (e.g., publications, presentations, awards, or testimony in recommendation letters), evidence of teaching experience and competence (e.g., teaching evaluations, sample syllabi, testimony in recommendation letters), and evidence of collegiality (e.g., participation in or organization of reading groups, special events, or projects). Likewise, candidates may be considered in terms of their capacity to contribute to diversity within a department (e.g., through teaching underrepresented subjects or experience in teaching inclusively). While these are samples of the sorts of criteria we have found effective, what is most important is to reflect upon and formalize criteria prior to engaging with candidates' dossiers in order to establish as much uniformity as possible.

There can, it should be noted, be complicating factors in developing and employing criteria in the evaluation of candidates. Most basically, there are many legitimate ways in which individual faculty members may disagree about relevant job criteria or how they ought be weighted in evaluating candidates. Such disagreement need not, however, be a barrier to employing this strategy for minimizing bias. Where no consensus regarding the relevant criteria or their weight exists, each individual reviewing dossiers ought have her own list of criteria and thereby guard the uniformity of her individual evaluations. That is, whether criteria are collectively shared or individual, what matters is that they be a governing constant in engaging with candidates' dossiers.

It is also important to note that it can be useful to retain a critical consciousness regarding the weighting of criteria used for evaluating dossiers. While criteria ought be uniformly applied to candidates, the effect of this should likewise be monitored. Thus, for example, if the application of a pre-established set of criteria has the consequence that the resulting pool of top candidates is utterly lacking in diversity, a re-evaluation of the criteria or the weight assigned to various elements may be in order. Shifting criteria are a worry, but this ought not supplant awareness of the complexities of implicit bias. As discussed below, for example, letters of recommendation can exhibit the implicit bias of their writers, so a set of criteria that heavily privileges letters may incline the search toward replicating such biases. Consequently, a careful eye on the results yielded by employing any particular arrangement of criteria and their relative importance is necessary.

C. Screening for Potential Bias Triggers

Even with reasonable pacing and clear criteria, we think it important to enact particular methods of engaging with candidates' dossiers. As noted above, dossiers contain elements that can operate as triggers to implicit bias. Even where we do not consciously register that a candidate belongs (or *appears* to belong) to a social group, we may unconsciously register it, and associations we implicitly make between the schemas for the group and qualifications for the job can influence evaluation, both positively and negatively. Self-consciously attending to potential bias triggers within the dossiers—those subtle and unsubtle apparent tells that may indicate information about a candidate's identity—can be a strategy for minimizing the influence of implicit bias. Because maintaining awareness of this is inevitably quite difficult where a reader is simultaneously engaging with a complex body of data about a candidate, we devised a mechanism for alerting readers to just those dossiers that contain potential triggers of bias that might disadvantage the candidate.

Before dossiers were vetted by our search committee, members of our Recruiting and Diversity Committee not on the search committee reviewed each dossier with the specific charge of identifying and flagging any dossier that contained potential negative implicit bias triggers.¹¹ A list of these dossiers was then made available to the search committee and whole faculty, with the list being used as a mechanism to guard against implicit bias. Faculty reviewing dossiers were encouraged to be especially mindful to guard against haste in reading flagged dossiers and to give them a second reading, both strategies for minimizing implicit

bias in evaluation. Because reading dossiers with the aim of identifying potential bias triggers is a complicated business, let us outline how we proceeded in doing so.

In identifying potential negative bias triggers within dossiers, we eschewed drawing any conclusions regarding the social identity of candidates. That is, we recognize that there is a substantial difference between drawing conclusions about candidates' *actual* identity features and registering what may be *perceived as tells* to identity or may *unconsciously be taken* as indicating identity features. Thus, for example, while membership in LGBT organizations cannot and should not ground any conclusions regarding someone's sexual orientation, such membership could plausibly trigger implicit biases regarding sexual orientation in a reader. Since our aim was only to identify dossier elements that might trigger bias, then, our listing of potential negative bias triggers included any and all triggers we could identify.

In devising a list of potential negative implicit bias triggers, we thought carefully about what metrics to employ and how to construct the list itself. We judged it important not simply to note *that* a dossier contained potential negative bias triggers, but to identify something of the *nature* of these triggers, specifying whether a dossier contained, for example, triggers tracking gender or triggers tracking race. We simply do not know enough about how implicit bias operates to be confident that triggers for one species of bias will operate as triggers for another do and thus whether guarding against one species of bias will be effective in guarding against any. We thus wished insofar as possible to avoid flagging potential bias triggers by appeal to a generic list. Likewise, we realize that some potential triggers to bias are far more obvious than others. For example, names that appear to betray gender are far easier to spot than a brief line in a cover letter that may appear to indicate disability status. However, a candidate's dossier can, of course, contain both, and we thus worried that simply flagging such a dossier as containing "potential bias triggers" might obscure the latter, with readers readily alerted to avoid bias tracking gender while still unwary about bias tracking disability status. Again, to emphasize, we do not know whether such biases operate similarly, and whether guarding against one would effectively guard against another. In consequence, we devised our list to include some specificity.

Our first and most basic focus was to create a category that would apply for any dossiers containing indications that a candidate may belong to a demographic group underrepresented in philosophy. For this, we used the following metrics:

1. Gender: used for dossiers for candidates with apparently female names and/or for whom recommendation letter writers used the pronoun "she."
2. Racial/Ethnic Identification: used for dossiers containing triggers that may be taken to indicate a candidate belongs to any racial or ethnic group other than non-Hispanic white.

3. LGBT: used for dossiers containing triggers that may be taken to indicate a candidate who is not heterosexual or is transgendered.

4. Disability: used for dossiers that contain triggers that may be taken to indicate a candidate who has a disability.

In using all of the above categories, it should be reiterated, we did *not* seek to draw any conclusions about the candidates' identities, recognizing that what may operate as an *apparent* tell, such as a name that appears to indicate race, is an epistemically unreliable basis for any such conclusions. Our sole aim was to identify what plausibly might trigger bias in readers.

In addition to creating categories to capture potential negative bias triggers linked to demographic features, we also judged it important to create a second list that would capture potential negative bias triggers linked to sub-fields within the discipline, sub-fields that might appear in applicants' research areas or in their conference presentation or publication lists. This list was in some measure a concession to regrettable realities in the profession, an acknowledgement that some sub-fields may stimulate implicit bias relating to the sub-field itself or to implicit associations made between sub-fields and the identities of those working within them.¹² For example, low publication rates for articles addressing feminist philosophy or philosophy of race in several top-ranked journals suggest that there may be bias at work in perceptions of these sub-fields, biases that could perniciously attach to any candidate who claims them.¹³ Likewise, we were concerned that information about some sub-fields may be unconsciously taken as a tell about a candidate's identity, the scholar who publishes on disability, for example, implicitly assumed by readers to *be* disabled and thus vulnerable to biases cued to disability status. We thus constructed a second category of potential bias triggers linked to disciplinary areas and flagged any dossier indicating work or research interest in the following areas: philosophy of race, feminist philosophy, queer philosophy, disability theory, Africana philosophies, Latin American philosophies, Native American philosophies, and Asian philosophies.

While our principal purpose in flagging dossiers for potential bias triggers is to try to shield these dossiers from implicit bias, having our faculty attend to them with additional time and care, it bears noting that the process itself is valuable. Considering the myriad issues attached to this effort and engaging in shared discussion about our aims brought to the fore of our hiring efforts a greatly enhanced consciousness about the risks and complexities of bias.

D. Reading Dossier Elements

A second way in which we sought to manage our engagement with candidates' dossiers was far less formal but nonetheless important to note. We discussed as a faculty and incorporated into descriptions of our hiring procedures the ways in which implicit bias may influence the *contents* of candidates' dossiers. That is, apart from guarding against our own implicit biases, we recognized the need to be aware of how implicit biases could influence what we would see in the dossiers themselves. For example, empirical studies have shown that letters of recommendation can exhibit

significant differences that break down along gender lines, with letters for women applicants tending to be weaker.¹⁴ *Where letters for men tend to emphasize more directly job related skills and intellectual acumen, letters for women tend to emphasize more nebulous social and personal characteristics and speak less often or less emphatically to job-related skills. We consequently judged it important that review of letters of recommendation proceed sensitive to this difference.*

We also considered risks attached to the “Matthew Effect.”¹⁵ In brief, the Matthew Effect—so named for the biblical passage Matthew 13:12, “For to all those who have, more will be given, and they will have an abundance; but from those who have nothing, even what they have will be taken away”—describes the way in which inequities can accumulate over time as differential expectations inform evaluation and outcomes. Our field tends to favor “hotshots” and prestige departments, but research on the Matthew Effect suggests that differential expectations play a role in different outcomes, in high prestige “hotshots” being more easily able to maintain that status and in others finding cracking into “hotshot” status more difficult even when the quality of their work is equivalent to that of the “hotshots.” The phenomenon can also of course be informed by implicit biases tracking gender, race, and the whole range of biases rooted in elements of social identity.¹⁶

The relevance of the Matthew Effect for job searches is in the need to maintain awareness that candidates’ past success may have Matthew Effect elements, with early privilege and high expectations setting the stage for continued privilege and elevated evaluative perceptions. Concomitantly, early disprivilege can set the stage for continued disprivilege. We find it important not to bluntly equate the rather nebulous quality of “promise” in early-career philosophers with halo effects of prior privilege and prestige or with accumulations of assets (e.g., prestigious postdoctoral positions or publications co-authored with well-known advisers) that may track with prior privilege and prestige. Candidates who have not yet accumulated such assets, but who are producing excellent work identified through reading of their anonymized writing samples, may have very successful careers if they are afforded appropriate resources and support in their first tenure-track positions.

E. Forgoing Eastern APA Interviews

Our traditional department practice would have been to interview our top ten or fifteen candidates at the Eastern APA meeting. However, as we revised our search procedures, we decided to include neither in-person nor Skype interviews at this stage. There are notorious difficulties with the quality of information one receives from an interview.¹⁷ APA and Skype interviews are highly artificial and stressful situations in which the pressure is on the candidate to offer snap responses. The ability to perform well in such situations may give little indication of how well the candidate would perform in more job-relevant tasks. In addition, interviewer behavior may create unfair dynamics: Dougherty et al. (“Confirming First Impressions in the Employment Interview: A Field Study of Interviewer Behavior,” *Journal of Applied Psychology* 79, no. 5 [1994]: 659–65) found that interviewers tend to behave in ways that confirm their first impressions of a candidate, for

instance, by showing more positive regard to candidates whom they favored prior to the interview. It is not difficult to see how this might enhance performance for some while depressing performance for others.

The data most relevant to future job performance are contained in the dossier submitted by the candidate, but impressions left by an interview, in part because they are so vivid, can end up overriding the more reliable information in the decision-making process. We judged that the time and effort we had previously devoted to sending several search committee members to the Eastern APA meeting would be better spent reviewing our longlisted candidates’ dossiers and reading additional writing samples we solicited from them, in order to base our decisions on highly job-relevant information.

F. Anonymizing Writing Samples

Although we recognize that many risks of implicit bias might be reduced by completely anonymizing dossiers, the logistical and time constraints of a search bar readily doing this. However, we do make an effort in this direction, focusing on what we judge an especially important element of the dossier: the writing samples. Once our search committee has resolved upon a list of 10–15 preferred candidates, we anonymize the writing samples provided by these candidates and make the anonymized samples available to our entire faculty, encouraging faculty to engage with these versions of the work as preparation for reducing this initial list of candidates to a shorter list. Reviewing anonymized work is a well-established practice in the profession, enhancing the reader’s ability to engage material more directly on its merits. We thus simply adapted this practice to secure its benefits for our job candidates. As mentioned above, a department may wish to request anonymized writing samples in the job advertisement: this will enable the search committee to assess anonymized work from the start, and may be especially effective for a small department that cannot delegate the work of selecting finalists to a search committee that is much smaller than its full faculty cohort.

Obviously, anonymizing writing samples is far from a perfect solution to problems of bias in assessment. Authors may disclose elements of their social identity within their texts, readers may make assumptions about the author’s social identity based on the topic of the text, and a text addressing an underrepresented area of philosophy may trigger biases about that area or about the people who tend to work in it. For these procedures to work effectively in reducing bias, it is important for the search to proceed in the context of recognition—and reminders as needed—that biases related to social identity and academic sub-discipline are pervasive in philosophy, and tend to serve as profound barriers to entry for members of underrepresented groups. Evaluators must be vigilant in questioning negative or lukewarm reactions they have to writing samples that may be triggering unconscious bias, and in reminding themselves of the value of the cognitive diversity that comes from the inclusion of scholars with diverse interests, knowledge bases, philosophical methods, and social identities. It might be beneficial, before assessment of dossiers begins, for the department as a whole to prime awareness of these issues by reading and discussing Sally Haslanger’s “Changing the

Ideology and Culture of Philosophy: Not By Reason (Alone)" (*Hypatia* 23, no. 2 [2008]: 210–23).

G. Ranking the Campus Visit List

As a search proceeds to the stage of the campus visits, we consider it important to anticipate the ways in which direct personal contact with candidates can alter much about the process and subsequent deliberations. Campus visits afford opportunities to interact with candidates in ways that unavoidably blend the social and the professional, so implicit biases may naturally come into play as the data available about the candidates radically expands and includes much more than what strictly bears on their capacities for the job. Because quite nebulous social factors can at this stage easily exert an undue influence on evaluation, we seek to establish our own self-imposed obstacles to such influences. We thus request that when our search committee delivers its list of candidates for campus visits, it present this as a ranked list. Where the search committee cannot agree on a ranking, we ask that each individual member of the committee have his or her own ranked list and indeed encourage all faculty involved in the search to do this. The purpose of ranking candidates prior to their arrival on campus is simply so that we, as a department, will be aware if the campus visits effect a change in our ranking. There may, of course, be good reasons for re-ordering the candidate rankings after the visits, but the initial ranking, based solely on the dossiers, provides an important stimulus for the department to query just what in the visits has prompted any revised evaluation of the candidates and thus better guard against inadvertently giving way to any biasing elements produced by the visits. Put simply, where minds are changed by the campus visits, we want to both recognize *that* they have changed and stimulate ourselves to query carefully *why*.

III. CAMPUS VISITS

As a search moves into the campus visit stage, our aims and concerns necessarily expand. Where implicit bias is the risk we seek to avoid in our handling of candidate materials, the visits entail the need for continued attention to this coupled with close attention to the performance conditions we establish for our candidates. With respect to the former, striving to achieve uniformity across multiple candidate visits is our principal strategy. Making each candidate's experience as like another's as possible can, like the application of uniform criteria, better guard against implicit bias featuring in the necessarily comparative judgments and evaluations we must make. With respect to the latter, our goal is most basically to provide an environment that does not disadvantage any candidate. While uniformity in the visit arrangements can go some distance toward this goal, we also must proceed sensitive to differences in situation, the ways in which, for example, the demographics of our majority male and white department will refract differently through the experience of different candidates depending upon their own identity features. The procedures outlined in this section are efforts to regulate for both of these elements, guarding our evaluations of candidates and engineering the best performance conditions for them we can.

A. Inviting Candidates for Campus Visits

We recognize that candidates may have needs that can affect the success or even viability of elements of the

campus visit. For example, a candidate with mobility issues may wish an alternative to a walking tour of campus or a pregnant candidate may need additional and more frequent breaks than we typically provide. Consequently, we follow our invitations for the visits with an inquiry regarding any such needs. This inquiry, it should be noted, is made by faculty on our Recruiting and Diversity Committee who identify themselves as such and who are not on the search committee. Our reasoning is that candidates will feel more at ease about announcing their needs, and less concerned about detrimental effects on the assessment of their performance, if given the signal that the department is committed to diversity and invited to communicate with faculty less solely focused on the vetting process.

B. Giving Candidates Information

A standard element of the campus visit is a meeting with our departmental governance committee that serves in part to inform the candidate about relevant departmental policies, such as tenure expectations. We recognize that there may be policies of interest to our candidates that they may nonetheless be wary of raising. In particular, inquiring about policies regarding family leave and related tenure clock adjustment possibilities may elicit concern in a candidate about betraying personal information or a life plan he or she would prefer to remain private for fear of its exercising a negative influence on our evaluation. We wish to avoid placing candidates in such a position and consequently ensure that such information is conveyed as part of a regular checklist of items to address. Moreover, we convey that this information is routinely supplied to all candidates, to guard against, for example, women candidates receiving the impression that we are notifying them *in particular* about parental leave and thus placing them at greater risk of experiencing stereotype threat.

C. On-Campus Interviews

One element of our campus visit is an interview session with the candidate that traverses issues regarding research, teaching and pedagogy, and general features of our department. We consider having a standard format for these interviews important for maintaining uniform evaluation of candidates.¹⁸ Consequently, our interviews follow a scripted list of questions devised in advance to capture what we judge to be the most important and relevant issues to address. Because each candidate within the search is responding to the same set of questions, we avoid the peril of some candidates receiving more "favorable" or "unfavorable" queries and have a more reliable way to compare candidate answers. The search committee conducting the interview is likewise responsible to maintain a uniform format for all interview sessions—for example, settling in advance upon whether follow-up queries will be allowed,¹⁹ who among the faculty present will ask questions, and in what order discussion will proceed.

In addition to ensuring uniformity in this fashion, we also undertake steps to provide the best environment possible for candidate performance. First, because quick facility in answering questions can be unreliable as a criterion in evaluating candidates and, at any rate, the campus visit provides no shortage of opportunities for the candidate to demonstrate "thinking on one's feet," our interviews do not

operate on this model. Instead, all candidates are provided with the list of the questions in advance of their visit, with each candidate given the questions on a schedule ensuring that all have an identical lead time to consider them. Second, we try to ensure that the audience for the interview reflects the diversity of the department, because this is valuable in its own right, because it helps make our department more attractive to candidates who value diversity, and because it can aid in containing the risks of stereotype threat for some candidates. To the extent that the demographic composition of our department allows, we strive to ensure that no candidate is interviewing under "solo status." Thus, for example, if a search committee has no women faculty as members, women faculty attend the interviews and participate by asking some of the questions. Finally, we include in all interviews at least one query regarding the candidate's approach to diverse classroom populations, as well as recruiting and retaining students from underrepresented demographic groups. This, we hope, signals to all our candidates the priority with which we treat diversity issues. It also provides us with valuable information about the candidate's perspective on an important professional issue that may not be addressed in the dossier.

D. Job Talk

Our job talk arrangements largely mimic those we make for colloquia. In our department the job talk is the most high stakes element of the campus visit, however, so we manage it more closely. We assign a member of the search committee to chair the session and moderate the question and answer period. The chair is charged with ensuring that discussion maintains a constructive tone and moves at a reasonable pace, and that questions are asked by a diverse array of people, women as well as men and graduate students as well as faculty. In this, we seek to avoid rather obvious risks, such as prolonged follow-up queries that risk bogging down discussion.

E. Meals

Much of the campus visit unavoidably blends professional and social aspects. Hosting candidates for meals requires special care precisely because the informality of meals can reduce vigilance in attention to important professional constraints in hiring processes. For members of the department, such events are a regular, enjoyable social feature of our hosting various guests, but for candidates, meals will almost inevitably be far more stressful, as they are, in an important sense, performing as candidates and potential colleagues. For our meals with candidates, we limit the number of people attending to six. Our reasons for this are multiple. Given our present department demographics, larger parties will almost inevitably overwhelmingly tilt towards a heavily male population. So, too, we recognize that the potential to overwhelm a tired candidate is great, and where the numbers are large the candidate will have difficulty even in remembering the names and status of all present. Implicit bias can be cued by elements as subtle as voice timbre, and in large gatherings a more commanding voice may be necessary to be heard while a softer voice operates as a deficit. We also restrict attendance at these events to those formally affiliated with the department to avoid generating any confusion in candidates about just who is evaluating them. Most importantly, when we solicit participants for

these meals, we rehearse the norms governing interaction at such events, reminding participants that questions about the personal relationships and family lives of our candidates are strictly verboten. While our faculty are well aware of these constraints, students may not be and so this helps to avoid any inadvertently inappropriate queries.

IV. FINAL VETTING

Once a search moves past the campus visits and we enter into final deliberations, we seek to minimize implicit bias and, in particular, to control any "noise" produced by the in-person contact of the campus visits. Most basically, we seek to frame the campus visits as data in supplement to the more fundamental presentation of the candidate in his or her dossier. Consequently, we encourage search committee members and all faculty to revisit and review the candidates' dossiers and the criteria adopted for evaluating them. We likewise recall our initial ranking of the candidates, devised prior to the visits, and query carefully any reasons offered for re-ordering this ranking. Two additional features of our final vetting of candidates are worth particular mention.

A. Soliciting Additional Information

Our graduate students and, to a lesser extent, undergraduates are often involved in various aspects of our searches, attending open events such as the job talk, hosting meals (including a meal during which the candidate meets only with graduate students), and escorting candidates. We believe that feedback from students following a campus visit should be actively sought with the understanding that their interactions with a candidate can sometimes have a very different flavor than the candidate's interactions with faculty. One of our goals in hiring is to recruit faculty who not only will work well with our students but will actively contribute to maintaining a healthy departmental climate for students. Consequently, any apparent red flags signaled in student feedback about candidates should be closely considered, though here, too, effort must be made to separate the social from the more substantive, especially since students reporting on their experience may lack the professional background to readily identify what is most salient and within their ken for comment. In soliciting such feedback, our goal is simply to assess the likely effectiveness of a candidate in working with our students and assisting in department efforts to recruit and retain a diverse student population.

B. Structuring Deliberations

Discussion of candidates following the prolonged process of a search may be prey to a number of hazards, not least of which is faculty exhaustion with the process, a reality that can readily slacken attention to guarding deliberations from bias. We thus include in our hiring procedures basic reminders regarding what we ought count most salient and what we ought omit in our discussions of the candidates. Thus, for example, we have concluded that the more social and informal aspects of the campus visits, such as conversations conducted over meals, ought not exercise any substantial influence in our deliberations. So many variables are in play in these parts of the visit that care should be taken to avoid comparatively evaluating candidates based on them. For example, who attended a meal with a candidate can greatly influence whether the dinner conversation was philosophically lively or not, so we strive to police our

discussions in order not to allow such elements to weigh in evaluations. More pointedly, we recognize that the candidate who seems to “fit in” best may do so simply because he or she fits the dominant demographic profile of the existing faculty, and so we eschew any discussions that would frame candidates in this fashion or register faculty’s subjective comfort with or enjoyment of a candidate. In short, we seek in our deliberations about the candidates to hew as closely and self-consciously as possible to discussions of the candidates’ work, as represented in the dossier and, to a lesser extent, the formal, professional elements of campus visits. Moreover, we seek at this late stage of the process simply to revive our own awareness that this should be our focus.

V. CONCLUSION

Many of the processes we have adopted in our hiring searches are, we think, plain good sense, but rehearsing “plain good sense” explicitly among a faculty has its own value. However organized, searches can nonetheless quite easily become a mix and muddle as faculty juggle their teaching, research, and service obligations while also conducting this important work. Losing sight of our plain good sense is always a risk, and the concerted, collective effort to maintain it can help avoid slips that will corrupt the integrity and fairness of a search. Likewise, many of our processes delve into minutiae of interactions with candidates. This, too, has value, for where avoiding implicit bias and engineering equitable conditions for candidates are concerned, we are convinced that minutiae matter. Small inequities in how candidates are evaluated and received can have significant consequences in the trajectory of a search. Attending carefully to the smaller things can aid in combating this.

Our department has now employed these processes in two hiring searches and used an earlier prototype of them in a third. From these experiences, we can attest to matters that may be of interest to departments interested in adapting them. First, to the extent that faculty may be concerned that such elaborate and explicit procedures introduce an odiously additional time- and energy-consuming element to a process that already drains faculty time and energy, this has not been our experience. Developing these processes was time-intensive, but with that work complete, in using these procedures, our searches have achieved a useful efficiency. Many questions that might arise about how to arrange various elements of a search are formally settled for us and so there is an economical automaticity in how we proceed. Where our processes do commit more faculty time to our searches than was heretofore the case—e.g., in constructing a list of dossiers containing potential bias triggers—the investment of additional time has been, in our judgment, worth it.

Second, we realize that having rather strictly formalized hiring procedures may be out of step with the informality that prevails in many philosophy departments. Such formality was, at least in our department, a departure from our past practices. However, we came to the conclusion that formality can often be the friend of fairness. Because implicit bias operates below conscious awareness, and because the sometimes casual atmosphere of the profession can casually exclude some, combating these perils is not best

served by stubborn insistence on what we find most familiar, natural, or comfortable. Uniformity is crucially important to equitable evaluation of candidates, and uniformity requires formality, an explicit commitment to doing things a particular way so that potentially biased deviations are avoided. Whatever sacrifice of comforts derived from more relaxed processes we have made, we judge them trumped by the enhancements in fairness achieved in our searches.

Finally, while we have not formally sought feedback from our candidates about the processes employed in our searches, what feedback we have received has been overwhelmingly positive. Candidates have attested to finding reassurance in the care with which we manage our interactions with them. Our processes, we think, have served to make the often inhumane experience of job-seeking a bit less so. While we do not address this aspect here, we consider our hiring procedures to be an important recruiting strategy, for they serve to notify candidates that we take their interests and concerns seriously, that we want to optimize their chances to perform well, that our evaluation of them is undertaken conscientiously and carefully, and that we are committed to addressing diversity problems in the larger profession.

NOTES

1. E.g., women represent 20.7 percent of faculty in philosophy in the United States and only 16.6 percent of full-time faculty (Norlock, “Women in the Profession,” 2011 update). Even worse, as of 2011 there were fewer than thirty black women employed full-time in philosophy departments (Gines, “Being a Black Woman Philosopher”).
2. See, e.g., the comparative chart developed by Kieran Healy that shows the percentage of Ph.D.s awarded to women in a variety of academic disciplines: <http://www.kieranhealy.org/blog/archives/2011/02/04/gender-divides-in-philosophy-and-other-disciplines/>.
3. In the past, the search committee has selected 10–15 job candidates for personal interviews at the Eastern APA meeting and the department has selected 3–5 for on-campus interviews. As we note below, revising our processes has entailed a change in these practices.
4. This is part of the emerging picture of human cognition being advanced by the behavioral sciences. On the old picture, people act to advance all of their values given their whole view of their situations. While the newer account allows that people can sometimes act in this cognitively inclusive way (especially when they are proceeding slowly and deliberately), most of the time they act quickly, automatically, and myopically (see, e.g., Kahneman, *Thinking, Fast and Slow*). Implicit bias results from this latter sort of thinking. Part of the story about how fast, unconscious processing works is that people act on proper subsets of their mental states—they “see” particular situations in terms of some of their interests, doxastic states, etc. (see, e.g., Schick, *Understanding Action*; Bazerman and Tenbrunsel, *Blind Spots*). Commonly activated value-belief-etc. “packages” serve as schemas that frame and guide interpretation and behavior. Shared schemas, in turn, give rise to social norms (see, e.g., Bicchieri, *The Grammar of Society*). The existence of social norms based on problematic schemas can have a deleterious effect on everyone so long as enough people conform to them (see, e.g., Cudd, *Analyzing Oppression*).
5. Moss-Racusin et al. (“Science Faculty’s Subtle Gender Biases Favor Male Students”) found that faculty members were biased against female students who applied for a laboratory manager position. Strikingly, female faculty members exhibited this bias just as strongly as did male faculty members. For a useful summary of various studies regarding how implicit bias may specifically influence hiring, see Women in Science and Engineering Leadership Institute, University of Wisconsin–Madison, “Reviewing Applicants: Research on Bias and Assumptions,” http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/docs/BiasBrochure_2ndEd.pdf. This small brochure is also an immensely useful, quick tool for orienting faculty and

administrators to both the myriad issues at play in hiring and basic recommendations for avoiding bias in hiring.

6. Haslanger, "Changing the Ideology and Culture of Philosophy, 3–4.
7. One standard example of this observes the way in which the cultural stereotyping of girls as less able at mathematics can operate to depress their performance: Girls, when merely reminded that they are girls, will underperform on math exercises (Ambady et al., "Stereotype Susceptibility in Children"; see Shih et al., "Stereotype Susceptibility" for a similar effect in women). For more on how stereotype threat operates and the ways in which it may compromise performance, see Steele, *Whistling Vivaldi*. In addition to Steele's research, the web-based tutorial "Reducing Stereotype Threat" is a very useful resource. See <http://www.reducingstereotypethreat.org/>.
8. Sekaquaptewa and Thompson, "Solo Status, Stereotype Threat, and Performance Expectancies."
9. Uhlmann and Cohen, "Constructed Criteria Redefining Merit to Justify Discrimination."
10. For example, one study indicated that job applicants with African American-sounding names had to send one and a half times as many resumes to achieve the callback rate enjoyed by applicants with white-sounding names (Bertrand and Mullainathan, *Are Emily and Greg More Employable Than Lakisha and Jamal?*); another found that female applicants for postdoctoral fellowships needed 2.5 as many publications to receive the same productivity score as male applicants (Wold and Wennerås, "Nepotism and Sexism in Peer Review").
11. We flag only *negative* bias triggers. As a practical matter, that is all we can do; if we tried to flag all of the *positive* bias triggers as well, we would, in effect, just be re-listing all of the dossiers. There is a risk of the flags being treated as, in effect, warning signs: unflagged dossiers being read as *normal*; flagged dossiers being read as *deviant* or *problematic*. (Thanks to Jennifer Saul for pointing this out during the Diversity in Philosophy Conference in Dayton, OH, on May 29–31, 2013.) Taking that worry seriously, we still think that flagging negative bias triggers is necessary. Triggers will cue negative implicit bias whether we flag them or not; making the triggers explicit allows for amelioration. The effect of counteracting negative schemas on the influence of positive schemas, however, is unclear. Hopefully, the general attention to eliminating bias in decision-making will undermine the usual *this-is-what-a-philosopher-looks-like* associations.
12. In addition to including particular sub-fields on our list of potential bias triggers, our department finds it useful to signal in our job advertisements the department's commitment to inclusivity. This is accomplished by simply adding a line in our ads noting that we are open to diverse approaches to philosophy. Insofar as the discipline may incline toward biases against some sub-fields, we judge it valuable to signal that work or interest in such sub-fields is welcome in our department.
13. Sally Haslanger's review of seven top-tier journals in analytic philosophy found very few publications in feminist philosophy or philosophy of race ("Changing the Ideology and Culture of Philosophy"). Kristie Dotson's (2012) essay "How Is This Paper Philosophy?" is an eloquent treatment of these issues and worries.
14. E.g., Madera et al., "Gender and Letters of Recommendation for Academia"; Schmader et al., "A Linguistic Comparison of Letters of Recommendation for Male and Female Chemistry and Biochemistry Job Applicants"; Trix and Psenka, "Exploring the Color of Glass").
15. Brennan, "Rethinking the Moral Significance of Micro-Inequities," contains a helpful discussion of how Matthew Effect elements may feature in reduced rates of awards and honors accorded women in academia in particular.
16. Both Jennifer Saul and Eric Schwitzgebel note the gendered elements of "seeming smart" in philosophy. See Saul, "Women in Philosophy"; and Schwitzgebel, "On Being Good at Seeming Smart," *The Splintered Mind*, March 25, 2010, <http://schwitsplinters.blogspot.com/2010/03/on-being-good-at-seeming-smart.html>.
17. Campion et al., "Structured Interviewing."

18. Many studies have found that highly structured interviews produce information with much greater predictive validity. For discussion, see *ibid.*; Wiesner and Cronshaw "A Meta-Analytic Investigation of the Impact of Interview Format and Degree of Structure on the Validity of the Employment Interview."

19. It may be advisable to limit follow-up questions, or even to eliminate them entirely. Follow-up queries are one way in which interviewers may show more positive regard for candidates they antecedently favor. Dougherty et al., "Confirming First Impressions in the Employment Interview." Improvised elements like follow-up questions may undercut the greater predictive validity produced by structured interviewing. See Campion et al., "Structured Interviewing"; Wiesner and Cronshaw, "A Meta-Analytic Investigation of the Impact of Interview Format and Degree of Structure on the Validity of the Employment Interview."

WORKS CITED

- Ambady, Nalini, Margaret Shih, Amy Kim, and Todd L. Pittinsky. "Stereotype Susceptibility in Children: Effects of Identity Activation on Quantitative Performance." *Psychological Science* 12, no. 5 (2001): 385–90.
- Bazerman, Max, and Ann Tenbrunsel. *Blind Spots*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011.
- Bertrand, Marianne, and Sendhil Mullainathan. *Are Emily and Greg More Employable Than Lakisha and Jamal? A Field Experiment on Labor Market Discrimination*. No. w9873. National Bureau of Economic Research, 2003.
- Bicchieri, Cristina. *The Grammar of Society*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Brennan, Samantha. "Rethinking the Moral Significance of Micro-Inequities: The Case of Women In Philosophy." In *Women in Philosophy: What Needs to Change?*, edited by Fiona Jenkins and Katrina Hutchison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Campion, Michael A., Elliott D. Pursell, and Barbara K. Brown. "Structured Interviewing: Raising the Psychometric Properties of the Employment Interview." *Personnel Psychology* 41, no. 1 (1988): 25–42.
- Cudd, Ann. *Analyzing Oppression*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Dotson, Kristie. "How Is This Paper Philosophy?" *Comparative Philosophy* 3, no. 1 (2012): 3–29.
- Dougherty, Thomas W., Daniel B. Turban, and John C. Callender. "Confirming First Impressions in the Employment Interview: A Field Study of Interviewer Behavior." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 79, no. 5 (1994): 659–65.
- Gines, Kathryn T. "Being a Black Woman Philosopher: Reflections on Founding the Collegium of Black Women Philosophers." *Hypatia* 26, no. 2 (2011): 429–43.
- Haslanger, Sally. "Changing the Ideology and Culture of Philosophy: Not by Reason (Alone)." *Hypatia* 23, no. 2 (2008): 210–23.
- Healy, Kieran. "Gender Divides in Philosophy and Other Disciplines." February 2, 2011. <http://kieranhealy.org/blog/archives/2011/02/04/gender-divides-in-philosophy-and-other-disciplines/>.
- Kahneman, Daniel. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011.
- Madera, Juan M., Michelle R. Hebl, and Randi C. Martin. "Gender and Letters of Recommendation for Academia: Agentic and Communal Differences." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 94, no. 6 (2009): 1591–99.
- Moss-Racusin, Corinne A., John F. Dovidio, Victoria L. Brescoll, Mark J. Graham, and Jo Handelsman. "Science Faculty's Subtle Gender Biases Favor Male Students." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109, no. 41 (2012): 16474–79.
- Norlock, Kathryn. "Women in the Profession: A Report to the APA Committee on the Status of Women," 2006, with 2011 update. <http://www.apaonlinecsw.org/workshops-and-summer-institutes>.
- Saul, Jennifer. "Implicit Bias, Stereotype Threat and Women in Philosophy." In *Women in Philosophy: What Needs to Change?*, edited by Fiona Jenkins and Katrina Hutchison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Saul, Jennifer. "Women in Philosophy." *The Philosopher's Magazine*. October 16, 2012. <http://philosophypress.co.uk/?p=1079>.
- Schick, Frederic. *Understanding Action*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Schmader, Toni, Jessica Whitehead, and Vicki H. Wysocki. "A Linguistic Comparison of Letters of Recommendation for Male and Female Chemistry and Biochemistry Job Applicants." *Sex Roles* 57, nos. 7-8 (2007): 509-14.

Sekaquaptewa, Denise, and Mischa Thompson. "Solo Status, Stereotype Threat, and Performance Expectancies: Their Effects on Women's Performance." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 39, no. 1 (2003): 68-74.

Shih, Margaret, Todd L. Pittinsky, and Nalini Ambady. "Stereotype Susceptibility: Identity Salience and Shifts in Quantitative Performance." *Psychological Science* 10, no. 1 (1999): 80-83.

Steele, Claude. *Whistling Vivaldi: And Other Clues to How Stereotypes Affect Us*. New York: Norton, 2011.

Trix, Frances, and Carolyn Psenka. "Exploring The Color of Glass: Letters of Recommendation for Female and Male Medical Faculty." *Discourse & Society* 14, no. 2 (2003): 191-220.

Uhlmann, Eric Luis, and Geoffrey L. Cohen. "Constructed Criteria Redefining Merit to Justify Discrimination." *Psychological Science* 16, no. 6 (2005): 474-80.

Valian, Virginia. *Why So Slow?: The Advancement of Women*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998.

Wiesner, Willi H., and Steven F. Cronshaw. "A Meta-Analytic Investigation of the Impact of Interview Format and Degree of Structure on the Validity of the Employment Interview." *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 61, no. 4 (1988): 275-90.

Wold, Agnes, and Christine Wennerås. "Nepotism and Sexism in Peer Review." *Nature* 387, no. 6631 (1997): 341-43.

Women in Science and Engineering Leadership Institute, University of Wisconsin-Madison. 2012. *Reviewing Applicants: Research on Bias and Assumptions*, 3rd ed. http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/docs/BiasBrochure_3rdEd.pdf.

An Ambivalent Ally: On Philosophical Argumentation and Diversity

Phyllis Rooney
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

1. A VALID ARGUMENT

A recent article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, "Women Challenge Male Philosophers to Make Room in Unfriendly Field" (January 2013), brings attention (again) to questions about whether and why philosophy is an unfriendly discipline for women. Robin Wilson, the article's author, reports, "part of the problem, women say, is that philosophy is a verbally aggressive field, and some women may be more uncomfortable than men are with the kind of sparring and jousting typical of philosophical debates." Wilson mentions conversations she had with various philosophers, including one with Brian Leiter, whose popular philosophy blog has contributed to discussions about gender equity.¹ Leiter, Wilson reports, "isn't sympathetic to arguments that the content of philosophy courses, and the style in which the discipline is taught, should be changed to make it more attractive to women." Leiter says that he "dislike[s] the suggestion that the field's too combative for delicate women," noting that some women in the discipline have also voiced their concern about this suggestion.

The combative argumentation (hereafter, CA) concern is one that regularly surfaces in discussions about gender disparity in philosophy. However, as Wilson correctly adumbrates, there is something of a tension about whether and how the

concern might be articulated and addressed. On the one hand, it is an issue that needs to be carefully examined, since many philosophers continue to give voice to it in discussions about diversity. On the other hand, as Leiter points out, it is an issue about which some women have reservations, especially if it suggests that women may not be tough enough for philosophical argumentation—a suggestion that carries an uncomfortable reminder of philosophy's long, sexist history of devaluing women's capacities in reasoning and philosophical debate.

In this article I propose a resolution of the tension. I will direct attention especially to the way in which the CA concern is framed and articulated, particularly as it relates to gender. To focus discussion, I examine a valid (deductive) argument that, to my mind, motivates some reservations about advancing CA as a gender equity concern:

P_1 : If CA (in philosophy) is a gender equity concern, then women are not tough enough for philosophical argumentation.

P_2 : It is not the case that women are not tough enough for philosophical argumentation.

C: It is not the case that CA (in philosophy) is a gender equity concern.

The conclusion of this valid (*modus tollens*) argument does not seem to bode well for efforts to advance critical reassessments of CA as a diversity issue, particularly in relation to gender. Yet the conclusion is compelling only if we do not have serious doubts about the premises. Such doubts are in order, I maintain, particularly in relation to P_1 . My primary goal in this paper is to uncover some implicit—yet questionable—understandings and assumptions about gender, about gender difference, and about connections between combativeness or toughness and (good) philosophizing that seem to make the conditional statement in P_1 (or variants thereof—women are "too delicate," for instance) a reasonable one for many philosophers to accept.

Let us first be clear about some central terms and claims in this discussion. I take the term "argumentation" in this context to refer to common practices of interaction among philosophers. These practices include presenting arguments to others (verbally or in written form), responding to the arguments of others, modifying arguments in light of others' responses, presenting modified arguments, and so on. The terms "combative" or "adversarial" as applied to argumentation can mean various things. There are levels of adversariality, Trudy Govier argues, and there are many reasons to impugn what she calls "ancillary adversariality" (lack of respect, rudeness, . . . animosity, hostility, failure to listen and attend carefully . . . quarrelsomeness, and so forth)² Such displays of combative argumentation may well turn away those who are put off by them, and that is a genuine concern if we wish to promote philosophical debate as a model of open, inclusive discussion. But in any case, Govier argues, such displays are also not in accord with the *epistemic* norms of respectful exchange of ideas and evidence that good argumentation aims to promote.