

Committee For the Status of Women and Minority Groups: Journals Report

As part of its ongoing mission, the CSWMG produces a report every three years on journal publications and publication practices, with particular attention to differences along lines of gender and of race/ethnicity. This report is based on surveys sent to 19 journals in the field of Classics each year from 2004 – 2006. In 2004, 16 journals responded; in 2005, 12; and in 2006, 15. This gives us an average response rate of 75.4%.

We should note at the outset that the field as a whole has not achieved gender parity in employment. According to the last report on the Departmental Census, women make up roughly 36% of FTE's teaching Classics in North America. Of tenured college and university professors, the percentage is even lower, roughly 29%. This remains true after several decades, although women are currently earning 43% of all PhD's in the field.

The percentage of racial and ethnic minorities in the field lags far behind their respective ratios in the populace at large. In the last Departmental Census Report, all racial and ethnic minorities together make up only 3.1% of the employed faculty in the field of Classics.

The following figures concerning journal submissions and acceptances are based on 3-year averages for all journals in the field. Although there is some variation year to year, there are no clearly discernible trends over the 3-year period. On the whole, we believe that the 3-year averages present a realistic picture of the state of publication in the field. It is worth noting, however, that the raw data on the gender of article authors are determined by journal editors' assessment of their given names, since no census information is collected directly from authors themselves. This means that some article submissions cannot be categorized because their authors only provide first initials or have names which are not easily understood as male or female. It also opens up the possibility that journal editors may have categorized certain names incorrectly. Finally, it means that journal submissions by minority authors cannot be determined.

Given their representation on classics faculties, the number of journal submissions by women in the field is not surprising. In the years 2004 – 6, on average, 34.5% of articles submitted to journals were by women. Another 1% were by authors whose gender could not be determined. On the whole, then, women appear to be submitting articles for publication at about the same rate as men.

When we turn to acceptance, women are more successful than men. Articles by women were accepted at a rate of 38%; only 23% of articles by men were accepted. As a result, women authored 46% of all published articles during the period surveyed, a number considerably higher than their percentage on Classics faculties. The cause for this higher rate of acceptance is not clear.

Editorial boards and referees show women at slightly higher percentages than their presence in the profession as a whole. Women made up 39% of all referees in the 3-year period, and 40% of journal editorial boards. Perhaps most striking is the number of women who served as editor-in-chief: over a 3-year average women made up 47% of editors-in-chief. It does not appear, then, that there is discrimination against women when it comes to service on editorial boards or as referees.

A total of 1.5% of members on editorial boards were members of racial or minority groups, and no journals had a minority member as editor-in-chief.

The Journals survey also asks journals to report on their review process. Of the journals surveyed over a 3-year period, 31 out of 43 responses (65%) indicated that they required anonymous submission; 5 (11.6%) preferred it; and 7 (16%) had no precisely defined policy.

For referees, the picture is a bit clearer. Nearly all (41 out of 43 responses, or 95%) required anonymous referees, 1 preferred it, and 1 left it to the author's request.

Most journals used two or more referees for each submission. Again, of the 43 responses over 3 years surveyed, 34 (79%) indicated that they used two referees, with another 4 (9%) using 3. Only 6 (14%) relied on only one.

The authors of this report would like to thank Heidi Broome-Raines of Brown University for compiling the statistics from the journals surveys.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Lyons
Kirk Ormand