Good Practice Guide

This guide is intended for use at philosophy institutes in Switzerland. Firstly, it names and informs about widespread problems at institutes of philosophy. Secondly, it makes concrete suggestions on how to create a better climate in all institutes of philosophy, in which all persons, regardless of their gender, feel safe and comfortable[1]. Specifically, we have in mind the goal to create a better climate for persons, who are underrepresented in the field of academic philosophy on the basis of their gender and/or the fact that they do not identify with the gender assigned to them at birth. This guide provides suggestions on how to improve the situation for all women (cis and trans), trans men and non-binary persons in academic philosophy.[2]

This guide contains proposals, which are useful for professors, junior and mid-level researchers or staff, and students at institutes of philosophy in Switzerland.

As a point of departure, we utilize the work and terminology, which has been formulated by Transgender Network Switzerland (TGNS). We have translated them for the purposes of the French and English translations and use the previously mentioned terms as follows:[3]

Trans persons: persons, who do not identify with the gender that has been assigned to them at birth.[4]

Cis persons: persons, who identify with the gender that was assigned to them at birth.

Trans woman: a woman, who was assigned the gender of boy at birth, but identifies as a woman.

Trans man: a man, who was assigned the gender of girl at birth, but identifies as a man.

Non-binary: umbrella terms for all persons, who do not exclusively identify with a binary gender category such as man or woman.[5]

---

[1] For a more extensive discussion of the question of why philosophers should strive for more diversity in their discipline, see Jennifer Saul (2013): "Implicit Bias, Stereotype Threat and Women in Philosophy", in: Women in Philosophy: What Needs to Change? Edited by Fiona Jenkins und Katrina Hutchison, Oxford University Press

[2] Although this expands the traditional focus of SWIP organizations, we are aware that this delimitation still falls short when it comes to addressing all persons, who are disadvantaged in patriarchal societies. For, in such contexts, in addition to cis women and trans persons, cis men who exhibit a feminine "gender expression" and/or do not meet certain masculine norms (in certain situations) are also disadvantaged. Although we cannot specifically address these persons' concerns, we hope that our concrete suggestions for improvement will also improve their situation in academic philosophy.

[3] Furthermore, we recognize our responsibility to regularly update the terminology utilized within these Good Practice Guides in order to respect the language used by the groups to whom we are referring.

[4] For more information regarding different trans identities see: https://www.tgns.ch/de/ or https://transequality.org/about-trans.

[5] For more information regarding non-binary or genderqueer gender identities please see:

The Guide contains the following chapters:

This is a substantially revised version of the Good Practice Guide of SWIP Germany, which has been adapted to reflect the conditions in Switzerland. In addition, the scope has been expanded to address the situation of trans women, trans men, and non-binary persons, who in addition to cis women, are underrepresented and marginalised in academic philosophy on the basis of gender because either they do not identify with the gender that was assigned to them at birth or a binary gender category. This means that we are particularly concerned with addressing the specific concerns and interests of trans persons. Further suggestions for additions or changes are particularly welcome in this domain.[7]

Before we give concrete suggestions on how to improve the situation of women, non-binary persons, and trans men, let us set forth a fundamental premise: to improve the situation of persons, who do not identify with the gender assigned to them at birth, it is essential that the gender identity of each person is respected. Respecting one's gender identity includes not only using correct personal pronouns, personal designations, and proper names in linguistic references, but also normalising providing and discussing everyone's pronouns in both in person and online formats. The correct personal pronouns, personal designations, and names of those persons are those desired by the persons themselves. It should also be ensured that all persons have access to toilets. Ideally, the university and the institute should have gender-neutral toilets. If this is not the case, the institute should at least clearly communicate (e.g., by posting a notice on all restroom doors) that all persons may use the toilets of the gender with which they identify or choose any option, in case such toilets are not available.

Furthermore, no gender identity should be considered as something that needs to be justified or explained. In particular, trans persons are not accountable to anyone for their gender identity. This applies to both binary and non-binary gender identities. Furthermore, persons must not be outed as trans against their will. If someone has disclosed that they do not identify with the gender assigned to them at birth, one should ask whether they want

---

https://www.nonbinary.ch/ or https://transequality.org/issues/resources/understanding-non-binary-persons-how-to-be-respectful-and-supportive

[6] The glossary (p.36) explains two key terms originating from socio-psychological research ("stereotype threat" and "implicit bias").

[7] We can be contacted under the following address: swip.switzerland@gmail.com.

SWIP

the information to remain in confidence or whether one should henceforth also make a public effort to ensure that the gender identity of the person in question is recognised and respected (e.g., by correcting third parties if they refer to someone using the wrong set of pronouns). Respecting the gender identity of a person also includes refraining from commenting (critically) on the way a person wishes to express their gender identity ("gender expression").

Authors:

The following persons contributed to the creation of the Good Practice Guide of SWIP Germany: Hannah Altehenger (Zurich), Birgit Benzing (Hannover), Christine Bratu (Göttingen), Francesca Bunkenborg (HU Berlin), Aline Dammel (FU Berlin), Birte de Gruisbourne (Paderborn), Sanja Dembic (HU Berlin), Hilkje Hänel (Potsdam), Rebekka Hufendiek (Bern), Anna Leuschner (Wuppertal), Lisa Mangold (FU Berlin), Leo Menges (Salzburg), Mari Mikkola (Amsterdam), Johanna M. Müller (HU Berlin), Doreen Orth (Potsdam), Jelscha Schmid (Basel), Raphael van Riel (Duisburg-Essen), Barbara Vetter (FU Berlin) und Anna Welpinghus (Dortmund).

Adaptation and further additions for use in Swiss institutes of philosophy: Thyra Elsasser (Sheffield), Stéphanie Gomes (Geneva), Claire Plassard (Zurich), Leire Urricelqui (Lucerne), Mira Wolf-Bauwens (Zurich), Stephanie Deig (Lucerne), Anna Klieber (Sheffield), Silvio Koelbing (Bern), Kathrin von Allmen (Zurich), Karen Poertzgen (Bern)

SWIP

Table of Contents

I Teaching and Supervision

1. Introduction

Teaching creates and shapes the space in which philosophers are educated. However, often due to stereotyping, members of underrepresented groups are overlooked and are often encouraged or supported less than other students. For example, a study at the Free University of Berlin[8] has surveyed women on what factors prevent them from participating actively in seminars.[9] The study's authors have identified four problem areas:

- A general feeling of insecurity (BA students attribute it to their personal lack of competence; on the other hand, MA students attribute it to structural conditions), in particular because they feel they lack professional prospects.
- The impression that one's contributions during seminars are not appreciated.
- The impression that seminars are more about performing and distinguishing oneself rather than close reading.
- The formation of an exclusive, "inner circle"; i.e., a group of students, mostly male, that dominate seminar discussions and are addressed by lecturers by name.

In the study, the participants often spoke of being confronted with male dominance in academic philosophy. The authors identify the following five different aspects of this dominance:

- Men enjoy the most visibility in philosophical spaces.
- The literature that is discussed is predominately authored by men.
- Masculinity is perceived as the norm, e.g., in thought experiments.
- "Good" philosophical attributes are associated with masculinity.[10]
- The authors of the study suspect that many of these tendencies are rooted in implicit biases of the parties involved as well as the phenomenon of stereotype threat.

Another recent large-scale study conducted by Eddy Nahmias, Toni Adleberg and Morgan Thompson at Georgia State University presents similar findings[11] and shows that female students stop taking philosophy classes after attending introductory courses at a higher rate than their male counterparts. Moreover, male and female students experienced the introductory courses in philosophy very differently. In general, female students found the

---

[8] https://www.geisteswissenschaften.fu-berlin.de/we01/media/Ergebnisbericht-der-Studie-Frauen_-in-der-Philosophie-2014.pdf.

[9] Unfortunately, this study did not examine the difficulties of non-binary persons and trans men. We suspect, however, that many of them are also negatively influenced by the fact that cis men and cis persons in general enjoy the most visibility in academic philosophy and are often constitute the norm or default.

[10] For more on this topic see below.

[11] Adleberg, Thompson, Nahmias (2014): „Do Women Have Different Philosophical Intuitions Than Men?" Philosophical Psychology 28(5), 615-641

courses less satisfying and the material being discussed less interesting and relevant to their lives. In addition, female students perceived that they had less in common with their teachers and reported feeling a higher potential of failure in philosophy.

Furthermore, the association between masculinity and attributes that are perceived to contribute to success in academic philosophy, such as the attribution of a particular innate brilliance, appears to play an important role. In their large-scale study "Expectations of brilliance underlie gender distributions across academic disciplines"[12], the findings of Sarah-Jane Leslie, Andrei Cimpian, Meredith Meyer and Edward Freeland support this conclusion by demonstrating that the degree of underrepresentation of women in a field can be predicted on the basis of the extent to which a certain "raw innate talent" is considered essential for success in that field.[13] As a result, the more a particular innate brilliance is considered indispensable for succeeding in an academic discipline, the higher women's underrepresentation is in it. Out of the 30 disciplines included in the study, philosophy turned out to be the discipline with the strongest demand for innate brilliance thereby exceeding the two STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) subjects: mathematics and physics.

The fact that women are not stereotyped as possessing this particular innate brilliance has troubling consequences. Firstly, for those women who have internalized this stereotype it leads to self-doubt regarding the possibility of having a successful academic career in philosophy. However, even women who do not end up doubting their talent due to this stereotype are still not immune to its influence. The innate brilliance requirement is so powerful that even women with complete confidence in their own abilities can end up doubting - and justifiably so - that their talent will be sufficiently recognized and on this basis refrain from considering or pursuing an academic career. Furthermore, even if this stereotype is not internalized thus leading to a deflated sense of one's abilities, it can nevertheless give rise to the phenomenon of stereotype threat[14] causing members of stereotyped groups to underperform.[15]

---

[12] Leslie, Cimpian, Meyer, Freeland (2005): "Expectations of brilliance underlie gender distributions across academic disciplines." *Science* 347: 262-265.

[13] In this respect, the "raw innate brilliance" hypothesis has proven to be superior in predicting the underrepresentation of women in academic disciplines compared to the three other hypotheses. Neither the requirements of long working days, nor the selectivity of a discipline, or the proportion of systematic thinking (compared to empathic thinking) could predict the underrepresentation of women across all disciplines). This study is particularly noteworthy because it is able to explain the particular absence or underrepresentation of women in certain natural science disciplines (such as molecular biology and neuroscience) and the severe underrepresentation in certain humanities and social sciences (such as philosophy and economics).

[14] For more information about stereotype threat, see the glossary below.

[15] Note that in addition to these stereotypes concerning innate brilliance, trans women are also affected and threatened by very specific stereotypes concerning their gender expression and presentation. For more on this, see Rachel McKinnon (2014): "Stereotype Threat and Attributional Ambiguity for Trans Women", Hypatia 29(4): 857-872.

In order to increase gender diversity in academic philosophy, it is therefore necessary to counteract the aforementioned effects of the widespread belief that a particular innate brilliance (associated with men) is required to succeed as an academic philosopher. For example, by emphasizing the importance of hard work, commitment, and intellectual curiosity as factors of success in academic philosophy.[16] In addition, individual female students should be told explicitly that they have excelled at doing something and encouraged to pursue an academic career. Often, obtaining excellent grades is not enough to counteract the structurally induced self-doubt internalised by female students.

In general, institutes of philosophy and individual lecturers should avoid situations that induce stereotyping and thus stereotype threat and minimize the influence of implicit biases wherever possible. In the following, we consider different aspects of teaching: teaching methods, moderating discussions, and selection of reading material and present concrete strategies to help reduce the aforementioned barriers to access in these areas.

2. Teaching Methods

Seminar instructors should try to learn every participant's name. If the number of participants does not allow for this, lecturers should abstain from calling anyone by their name. If teaching in languages with two kinds of second person address whereby one is more formal and the other less so (e.g., "Sie" vs. "du" in German or "vous" vs. "tu" in French), lecturers should make sure to either address everyone in the formal or everyone in the informal way.

Whenever lecturers ask participants to introduce themselves, they should invite them to name their pronouns. They should not assume to know everyone's pronouns.

Lecturers should also try to address groups of participants using gender-neutral language. In English, one should not use terms like "ladies and gentlemen" or "guys," but rather terms such as "everyone", "folks", or "you all (y'all)". In languages where nouns are gendered such as German, French, and Italian, both gendered forms of the term will often be used such as in German "Studentinnen und Studenten" or in French, "étudiantes et étudiants" in order to be more inclusive; however, in this case non-binary persons are not addressed, and it is preferable to utilize the gender-neutral participle form when possible. For example, in German, one should use written terms such as "Student*innen" and a form that includes the asterisk in the spoken form e.g., a pause where the asterisk would be. In French, gender neutral terms such as, "les membres du corps estudiantin" or "la communauté étudiante" can be used in the written or spoken forms.[17]

---

[16] Such efforts benefit all students because it has been shown that everyone performs better under such conditions, but especially female students and members of other groups that are stereotyped as not possessing this particular innate brilliance.

[17] For more resources on inclusive language practices in English, French and German, please visit https://geschicktgendern.de/ or our website: https://www.swipswitzerland.org/basic-10.

Varying their teaching methods to accommodate different needs is one way that lecturers can help combat students' insecurities. To do so, lecturers can experiment with different alternatives to plenary or so-called Socratic style discussions such as:

- ❏ Silent discussions in which participants have discussions by writing contributions on posters.
- ❏ Discussion in smaller groups preceding or following plenary discussions.
- ❏ close reading of texts and limiting discussion to only material covered in the texts.
- ❏ interactive forms of discussion such as pre-prepared contributions (e.g., discussion questions) participants are asked to hand in beforehand in order to structure the discussion

The last suggestion, in particular, enables teachers to get students involved, who would otherwise have difficulties participating, in addition to allowing them to pay special attention to written submissions of these participants, and to provide the opportunity to recognize and highlight their good work.

In seminars, lecturers should discuss professional options outside of academia for philosophers, e.g., by reading texts from the Ethics Council or by stressing the fact that one of the authors on the syllabus no longer works at a university or by mentioning their contributions outside of academia.

Furthermore, lecturers should actively advertise student positions and conferences and point to helpful university institutions and resources concerning professional development during seminars. They should share information on the criteria for a good application with all participants and not just a select few in the "inner circle."

3. Moderating Discussions

Lecturers should make sure to explicitly express their interest in and appreciation for contributions, particularly those given by participants, who do not actively contribute to seminar discussions often. For example, this can be done by way of asking for clarification of their contributions or questions.

Lecturers should critically question their own notions about what they expect from good philosophy students and examine if these expectations should be modified or adjusted. One should actively check themselves for implicit and unjustified overvaluation of "typically male" attributes (such as "aggressive behaviour in discussions") or the devaluation of "typically female" attributes (such as being "shy" or "reserved") and if possible, publicly discuss these reflections. More so, they should make sure to intervene if students behave rudely or aggressively towards fellow seminar participants instead of collaborating in a constructive way. Also, they should correct participants who use incorrect pronouns to refer

to other persons in the third person (even if the latter are not present). For more on how to react to (intentional) misgendering (and other kinds of abusive behaviour), see chapter III.3.

4. Seminar Literature

Lecturers should make diversity (in the sense of including a diverse and varied range of texts by authors of underrepresented groups) a selection criterion for the texts on the reading list. They should make sure to put in the work to find texts that are written by women, non-binary persons, trans men, and members of other underrepresented groups, which would be suitable to discuss during a seminar on a particular topic.

If possible, seminars in which only reading lists are composed exclusively of texts by white, cis men should be avoided. The literature search should be conducted by the lecturers themselves and should not be delegated to members of the underrepresented group in question. There are many helpful resources that can be used.[18]

The use of thought experiments and examples is of great importance in philosophy. However, they often tend to reproduce stereotypes in an uncritical and unreflexive manner with regard to gender or the status of persons with disabilities. If possible, lecturers should try to select literature, in which the selected experiments and examples do not utilize male, white cis persons without cognitive and/or physical disabilities as the norm. If this is not possible, they should make the effort to stress and discuss why they think that the traditional formulation of a thought experiment or example is problematic. For example, this can be done very effectively by departing from the original formulation in their own presentation of the thought experiment or example. This is particularly important whenever a philosophical question or topic is of great practical consequence to certain groups of persons and lecturers should make sure everyone participating is aware of these stakes. Participants should be generally aware of this during discussion, but also particularly, when members of those groups are participating.

5. Grading

In general, evaluation criteria for assignments should be defined in advance and openly communicated. Feedback should be as transparent as possible and offer criticism in a constructive way.

Even though anonymization will not be feasible in all cases, it should be attempted wherever possible, as it is the most effective means of eliminating the effects of implicit biases on evaluations. For example, students could identify themselves by giving only their matriculation number on exams or seminar papers and omitting their names. If necessary, the final grade can be adjusted by taking relevant factors such as how far along a student is

---

[18] Examples of such resources are the list compiled by SWIP Germany of texts in German by women philosophers (http://swip-philosophinnen.org/ressourcen/literatur/) or the Diversity Reading List for texts in English (https://diversityreadinglist.org/). For further resources, please visit: www.swipswitzerland.org/projects-or-initiatives.

in their studies or whether philosophy is their major or minor into account. In addition, there should be easy access to obtaining a second evaluation by another lecturer, especially for students, who suspect that they have received an unfair evaluation on the basis of their social group membership.

Examiners should make sure to not ask for any superfluous information (for example regarding one's gender identity, age, or social background). Asking for such information can trigger stereotype threat, which leads to persons performing less well than they otherwise would have. Also, such information might give rise to implicit biases that distort an examiner's evaluation of the student's performance.

6. Supervision

Supervisor-supervisee relations (for example between a PhD student and their supervisor) can potentially be subject to many of the aforementioned problems as well. For example, it is often the case that white cis men receive more attention and thus exposure and access to existing networks. To avoid such unequal treatment, it is useful to set out the conditions of the supervision in the form of a contract in which expectations on both sides are formulated. Attention and constructive feedback are particularly important for members of underrepresented groups.

Particularly, in the context of supervisor-supervisee relations, it should not be forgotten that inherent hierarchies in the relationship do not cease to exist in informal social situations. Also, it should be considered that not all students are able to take part in work meetings and social gatherings outside normal work hours due to care obligations or other factors. Therefore, it should at least be ensured that evening events are announced early enough so that persons with care obligations have sufficient time to find someone to take over those obligations. However, the best option would be if the department would try to hold some of the informal social gatherings during the day (rather than only on evenings) and provide childcare for events that are necessary to career advancement or networking.

All student assistants should be treated equitably and both the kinds of tasks and amount of work they are expected and encouraged to complete should be equitably distributed. For example, when distributing organizational tasks during a conference, all student assistants should be able to participate equally in philosophical discussions (while completing their organizational tasks). This should also be considered with regard to seating arrangements during social festivities during or following conference events.

II Care Obligations

1. Introduction

In this chapter, we present suggestions on how to make studies and academic careers more accessible for persons with care obligations. By care obligations we are referring to obligations to do care work outside of the workplace, e.g., caring for and supervising children and adults.[19]

In theory, all persons can have such care obligations. However, as women are not only traditionally expected to, but also end up shouldering a disproportionate amount of care work, being attentive to the compatibility of academic training and career with non-university care work is particularly relevant when it comes to counteracting the underrepresentation of women in academic philosophy.[20]

When formulating corresponding countermeasures, it is important to remember that all persons, regardless of their gender identity, can have care obligations. In addition, measures to reconcile academic work with care obligations should not focus solely on childcare. Persons looking after adults in need of care or nursing are too often forgotten, even though they can and do face similar difficulties.

Care obligations do not release one from meeting requirements regarding the quality of academic work to be done; however, they can explain why persons with care obligations often do not or cannot perform certain academic work at the same pace as philosophers without such duties. In addition, persons with care obligations outside of the university often acquire other skills in these roles. Therefore, it can be worthwhile, for example, to rethink the expectations of applicants and valorise skill sets gained outside of academic work.

In the following sections, suggestions are made on how the conditions in various areas of academic life can be improved for persons with care obligations.

2. Scientific Events

University events such as lectures, colloquia, workshops, and courses should take place at times when external support is usually available (usually between 8:00 am and 5:00 pm). Free childcare should be offered at conferences or ideally, if possible, the travel costs for an additional carer should be financed.

---

[19] We are aware of the fact that a lot of care work (e.g., in the form of emotional labour) is also done at the workplace. However, here we merely focus on the added difficulties persons with care obligations outside their workplace face during their studies or their academic career.

[20] Unfortunately, we are not familiar with any studies or data on whether non-binary persons and trans men also take on a disproportionately large share of extracurricular care work. This seems to us to be quite possible, since at least some of them are still, or at least in the past, often read as women and thus the social norm that women should bear a large part of the care work could therefore also have an influence on their responsibilities. However, the fact that we cannot say with certainty if non-binary persons and trans men actually take on a disproportionate amount of care work is ultimately not decisive for our purposes as our proposals are intended to improve the situation of all persons with non-university care duties regardless of their gender identity.

If events take place in the evening, it is advantageous if persons with care obligations are not (implicitly) under pressure to attend these events. It is also important that events are announced well in advance so that persons with non-university care or supervision obligations have sufficient time to organise supervision by others if they wish to attend the event.

3. Infrastructure

Institutes should ensure that the necessary infrastructure required for the care of young children is available locally. Ideally, the initiative should be taken by the institute at faculty level with the aim of providing lockers, storage facilities, and/or a parent-child room. Furthermore, universities should ensure that all persons, regardless of their gender, have access to changing tables and rooms. Each institute should designate a contact person responsible for such measures. The institute should actively draw attention to these resources.

4. Planning & Distribution of Teaching or Workload During the Semester

Those with care obligations should be given appropriate priority in the organisation and the allocation of time slots for teaching each semester. In general, all the above-mentioned aspects should be considered when distributing the workload for teaching or in the planning of compulsory courses.

If persons, who are already employed, with care obligations apply for unpaid leave for this reason special efforts should be made to grant it to them.

5. Career

It is increasingly the norm that stays abroad are expected of students, doctoral candidates, and junior researchers, but for persons with care obligations they are usually very difficult to organise and involve additional costs. Teachers, supervisors, and members of selection committees should be aware of this problem. Different options are available to meet these challenges. In order to enable persons with care obligations to spend time abroad, additional financial support should be provided to cover the extra costs of frequent travel to and from the university or accommodation for family members. Alternatively, the option of supporting doctoral candidates and young researchers in inviting guest researchers for several shorter periods or a longer period of time, in order to promote the necessary international exchange, should be examined. This could also benefit students and other academics on site.

In job advertisements or interviews, applicants may be explicitly asked to indicate factors that have influenced their scientific productivity and curriculum vitae such as caring for children or relatives. These factors should be included in the assessment of scientific performance; however, they should not be factors that lead to the devaluation of the application.

6. Raising Awareness

It is not always possible to say in general terms what measures are appropriate in individual cases. In order to create conditions that result in the respectful treatment and support of persons with care obligations, one should be aware that persons with care obligations encounter the following:

- They have general time restrictions that are determined by their specific circumstances (in particular on the external care or support services available) and in the case of doubt, it is important to inquire.
- They might temporarily have more time restrictions than usual, e.g., due to a phase of particularly intensive care needs.
- They are often place-bound in a way that makes it much more difficult for them to move to a new location or to organise a stay abroad.
- They often have financial limitations; especially during the doctoral phase, as persons with care obligations may not be able to afford to attend every conference trip or every additional informal social event after a lecture.
- They often need more time to complete a degree or finishing qualifications and this on its own should not be taken as an indication of poor academic quality.

III Abusive behaviour

1. Introduction

Several forms of abusive behaviour render it difficult for women, non-binary persons, and trans men to develop and flourish in academic philosophy.[21] Abusive behaviour includes all forms of sexual harassment, moral harassment, intentional misgendering, and intrusive questions (as many intrusive questions also constitute sexual harassment). The following is a

---

[21] Abusive behaviour, as discussed in this chapter, is of course not only directed at members of underrepresented groups. Cis men can also be victims of such attacks. However, as women, non-binary persons and trans men are disproportionately the target of such assaults, it is essential to create a climate in which abusive behaviour is not tolerated in order to improve the situation of underrepresented groups in academic philosophy. However, it should not be forgotten that all persons, regardless of their gender, can be victims of abusive behaviour.

brief introduction to these (often interlocking or overlapping) types of abusive behaviour[22] and strategies for combating abusive behaviour.

2. Types of Abusive Behaviour

2.1 Sexual Harassment

The concept of sexual harassment emerged in the 1970s and is still evolving today. Sexual harassment can be instigated by persons of either sex, just as persons of either sex can be affected by it. Power structures often play an aggravating role and as such the emphasis of these discussions is often restricted to the harassment of students by teaching staff. However, it is important to be aware of the fact that sexual harassment does not necessary occur exclusively as a result of institutional power asymmetries. Sexual harassment can occur between all members of an institute. Institutes should therefore treat cases of sexual harassment between or within all members of all groups at the institute, i.e., lecturers, students, and administrative staff, with equal seriousness, as such incidents can have extremely negative personal effects on those subjected to it and on the institute culture. Members of institutes should also be aware that sexual harassment is often related to and influenced not only by a person's gender identity, but also by their background, religion, class, or cognitive/physical limitations.

The term sexual harassment refers to derogatory, defamatory, or coercive behaviour, which is related to one's gender or gender identity such as:

- Defamatory language
- Unwanted comments of a sexual nature
- Degrading personal remarks about one's appearance, physicality, behaviour, or intimate life
- Sexual gestures and non-verbal comments
- Discussing, showing, or displaying verbal, visual, or electronic images that are sexist or pornographic
- Unwanted physical contact and unsolicited invitations to engage in sexual acts
- Any form of sexual assault

One reason why institutes often assume that harassment is not taking place or do not openly denounce harassment and therefore do not take any preventive measures to combat it, is that the concept of sexual harassment is too narrowly understood, and harassment is equated with coercion. Thus, persons often equate sexual harassment exclusively with occurrences of manifest physical assault. However, cases of this kind are likely to be occurrences where harassment veers into sexual coercion or assault. Sexual coercion or

---

[22] We do not claim to have covered all types of abusive behaviour. Our primary concern here is to cover those types of abusive behaviour, which particularly often affect women, non-binary persons and trans men.

assault is a criminal offence. According to the Swiss Criminal Code (SCC Art. 189), sexual coercion is a punishable offence if a person "forces a person to tolerate an act similar to sexual intercourse or any other sexual act, in particular by threatening, using violence, putting him/her under psychological pressure or rendering him/her incapable of resistance". As a criminal offence, sexual coercion falls primarily under the jurisdiction of the police and courts.

Sexual harassment, on the other hand, is legally understood to constitute workplace discrimination, as defined in Art. 4 of the Swiss Gender Equality Act (GEA).[23] The Swiss Gender Equality Act also sets forth the rights of employees in this regard vis-à-vis their employers. Therefore, as employers and training centres, university institutes are responsible for creating an environment that actively counteracts sexual harassment (concrete strategies and measures in this regard are described below). At present, there is no solid empirical data measuring the extent of sexual harassment at Swiss philosophy institutes.[24] However, testimonies have been collected in English-speaking countries that are revealing.[25]

2.2 Moral Harassment

---

[23] Based on the GEA the Swiss Federal Office for Gender Equality (FOGE) defines sexual harassment: "The term sexual harassment in the workplace includes any behaviour with a sexual reference or on the basis of gender that is undesirable from one side and which violates the dignity of a person. [...] Sexual harassment can be carried out with words, gestures, or actions. It can be carried out by individuals or by groups." Therefore, harassment is not only considered sexual if it is explicitly sexual in nature. It also includes harassment related to gender (e.g., hostile, and derogatory comments against women that are not directly sexual). Harassment related to sexual orientation or gender identity is usually also understood as sexual harassment. Sexual harassment, when defined as it is here, is not limited to one-to-one interactions. On the contrary, even general comments made in lectures or seminars, which are not aimed at individuals but at groups, can be understood to constitute cases of sexual harassment. For further information see:
https://www.ebg.admin.ch/ebg/en/home/topics/work/sexual-harassment-in-the-workplace.html.
[24] According to the representative study "Risk and prevalence of sexual harassment at work" commissioned by the EBG & SECO in 2008), 54.8% of all women surveyed in Switzerland have experiences of sexual harassment at work. The study also included a measure of the subjective impact, e.g., whether the reported behaviour was understood to constitute sexual harassment or was otherwise disruptive or disturbing. Accordingly, 28.3 % of the surveyed women report experiencing behaviour that constitutes sexual harassment and otherwise disruptive or disturbing behaviour. An older Study at Swiss universities and conservatoires («Anmachen. Platzanweisen. Soziologische Untersuchung zu sexueller Belästigung in der höheren Ausbildung», 2000) came to similar conclusions, especially in relation to reports regarding the prevalence of behaviour that constitutes sexual harassment. It is important to note that those behaviours that are considered to constitute sexual harassment but are not always explicitly referred to as such (e.g., sexual jokes or showing of images), often also have a negative impact on those affected by it, even if they do not refer to it as "sexual harassment". Institutes are therefore called upon to seriously consider and address the problem of sexual harassment, even if to their knowledge, there are no or few cases at their institute.
For specific resources against combatting sexual harassment in university settings refer to the guide, "Gardons les yeux grands ouverts!" published at the University of Geneva:
https://www.unige.ch/rectorat/egalite/files/8915/9949/0065/Guide_uniunie_FR_2019.pdf
[25] On the blog "What it is like to be a Woman in Philosophy" women report on, among other things, their experiences of sexual harassment in philosophy:
https://beingawomaninphilosophy.wordpress.com/;
for an overview of the available data in the US see:
https://dailynous.com/2019/08/29/sexual-harassment-philosophy-guest-post-janice-dowell-david-sobel/.

A phenomenon often closely linked to sexual harassment is moral harassment, which is a form of degrading and compromising treatment of a person with the aim of destabilising them mentally. For example, such treatment could include bullying in response to one's breaking off an informal social relationship with another person with whom one is also in a hierarchical employment relationship within the same institution. In general, there should be more awareness of possible complications resulting from intimate romantic relationships arising between persons whose lives are structured by hierarchical work relationships.

2.3 Intrusive Questions

Another form of problematic behaviour (partly overlapping or interlocking with sexual harassment) is intrusive questions. These include questions addressed to a trans person, which concern very personal and intimate aspects of their transition. For example, questions about a person's genitals, about any gender-confirming measures that may have been taken (such as potential or past operations or hormone treatments), or about the person's sex life. It is also inappropriate to ask trans persons about their birth or dead name (i.e., the name assigned to them at birth or a name that is no longer in use) or their appearance before transition (e.g., by asking for photographs).

In a broader sense, the posing of certain questions, intrusive or not, can also be epistemically exploitative, and thus fall within the realm of moral harassment. This includes, for example, when the questioner asks a member of an underrepresented group to explain their social experiences without first making a serious effort to find out more about the topic independently; thus, further exploiting these persons by putting the epistemic burden on the underrepresented group.

It is not the duty of trans persons to explain, define, or defend their gender identity.[26] Even if a question is accompanied by a willingness to listen to the person in question and to respect their gender identity (i.e. the existence of their gender identity is not questioned), the person in question does not owe any explanation of what it means for them not to identify with the gender that was assigned to them at birth.

2.4 Intentional Misgendering

A further kind of abuse or harassment is the deliberate misgendering of a person, i.e., the intentional use of incorrect personal pronouns and/or gender-specific references or terms. Although there is a distinction between intentionally misgendering someone, and cases where an incorrect personal pronoun is inadvertently or unintentionally used, which can also be a result of incorrectly assuming which personal pronouns a person uses because of their appearance, presentation, or name, it is important to avoid such mistakes. It is best to make

---

[26] Furthermore, if a person is additionally told that their gender identity or the existence of their gender identity is something they must justify, this goes beyond epistemic exploitation and constitutes abusive behaviour.

a habit of asking that one meet for their pronouns. Also, to be open to using any non-binary pronouns that one encounters, or to the request not to use personal pronouns at all.[27]

In the case where one fails to ask for one's pronouns and subsequently uses the wrong ones, the best response, once the mistake has been brought to one's attention, is to apologize briefly and use the correct personal pronouns from that point onward. It can also happen that contrary to one's better intentions, one uses the wrong pronoun/person's name (e.g., during a period of adjustment). In such cases, one should avoid overly apologizing, harshly reacting or defending oneself. Instead, one should always correct the mistake, apologize briefly if necessary, and then continue the conversation. One should correct the mistake and not simply let it pass, because it is not always clear to the persons concerned whether they have been mistreated intentionally or only inadvertently. One should always refrain from intentional misgendering

3. Combating Abusive Behaviour

3.1 Institutional Requirements

Each institution should appoint a first point of contact for persons who are the target of or subjected to abuse. For example, the SWIP representative of the respective institute could serve as a first point of contact. It is important that the website of the institute clearly indicates the person to whom the concerned person can turn.

Large institutions have their own contact point for cases of sexual harassment. However, it should be noted that each university also has its own institution-specific definition of *sexual harassment.* Institutional definitions of "sexual harassment" vary widely.[28] For example,

---

[27] Here is a list of different non-binary personal pronouns used by non-binary persons:
German: https://nibi.space/pronomen;
English: https://uwm.edu/lgbtrc/support/gender-pronouns/;
French:
https://entousgenresblog.wordpress.com/2017/04/19/quels-pronoms-neutres-en-francais-et-comment-les-utiliser/.
[28] Links to the various definitions of sexual harassment in Swiss universities:
Universität Bern: https://www.respekt.unibe.ch/was_ist_zwnjsexuelle_belaestigung/index_ger.html
Universität Basel: https://www.unibas.ch/de/Studium/Beratung/Soziales-Gesundheit/Sexuelle-Belaestigung.html
Universität Fribourg: https://www3.unifr.ch/apps/legal/de/load/275418
Université de Genève: https://www.unige.ch/rectorat/egalite/ancrage/harcelement/
Université de Lausanne:
https://www.unil.ch/help/fr/home/menuinst/personnes-sous-contrat/harcelement-sexuel.html
Universität Luzern: https://www.unilu.ch/studium/beratung/schutz-vor-sexueller-belaestigung/
Université de Neuchâtel:
http://www.unine.ch/conflits/home/harcelement/definitions.html#cidad37ac07-2605-4ca2-a5bb-7d70e4513fc4
Universität St. Gallen:
https://www.unisg.ch/de/universitaet/hsgservices/beratung/beratungsstellen/chancengleichheit/gleichstellungskommission/1-rechtsgrundlagenundselbstverpflichtung
ETH Zürich: https://respekt.ethz.ch/respektloses-verhalten/belaestigung.html
Universität Zürich: https://www.uzh.ch/de/about/basics/genderpolicy/sexualharassment.html.

some institutional definitions focus exclusively on explicit sexual innuendo and sexualised behaviour, while others also include non-sexual content that contributes to discrimination based on gender. It is essential that students and members of the institute are familiar with the definition of sexual harassment commonly used at their university and that they are also familiar with the authority to which they can turn and work with, in the event that sexual harassment occurs, in order to take action. However, it is not sufficient to only provide institutional contact points for reporting incidents. Moreover, it is the responsibility of the institution to take preventive measures, because when abusive behaviour occurs, and is tolerated, it contributes to a hostile environment.[29]

The duty to prevent abusive behaviour falls within the purview of all persons at an institute. This means that members of social groups, who are most frequently affected by abusive behaviour do not bear the primary responsibility for preventing it. In this context, a special responsibility lies with those persons who are tenured, permanently employed and/or heads of an institute. As such, in the following sections, preventive as well as reactive strategies for persons within different positions in the institutional hierarchy are given.

3.2 Department Heads

Those who are heads of departments should ensure that all members of the institute and students are aware that abusive behaviour will not be tolerated. They should also ensure that everyone knows who is to be contacted in the event of an incident. They should ensure that all students are aware of the applicable sexual harassment policy at the university. This includes making sure that all members of the institute are aware of their university's definition of sexual harassment, as well as the university's contact point for reporting such incidents, in addition to information regarding who is in a position to make a complaint.[30] In general, and contrary to popular belief, it does not necessarily have to be the victim, who makes the complaint. Department heads and senior faculty members should also communicate this information when recruiting and welcoming new staff and students.

3.3 Professors

Due to their positions within academic hierarchies, professors bear a particularly great responsibility for creating an institutional climate that prevents and counteracts abusive behaviour. Abusive behaviour (and sexual harassment in particular) is often enabled in the context of environments, where conditions are such that those, who are subjected to it,

---

[29] A rejection of common objections to the fact that active prevention of abusive behaviour (and sexual harassment in particular) leads to a better institute climate can be found here: http://swip-philosophinnen.org/sdg/.
[30] See footnote 28.

cannot defend themselves against transgressions due to their hierarchically subordinate position.

Professors should be aware of their positions of power and use them responsibly. This goes beyond not engaging in abusive behaviour. It also includes setting a tone in the institute by setting and enforcing standards that prevent and address inappropriate or abusive behaviour. In concrete terms, this means not tolerating inappropriate behaviour at events, conferences, workshops, or evening events and making it clear that one can be approached by employees and students and taking immediate action in the event that such abuse would occur. For example, one way to do this is by issuing a warning or informing guest speakers that such behaviour will not be tolerated at the institute, etc.

For professors, it is also important to remember that institutionalised hierarchies are always relevant and do not disappear even in informal or more social contexts. Informal or social occasions are not a more appropriate place for insinuating remarks and invasive questions and the same standards should be applied as would be during a seminar. As a person in authority, it is important to not only set a good example, but also to ensure that the others present do not behave in an abusive manner.

3.4 Mid-level (Junior) Faculty and Assistant Professors

Similar guidelines apply to mid-level (junior) faculty and assistant professors as do to professors. They too, stand in relative positions of power and thus responsibility within the institutional hierarchy relative to students, which also can lead to the crossing of boundaries and requires the same degree of sensitivity.

Just like professors, mid-level faculty members are responsible for ensuring that no abusive behaviour occurs in their seminars. They should also pay attention to this when organising events with guests.

However, members of the mid-level faculty also find themselves in relations of dependence on professors, which often makes it difficult to voice criticism and take action against abusive behaviour. However, the responsibility to support colleagues and students in the case of harassment by professors remains and some options for action are mentioned below.

3.5 Students

Students do not bear the same responsibility as the professors, mid-level faculty, and researchers at an institute, because they do not have the same access to institutional resources and cannot pursue the same courses of action as members of the institute (e.g., issuing warnings).

But there are many situations in which the commitment of students to actively combat such behaviour is also required. Inappropriate or abusive behaviour (and sexual harassment in particular) is usually not only caused by the misconduct of one individual person but is structurally enabled by everyone looking away or silently agreeing to it. There are many ways in which one can contribute to or counteract the structural maintenance of abusive behaviour. In the following, we will present various ways in which one, as a third party or bystander, can respond to inappropriate or abusive behaviour.

3.6 Bystanders

Within all levels of the hierarchy, it is possible to witness or even be an accomplice to assault or harassment. For example, if one overhears an insinuating remark made by a professor to a student, or if someone whispers such a remark about a speaker during a lecture. In such situations, there are various options and strategies for action.

In principle, the following applies: there are no uninvolved third parties. Although it is often difficult to spontaneously react boldly and courageously, the absolute minimum requirement is not to acquiesce and thus endorse inappropriate or abusive behaviour. For example, one should refuse to laugh at a sexist or transphobic joke and not tacitly endorse salacious remarks or offensive questions in any way. If possible, one should express disagreement or disavowal by for example raising one's eyebrows in an outraged manner.

Furthermore, one should not in any case give the impression to the person who is or was assaulted that there is no reason to get upset. Those affected often face disbelief, relativization or belittlement of their experiences when they report to others what happened to them. Such reactions contribute significantly to a climate in which inappropriate or abusive behaviour becomes the norm. It is therefore important to always take accusations seriously and to seek redress together in concert with the person concerned.

However, the best solution is to actively prevent abusive behaviour by naming it as such at the moment it occurs and by clearly labelling it as inappropriate e.g., by directly pointing out that a joke, question, or remark is inappropriate.

If a speaker uses the wrong pronouns or terms to refer to another person, the basic rule is that the speaker should be corrected.[31] However, if the person being misgendered is present, they may prefer to correct the issue themselves. As a bystander, one should ideally ask the misgendered person how they would prefer one to react in such situations in the future.

---

[31] Unless the person being referred to has indicated that their pronouns are to be kept in confidence and does not (yet) want third parties to be informed.

It is important that the abusive or inappropriate behaviour is directly interrupted, and someone intervenes immediately in the situation. Another strategy to rebut abusive or inappropriate behaviour is to contribute to the consensus expressed by other members of the institute. As a result, the person or (group) concerned is publicly supported and it prevents a situation in which only the person affected (or members of the group) must defend themselves against the inappropriate or abusive behaviour. Ideally, the person who made the remark or asked the question should be put on the defensive and not the person or group who was abused. Afterwards, the offender can redeem themselves by engaging in and expressing solidarity with those affected by seeking strategies for action together with them. Together, they can for example hold those in higher hierarchical positions responsible and report the incident. In addition to the university, there are also external contact points one can turn to for further advice.[32]

To summarize:

- It is minimally required that all members of an institute do not actively contribute to a climate that encourages inappropriate or abusive behaviour, in which perpetrators feel encouraged and those affected are isolated and do not feel that they are taken seriously.
- Ideally, all members of an institute should take steps or strive toward creating a climate that actively prevents abusive behaviour by showing solidarity with those affected by establishing alliances against inappropriate and abusive behaviour.

IV Conferences and Workshops

1. Introduction
In academic philosophy, many networks are still traditionally cis male dominated and efforts are not made to include women, trans men, or non-binary or genderqueer persons and others from underrepresented groups. At large conferences, it is often the case that established professors are called on more regularly to speak or ask questions and often women, trans men, or non-binary persons and others from underrepresented groups are systematically ignored. Effective mentoring structures are lacking and those who are affected by these issues, often do not want to, or cannot openly discuss problems with superiors. In addition, there are many implicit biases with regard to groups that are structurally disadvantaged in philosophy, which result in invitations not being extended to them or their contributions being taken less seriously.

---

[32] Non-university contact points: https://belaestigt.ch/anlaufstellen/

A lack of mentoring and encouragement is particularly problematic due to the existence of micro-inequities. These are in themselves insignificant, subtle, and inconspicuous individual cases or events that are difficult to prove and often happen unconsciously; as such, they are not recognised by those responsible. Examples of micro-inequities are instances such as: not being introduced to guest speakers by colleagues, being excluded from informal networks or meetings, hearing supposedly harmless "jokes" or offensive remarks at conferences, receiving little or no positive feedback, and public discussions about who has "got it" and who does not[33]. As isolated incidents, such experiences do not have major consequences, but according to social science research they cumulatively have a major impact on the future prospects of individuals from structurally disadvantaged groups.[34]

2. Selection of Speakers

Gender and social background influence one's status and likelihood of attaining professional success[35] and as such the likelihood of attaining professional success is lower for those in underrepresented groups.[36] Despite the fact that about 50% of first-year students in philosophy are women or female identified, the percentage of female professors in Switzerland is about 27%.[37] Furthermore, employment of non-white faculty remains the exception to the rule at philosophy institutes across Switzerland. When one considers these or other social factors such as class, the situation indeed becomes grimmer. Intuitively, most of us find it easier to perceive a cis male who is educated and enjoys a middle-class appearance, as a brilliant and important philosopher as opposed to a woman from a working-class background. If criteria such as status or success play a big role in the selection of speakers and how invited speakers are treated then we do not only discriminate by failing to consider these realities, but this also results in the creation of a subpar academic and scientific program from a professional point of view. It is therefore worthwhile to design the selection process to reflect awareness of these realities:

❏ Speakers should be selected based on the quality and salience of their work and not according to their name recognition i.e., because they are a "big name" in their field. As, due to the aforementioned conditions that affect underrepresented groups in philosophy, the names that come to mind first are not always those who do the most interesting work.

---

[33] Discourses such as these reflect the problematic assumption that to succeed in academic philosophy one needs a certain "raw innate talent" (something members of currently underrepresented groups are stereotyped as not possessing). For more on this, see section I.1.

[34] Rowe, Mary (2008): "Micro-Affirmations and Micro-Inequities", in: Journal of the International Ombudsman Association 1. S. 45–48.

[35] Unfortunately, to our knowledge, there is no data yet available quantifying how trans persons are underrepresented in academic philosophy. Furthermore, as there are currently persons in academic philosophy, who strive to exclude trans persons, particularly trans women from inclusion. As a result, regrettably the number of reports of trans persons leaving academic philosophy is on the rise. Therefore, we assume that trans persons are particularly disadvantaged in their efforts to succeed in academic philosophy.

[36] See Hutchison, K., & Jenkins, F. (Eds.). (2013). *Women in Philosophy: What Needs to Change?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[37] Philipp Blum: https://philipp.philosophie.ch/statistics-philCH.pdf.

❏ Invite members of underrepresented groups. If one is not familiar off the top of their head with women, trans men or non-binary persons, who could be invited, consult a directory such as the list compiled by SWIP Germany of women philosophers working in the German-speaking realm, or the UP Directory[38] which focuses on those in English-speaking realm, but also contains many entries from the German-speaking realm.[39] Attention should also be paid to invite speakers, who are underrepresented on other axes and in this respect the UP Directory can be helpful.

❏ It is irritating for invited speakers or guests to be told that they have been invited merely in order to keep the proportion of voices from underrepresented groups high. This suggests that the quality of their work did not play a role in the selection process.

❏ When choosing speakers, it should be taken into account whether or not all participants would be able to enjoy a pleasant conference. Speakers who have a reputation for harassing or molesting others should therefore not be invited.

❏ Hierarchies are also often reproduced through disadvantageous determinations of speaking time slots i.e., when the address will take place and how long it will be (e.g., if out of two keynote speakers, the woman is given the time slot where a lesser audience is expected because she is less of a "big name"). Again, implicit biases are often at work without the intent to discriminate. It is worth keeping this in mind when designing event or conference programs.

❏ It is recommendable that submissions be evaluated anonymously in a call for papers.

3. Organization

In this section, suggestions have been outlined, which can be used to guide one in the pursuit of organizing an enjoyable and successful event for all interested parties.

a) Organizing Committee

Distribution of duties within the conference organisation committee:

● Which assistant or doctoral student will make coffee?
● Who has the opportunity to listen to the lecturers or to talk to the researchers?

The unequal distribution of organisational tasks can contribute to further entrenching status differences that depend on gender, origin, etc. among assistants and the staff of a chair or department head. Asking such questions and taking into consideration the factors below can help make them known and develop strategies to combat them.

b) Accessibility

---

[38] http://www.theupdirectory.com/.
[39] Further links can be found on our website: https://de.swipswitzerland.org/projects-or-initiatives.

❏ Be familiar with or know who to contact for information related to specific needs.
❏ Selected venues should be free of physical obstructions and have guaranteed wheelchair access. If this is not possible, this should already be indicated in the programme or poster.
❏ Assistance for the visually and hearing impaired should be offered. Be familiar with the resources of the university or be prepared to become familiar with them if necessary. Respond flexibly to needs.
❏ Restaurants for meals organized within the framework of the event should be selected that are not only free of physical barriers but are also not too loud.
❏ A contact person should be named and made available to answer questions about accessibility in the call/poster or during registration.

c) Childcare

Some universities offer cheap and unbureaucratic support/care services for events. If this is available at your university, actively offer to organise childcare on request. If there is no childcare service at your university, external childcare can be organized for large events. For small events, the self-organization of participants can be encouraged. It should be mentioned in the call if childcare is available.

d) Toilets

The use of public toilets is often intimidating both for trans women, trans men and non-binary persons. Ideally, the university should have gender-neutral toilets, which are explicitly marked and made public. If this is not the case, it should at least be explicitly mentioned that all persons are allowed to use those toilets that correspond to the gender they identify with or choose any other option if no such toilets are available.

e) Abusive behaviour

Abusive behaviour also takes place at conferences. See chapter III of this guide.

4. Leading Discussions

❏ Address the group by using gender-neutral terms if possible. One can greet those present as "participants "or "attendees" in more professional settings or in more informal settings instead of terms like "guys" use terms like "folks" or "you all (y'all)". Avoid terms like "ladies and gentlemen".[40]
❏ Do not always call on the better known or established (big name) persons first. This

---

[40] More on this in Chapter I.2.

usually results in fewer women, trans men and non-binary persons speaking. Also, do not just call on persons sitting in the first row.

❏ Also, make a point to interrupt persons with big names and not just those with less recognition. This is particularly the case when time is short and persons with big names are repeatedly inquiring or co-opting the lecture under the guise of posing questions etc.

❏ Persons who have not yet spoken at the conference should be called upon first.

❏ Let students and doctoral candidates ask the first questions.

❏ Creating and enforcing a policy where only one question may be posed per request to speak facilitates more persons having the opportunity to ask their questions.

❏ Empower members of underrepresented groups to speak by making a point to call on them.

❏ Take a five-minute break after the lecture so that everyone has time to think about and formulate a question. Furthermore, it is important that a list of speakers is not made during the lecture or during the break.

5. Good Discussion Behaviour

It is in the interest of the presenter if contributions to the discussion are as constructive as possible i.e., if they aim, for example, to show new possibilities or applications that strengthen the position defended by the presenter. It is therefore recommended that participants or discussants take this into account whenever possible – even if they do not share the general background assumptions of the presenter or even if they consider the entire debate of which the presenter refers to be mistaken.

It is advisable that all participants in the discussion limit their contributions to a few points. This will ensure that the presenter has an opportunity to address all points, which are raised. It also gives other persons the opportunity to contribute and prevents domination of the discussion by a select few.

The usage of objections, which take the form of drastic rhetoric, should be avoided as it contributes to the creation of a hostile and aggressive discussion atmosphere and can be very uncomfortable and unsettling for discussion participants. This includes:

● "This is totally implausible!"
● "Nobody would consider this plausible!"
● "This is nonsense/babble/absurd!
● "How can you seriously claim that?"
● or the persistent insistence on a certain point.

Certain non-verbal signals (such as perplexed, disbelieving, or flabbergasted miming or

gestures e.g., ostentatious head shaking or mocking laughter) can have the same effect. Such an atmosphere can be perceived as very unpleasant and unsettling by discussion participants.

Engaging in hostile and aggressive behaviour during discussions, further entrenches the masculine stereotype of aggressivity as the norm for conducting philosophical discussions. This can also trigger the empirically well-documented phenomenon of *stereotype threat*[41] and a general feeling of not fitting in, particularly, among discussion participants, who are women. Persons who are threatened by stereotypes will often refrain from contributing to discussions due to the resulting stress and other negative feelings (fear, etc.). As a result, the degree of inclusivity in the discussion is reduced and valuable contributions are lost.

Private conversations that are held during a lecture or during the discussion after a lecture can be perceived as disturbing and unsettling by the person giving the lecture. It is therefore advisable to refrain from such conversations -- even if they involve the discussion of substantive points.

Another way to promote inclusion is to introduce all those present to one another at social gatherings, which are taking place in connection with lectures or conferences (e.g., at a pub or restaurant after a guest lecture or during coffee breaks at a conference) and ensure they are included in the conversation regardless of how advanced they are in their academic careers. Older, well-connected participants in particular can make a positive contribution on this front by introducing younger, less well-connected participants to others present.

V Recruitment Procedures & Appointment Commissions

1. Introduction
Recruitment and appointment procedures are processes in which stereotype threat and implicit biases can hinder and effectively exclude members of underrepresented groups. Moreover, recruitment and appointment procedures are multi-stage processes; therefore, in order to achieve a fair selection process, different things must be taken into account at different stages.

2. Job postings
The formulation of job postings requires important decisions that have the potential to preclude certain results. The more comprehensive the job description the more applicants that could be potentially addressed. Different applicants could be addressed depending on the thematic orientation and the type of professorship (assistant professorship with tenure track or full professorship) and the distribution and importance of the tasks (focus on

---

[41] Steele, Claude: "A Threat in the Air: How Stereotypes Shape Intellectual Identity and Performance", in: American Psychologist 52 (1997), S. 613–629.

research or teaching). In order to address as many members of underrepresented groups as possible, one should:

❏ Post vacant professorships with the broadest possible thematic description. Job postings that are tailored to a particular person's research focus should be avoided.

❏ Do not distribute calls to individual candidates for applications before their general publication.

❏ Include research areas in which members of currently underrepresented groups are particularly active in e.g., (trans)feminist philosophy, Critical Race Theory etc.

❏ Determine in advance whether there are more junior or senior members of underrepresented groups in the area in which the job posting is made. Accordingly, adjustments to the salary levels and distribution of work tasks or duties should be made to address those candidates.

❏ Advertise the job opening as early as possible. In addition to traditional outlets, job openings should also be advertised through (national and international) mailing lists; especially mailing lists of organisations concerned with equal representation in philosophy (e.g., SWIP and Minorities and Philosophy (MAP) chapters[42]).

❏ Include an explicit commitment to realizing equal representation of currently underrepresented groups in the job description (e.g., "The institute aims to increase its representation of members of underrepresented groups in research and teaching. Members of underrepresented groups are therefore especially encouraged to apply.")

❏ While the call for applications is open, actively seek out and approach suitable candidates that are members of underrepresented groups (both nationally and internationally) and invite them to apply. Both the proceedings and the results of this search should be documented in the minutes of the appointment committee.

3. Appointment committee
During formation of the appointment committee, special attention should be paid to ensure:

❏ That there are at least two persons that are not cis men on the committee. One of them may be the representative for the equality opportunity office of the university, but only if the representative has voting power. Having only one person who is not a cis man on the committee should be avoided.

❏ It should be possible for the external members of the committee to participate in meetings. This is especially pressing if it is the case that without external members there is not a sufficient number of persons who are not cis men in the committee.

❏ The committee members should not be overly burdened with other academic duties or offices on academic commissions or bodies. This must be taken into account especially when selecting women to be committee members, as they are often doing

---

[42] For more information about Minorities and Philosophy please visit: https://www.mapforthegap.org.uk/.

a lot of this kind of work, due to the systemic underrepresentation of women relative to cis men in academic positions.

❏ The committee members should be interested in their work and able to collaborate in a cooperative manner.

❏ The chairperson of the committee should enjoy the institutional standing necessary to encourage the other members to cooperate.

❏ The equality representative should not be side-lined or relegated as someone only authoritative on matters of equality i.e., their opinion should be considered of central relevance.

4. Selection criteria

Selection criteria determine which candidates can be considered for the advertised job. It should be noted that under the current circumstances it is more difficult for members of underrepresented groups to fully meet certain selection criteria. For example, it is known from comparable academic and scientific fields with a similarly low representation of women that structural discrimination and the phenomenon of stereotype threat can limit the productivity of women, particularly concerning their publications. Also, members of underrepresented groups are often less frequently invited to contribute to edited volumes and to speak at conferences.

In addition, if candidates, who are members of underrepresented groups, have care obligations their biological and academic ages may differ due to periods of care work. Furthermore, international research stays often are more difficult to organize for those shouldering unequal burdens of care work.

The selection criteria should therefore:

❏ Focus on the quality of publications and talks rather than quantity.
❏ Only take into account the academic (rather than the biological) age of candidates.
❏ Also count co-operations with international partners as international experience (even if it did not include a prolonged research visit abroad).
❏ Be determined before the first applications are screened. Otherwise, it cannot be ruled out that knowledge of the applicant's situation may (inadvertently) influence the determination of the criteria. It should also be ensured that the selection criteria match the job description.
❏ Be sufficiently specific to ensure that implicit biases have as little influence as possible in the assessment of the candidates. For example, it is not enough to require that candidates have relevant publications in their areas of research. Instead, it must be decided if monographs and not just articles and book chapters count as relevant publications. Furthermore, it must be determined in advance if candidates

should approach the subject area in a particular way, e.g., historically, in the style of analytic or continental philosophy and/or in the tradition of a certain philosophical school, e.g., phenomenology or the Frankfurt School, or if all philosophical approaches are equally accepted.

❏ Be formulated broadly enough in order to avoid unduly reducing the applicant pool. In particular, they should not be tailored to fit or reflect a particular person's research focus (see 5.2 above).

❏ Specify whether a traditional habilitation is required. If not, it should be made clear which alternative achievements will be treated as equivalent to a habilitation. The guidelines of one's university should be taken into account on this matter

5. Selection Procedures

Among other things, the influence of implicit biases on our decisions depends on the amount of time one has to make a decision and how competent one feels to make it. Therefore, reviews or assessments of application documents and the selection of candidates for job talks should be carried out by competent persons and time pressure should be avoided.

In many cases, the administrative staff of the dean's office of the relevant faculty prepares a synopsis summarizing all of the application documents received for each of the respective candidates. The criteria by which they evaluate the application documents should be decided by the appointment committee before the first documents are screened and the relevance of these criteria should be systematized. It should not fall to the administrative staff to decide upon the criteria that determine the relevance of items from the list of publications, presentations, awards, and third-party funding. For example, possible criteria for the synopsis are name, title, title of the PhD thesis, title of the habilitation or equivalent publication(s), current position, number, and the age of children.

When discussing the applicant files and selecting the candidates the committee should make sure:

- ❏ to devote sufficient time to each application so that the influence of implicit biases can be counteracted. All assessments should be argued for in a reasoned way and these discussions should be recorded in the minutes.
- ❏ that all committee members are heard. The chairperson should make sure that no member is given too much or too little speaking time. Furthermore, they should continuously require a friendly and cooperative communication style from all members of the commission.
- ❏ that only the criteria determined in advance are deployed and that they are deployed consistently and equitably.
- ❏ that all members are made aware if another member is acquainted with the candidate being discussed (e.g., through past or current cooperation). The chairperson should ask all members to disclose such information. However, it should be noted that a personal connection to a candidate does not necessarily distort a member's assessment of the candidate.
- ❏ Avoid inviting less than two non-cis men to give a job talk or creating a short list comprising of only cis men.

If it turns out that the number of applications from members of underrepresented groups is too low, the committee must review and reassess whether the job posting was thematically too narrow and/or inappropriately gendered. Moreover, it should be assessed if the national

and international search for suitable members of underrepresented groups was sufficiently thorough and if they were explicitly invited at an acceptable level.

Applicants who did not make the cut should be notified as soon as possible.

6. Job Talks

In a job talk a candidate is given the opportunity to present their academic work and get a personal impression of the institute. In order to make the process as fair as possible and the candidate's experience as comfortable as possible, the committee should make sure:

❏ that all candidates invited to give a job talk are notified as early in advance as possible and that everyone is provided with all the relevant information. In particular, they should be informed if, in addition to the traditional job talk, they are also expected to prepare a teaching sample. Furthermore, the candidate should be informed about technical equipment that will be at their disposal during the talk.

❏ a pleasant working atmosphere is maintained during the job talks, the public Q&A's, and the committee interview. The candidates are not students, but rather potential colleagues, and a job talk is not an opportunity to test their qualifications.

❏ that no part of the hiring process engenders stereotype threat. To this end, it must be ensured that a woman candidate is not the only woman in the room during the commission interview (see 5.3 above). Also, one should not draw a candidate's attention to the fact that they are a member of a social group that is underrepresented in academia/philosophy (e.g., by talking about how only a few women have been able to succeed in their sub-discipline/philosophy/academia or by asking women about their children).

❏ that all applicants are given equal time to present their work. This applies equally to the job talk, the Q & A, and the committee interview, but also to requirements to spend time with those on the committee in addition to the official proceedings. For example, having lunch or dinner with only some of the candidates and not others should be avoided. To minimize the influence of implicit biases, make sure to schedule sufficient time for the talk, the Q&A, and the committee interview.

❏ that in the committee interview all candidates are asked the same questions to create an equitable and comparable basis upon which the decision can be made. When asking questions (e.g., about their teaching concept, planned research projects, etc.), it must again be taken into account whether candidates have different chances of succeeding in the particular research fields in question due to structural conditions. Questions that are inadmissibly gendered must not be asked.

7. External expertise

External evaluations broaden the committee's potential range of opinions and are relevant in the ranking of the candidates for determining the short-listed candidates. It is advantageous if:

❏ the external evaluators are determined before the applications are received. The choice of evaluators should be thematically justified, and this justification should be recorded in the minutes.
❏ the inclusion of persons from underrepresented groups should be taken into account in the selection of the external evaluators.
❏ it is determined in advance how the external reviews will be weighted. External experts should not only serve to support the committee members' opinions and they should be given appropriate independent weight.
❏ The weight of the external reviews in further stages of the procedure should be determined in advance. External expert opinions should not only serve to support existing opinions already represented in the commission but should be given their own weight.
❏ external evaluators should not be provided with a preliminary ranking of the candidates made by the committee to ensure that their opinions are formed independently.

8. Decision Making

In addition to assuring that the process of formulating the selection criteria for candidates for job talks is fair, the committee should also ensure the following while making the final ranking:

❏ That there is sufficient time to collectively deliberate and make their final decision.
❏ that no member of the committee is given considerably more or less speaking time than others. In addition, the chairperson should continue to demand a friendly and cooperative communication style from all committee members.
❏ that candidates, who did not make the short list, are informed promptly.
❏ To inform those candidates on the short list in a timely manner about the fact that they are still in the running and that the procedure is ongoing. As soon as the process is completed, the candidates who have not advanced should be informed.[43]

---

[43] Further reading: Hiring Toolkit der Canadian Philosophical Association (https://www.acpcpa.ca/cpages/hiring-toolkit); for a German version, see the brochure "Faire Berufungsverfahren" by the University of Stuttgart (https://lakog-bw.de/wp-content/uploads/lakog_handreichung_web.pdf).

VI Glossary

1. Implicit Bias

Implicit biases are largely unconscious assumptions, associations, schemas, and expectations that help us order our impressions and make sense of the world. As such, these associations are not per se bad, and may even be necessary for human cognition. However, when it comes to social groups, especially those who are oppressed or underrepresented, such biases can do great harm by influencing how we evaluate persons and assess their performance. For example, it has been shown that the same CV is evaluated differently depending on whether a male or female name is at the top of it. This means that our unconscious preconceptions lead to unfair and unequal performance assessments.

2. Stereotype Threat

Stereotype threat is a phenomenon in which stereotypes influence the performance of individual members of a stereotyped group. This occurs when a member of a stereotyped group is reminded of their membership in the stereotyped group before undertaking a task (e.g., an exam or a presentation) and their performance worsens. For example, girls who are reminded of their gender before a math exam (e.g., by being asked to state their gender) perform worse than if they are not asked. In some cases, a worsening in performance occurs already when one is one of the few women present and the topic at hand (e.g., in a conversation) is stereotyped or coded as male. Furthermore, it should be noted that in addition to stereotypes that affect all women, trans women are also threatened by specific stereotypes that affect their gender expression.[44]

One hypothesis explaining the worsening of performance in a stereotype threat situation is that members of the stereotyped group are made aware of negative prejudice against their group by being reminded of their group membership and this in turn causes them to become acutely frightened of confirming the prejudice. This fear is thus assumed to lead to a worsening in performance since they feel less confident and more cognitive resources are consumed in order to overcome this feeling of insecurity.

---

[44] For more on this, see Rachel McKinnon (2014): "Stereotype Threat and Attributional Ambiguity for Trans Women", Hypatia 29(4): 857-872.