

October 9, 2012

North American Society for Social Philosophy Report to APA

Submitted by Nancy E. Snow, Marquette University, NASSP Archivist

I. Introduction

On June 7, 2011, Professors Margaret Crouch and Nancy E. Snow, President and Archivist of the North American Society for Social Philosophy (NASSP) submitted a grant proposal to the American Philosophical Association (APA) on behalf of the NASSP (proposal attached). We requested \$5000 to fund a workshop held at the 2012 NASSP conference, hosted by Northeastern University in Boston, Massachusetts. Our aim was to allocate \$2500 to two keynote speakers in the areas of social and/or political philosophy, and \$2500 to be distributed among graduate student recipients. The stipends were to enable these students to attend two special workshops on publications and presentation skills to be conducted by each keynote speaker. We received \$2500 (award letter attached). This allowed us to award 10 stipends of \$250 each to attend one workshop on publication presented by one of our keynote speakers, Professor James Bohman of St. Louis University. One awardee did not respond to two e-mails sent by Nancy Snow in attempts to contact her, nor did she attend the conference. Consequently, nine graduate students were awarded \$250 each, and Professor Bohman was paid \$250 from the APA grant plus \$50 from the NASSP to conduct the workshop. The workshop was attended by 18 people. Evaluations were distributed and collected (evaluation form attached). The results are reported in section II below and a brief discussion is given in section III.

II. Data Report

A. Demographic Information

Question #1: I am:

Doctoral Students in Philosophy	17
Master's Student in Philosophy	1

Question #2: I am in:

1st year of study	4
2nd year	3
3rd year	3
4th year	1
5th year	5
6th or beyond	2

B. Participants' Publications Backgrounds

Question #3: I have had graduate-level preparation in how to publish.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	5	6	1	1	4	0

Question #4: I have already published in philosophy.

Yes	No	Had submissions under consideration at the time of completing the evaluation
7	8	4* (one participant both had published and had submissions under consideration)

Question #5: If you answered “yes” to number 4, where have you published?

Participants who answered “yes” had published in: *Dialogue*; *Boston University Law Review* and *Jurisprudence* (both co-authored with faculty); a book review in *Hypatia*; *Hypatia* and *Philosophy of Science*; *The American Journal of Bioethics*, *The Journal of Neuroscience*, and a book review in *The Journal of Moral Philosophy*; *Teaching Philosophy*; *Radical Philosophy Review*, and a revise and resubmit in the *Business Ethics Quarterly*; and *Social Philosophy Today*.

Question # 6: If you answered “no” to number 4, have you submitted, but had submissions rejected?

Not Submitted	Not published and rejected	Published and rejected	Published and Left Blank	Under Consideration and Rejected
6	2	2	4	4

Some of the data in response to question 6 are unreliable because of the antecedent in the wording of the question: “If you answered ‘no’ to number 4 (“I have already published in philosophy”). Two respondents answered that they had published in philosophy, but had also submitted papers that were rejected. Four who had published in philosophy left question 6 blank, presumably because they had not answered ‘no’ to number 4. We do not know whether these four participants also had submissions that had been rejected.

Question # 7: If you answered “yes” to number 6, where have you submitted?

Respondents reported they had submitted to: *Nietzsche Studies Journal*, *Faith and Philosophy*; *Constellations*; *The Journal of Political Philosophy*; *Ethics*, *Social Theory and Practice*, *The Journal of Moral Philosophy* and more; *Hypatia*,

Philosophy of the Social Sciences, Social Theory and Practice; Ethics, Utilitas, Analysis, Episteme; Philosophy and Phenomenological Research; and Philosopher's Imprint.

C. Session Evaluation

One participant wrote the following narrative: “Since I am basically finished and have published already, this was not very useful for me. However, I like the idea and suspect more junior grad. Students found it informative and reassuring.” This participant left all of part III, “Session Evaluation,” blank. The data in the following table is entered for the seventeen remaining participants for questions 1-7 of part III.

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
# 1	0	4	3	4	3	3	0
# 2	0	5	7	1	3	1	0
# 3	0	6	4	1	3	5	0
# 4	3	7	3	1	2	1	0
# 5	0	11	3	0	1	2	0
# 6	2	11	5	0	0	0	0
# 7	0	9	4	1	0	2	0

Question # 8: I would be willing to participate in follow-up studies on publishing.

Yes	No	Left Blank
13	3	2

III. Discussion

The demographic data from part I of the evaluation indicate that most session participants were doctoral students in philosophy at various stages in their programs. Data from part II indicate that some had had some kind of preparation for publishing, and that most had either published or had submissions under consideration at the time of the workshop. Responses to questions 1-7 of part III of the evaluation indicate that reactions to the workshop were mostly positive. In response to question seven, thirteen of seventeen respondents either agreed or somewhat agreed that the session was, overall, helpful. In response to question four, thirteen of seventeen indicated that the session helped them to understand where to submit their work. In response to question five, fourteen of seventeen agreed or somewhat agreed that the session

helped them to understand what to do in the event of a submission rejection. In response to question six, all participants found the session helpful in understanding how to handle a “revise and resubmit.” The point spread of responses to questions 1-3 indicate that fewer participants found the “nuts and bolts” aspects of the session helpful; that is, the session did not convey as clearly as had been intended the differences between graduate-level and professional-level writing, the differences amongst types of philosophical writing, or techniques for writing articles. Should such workshops be conducted in the future, these are clear areas for improvement. Thirteen of eighteen participants indicated a willingness to participate in follow-up studies on publishing.

The NASSP thanks the APA for funding this workshop. The data indicate that it was of benefit to most participants. Copies of the completed evaluations are available upon request.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the NASSP,

Nancy E. Snow, NASSP Archivist
Professor of Philosophy, Marquette University