CANADIAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION DIVERSITY TASK FORCE

REPORT AND ANALYSIS OF THE CANADIAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION MEMBER SURVEY

Prepared by the CPSA Diversity Task Force
Yasmeen Abu-Laban (Chair), University of Alberta
Joanna Everitt, University of New Brunswick- Saint John
Richard Johnston, University of British of Columbia
Martin Papillon, Université d'Ottawa
David Rayside, University of Toronto

May 2012

A NOTE OF THANKS

Table of Contents

REPORT AND ANALYSIS OF THE CANADIAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION MEMBER SURVEY

Prepared by the Diversity Task Force (Yasmeen Abu-Laban, Joanna Everitt, Richard Johnston, Martin Papillon, and David Rayside)

I. BACKGROUND

In 2006, the Board of Directors of the Canadian Political Science Association (CPSA) struck a Diversity Task Force, with a mandate to examine issues relating to "diversity" in the profession. The Diversity Task Force comprises Yasmeen Abu-Laban, Chair (University of Alberta), Joanna Everitt (University of New Brunswick-Saint John), Richard Johnston (University of British Columbia), Martin Papillon (Université d'Ottawa) and David Rayside (University of Toronto).

Periodically since the 1970s the CPSA has examined issues relating to the state of the profession, most notably as contained in three surveys and related reports which have focused on the status of women.[1] In recognition of these important earlier studies, the Diversity Task Force retained a focus on issues relating to "the status of women," but also broadened its focus to consider all groups explicitly designated under Canada's *Employment Equity Act* (women, persons with disabilities, Aboriginal people, and members of visible minorities).[2] In addition, reflecting popular political discussions and current scholarly trends across multiple social science disciplines, where possible, the Diversity Task Force also sought to be attuned to additional areas of identity (and social divide). These areas include sexuality, religion, language and age amongst others.

The work of the Diversity Task Force took two tracks. In the first track, a survey questionnaire was developed by the Diversity Task Force and sent to Chairs of Canadian Departments of Political Science in 2008. This survey, and the analysis of results relating to departmental demographic composition, research and course

---

[1] See Committee on the Profile of the Profession, "Preliminary Report", August 1973;M. Janine Brodie, Caroline Andrew and David Rayside; "Report on the Status of Women in the Discipline", June 1982; and Diane Lamoureux, Linda Trimble and Miriam Koene, "Status of Women in the Discipline" May 1997; Diane Lamoureux and Linda Trimble, "Recommendations to the Board of the Canadian Political Science Association" 30 May 1997; and Linda Trimble, "Report on the Results of the Status of Women Survey, Part Two: Questionnaire for Political Science Chairs", *CPSA Bulletin* XXIX: 1 (May 2000): 19-25.

[2] In the Canadian context this focus is pertinent because Canadian universities typically participate in the Federal Contractors Program which falls under the *Employment Equity Act*.

offerings, as well as social life and mentoring, is contained in a May 2010 report produced by the Diversity Task Force for the Board of Directions of the Canadian Political Science Association. This report is available on the CPSA website at http://www.cpsa-acsp.ca/

In the second track of its work, the Diversity Task Force developed an online survey, supported on the website of the CPSA, and directed to members of the Canadian Political Science Association. In the spring of 2010, members of the CPSA were informed of this survey and invited to participate online via email, communications with Chairs of Canadian Political Science Departments, and written and oral communications at the 2010 annual CPSA conference.   The survey, in both an English and French version, was available online until the end of June 2010. The survey instrument (English version) is included in Appendix A.

Unless otherwise stated, the present report and analysis concerns the 2010 survey of CPSA members only. However, to have a more complete picture of the work and findings of the Diversity Task Force, readers are encouraged to examine this report dealing with the survey of CPSA members, alongside the 2010 report of the survey directed at Chairs of Canadian departments of Political Science.

II. RESPONSE RATE AND REPORTING

The response rate for the member survey was healthy. In June of 2010 there were 1,377 members of the Canadian Political Science Association, the vast majority— over 90%— residing in Canada.[3]   The survey itself garnered a total of 484 respondents, which if all respondents were members of the CPSA would represent just over 35% of the Association's members. However, because this was a self-selected group of respondents and because CPSA members do not include all political scientists in Canada (or abroad), the Diversity Task Force acknowledges that the survey results cannot be seen as drawn from a representative pool of political scientists in Canada, or even in the CPSA.

Nonetheless, the interest generated by the survey and the willingness of the equivalent of over one-third of CPSA members to complete the questionnaire in 2010 are notable. In particular, the member response rate was proportionately much higher than the Diversity Task Force survey directed at Chairs (in which only one-fourth of Canadian departments completed the questionnaire in 2008-2009).

Furthermore, the data do allow for some observations of relevance to questions of diversity, the status of women, and the similar or divergent experiences and perceptions of many in the profession in Canada. In particular, we were interested in addressing whether and how experience and perception may vary by cohort, as determined by the most recent decade in which respondents were students. The

---

[3] In June of 2010 there were 129 members residing outside of Canada (about 9.3%).

Diversity Task Force felt that this was an especially critical dimension because it allows for some ability to assess whether the way respondents experience and understand "the profession" has changed over time, and if so how. Therefore, in what follows we address differences across groupings based on self-identified placement in particular categories, as well as our own placement of respondents into cohorts based on the decade or period in which their most recent degree was received.

 As we will detail there are differences evident between groups, as well as between cohorts. The survey findings suggest that "the profession" is subject to differentiated experiences and perceptual understandings.

III. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

A total of 484 respondents completed the online questionnaire. Of these, 288 (or 59%) identified as males, 193 (or 40%) identified as females, and a total of 3 (less than 1%) identified as another. Historically, the political science profession was overwhelmingly made up of white males, but over time it became more diverse as increasing numbers of women and other equity groups began to enter the profession— a finding also echoed in the 2010 report from Chairs of Canadian Departments regarding faculty composition at different ranks.

Considering equity groups other than women, a total of 62 respondents (or about 13%) were visible minorities (as defined by the Employment Equity Act); 5 (about 1%+) were Aboriginal people; 21 (or over 4%) were persons with disabilities and 45 respondents (or over 9%) were lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgendered (LGBT). Overall, of the 484 respondents who completed the online questionnaire, 329 (or 68%) belonged to one or the other of the equity groups under consideration. In addition, there is abundant overlap among the equity groups identified in this survey.   For example, we note that 16.3 percent of the female respondents (compared to 11.1 percent of the male respondents) indicated they were a visible minority.

An important goal of the survey was to assess whether and how the divergent experiences and perceptions of people in the profession may vary by cohort, as measured by the most recent decade in which respondents were students. The respondents were asked to indicate the year in which they received their highest degree, and based on this respondents were placed in one of the following five "decades" in which they were students: "pre-1970"; "1970s"; "1980s"; "1990s"; and "2000s." The average age of the respondents was 42.8 years and the distribution of age cohorts by gender (male and female) is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Age Cohorts by Gender

	Male	Female	Total
Pre 1970s student	63 (78.8 %)	17 (21.3 %)	80
Student in '70s	43 (59.7 %)	26 (36.1 %)	69
Student in '80s	59 (49.6 %)	60 (50.4 %)	119
Student in '90s	91 (56.2 %)	71 (43.8 %)	162
Student in '00s	24 (53.3 %)	21 (46.7 %)	45

Respondents were also asked about their religious affiliation. By far, the largest category selected by the respondents was "no religious faith" (n=192, or 42%), attesting to the dominance of political scientists with a secular orientation. This was followed by Catholic (n=109, or 24%); Protestant (n=76, or 17%); Jewish (n=26, or 6%), spiritual but no particular tradition (n=21, or 5%). The remaining religions had much smaller numbers: Buddhist or other Eastern Asian traditions (9); Orthodox (7); Muslim (5); Hindu (4); and one or two respondents endorsing each of Aboriginal spiritual tradition, agnostic, Mormon, or Sikh.

The survey further asked respondents to indicate whether they were married or living common law. While the majority of respondents (69%) indicated that they were married or living common law, it is notable that female respondents were more likely to be single (about 33% of women versus 21% of males) as were visible minorities (about 33% of visible minorities versus 25% of the white majority group). Over half of all respondents (51%) had no children, with female respondents being more likely to be childless than men (58% versus 46%) and visible minorities more likely to be childless than the white majority group (62% versus 50%). Amongst those with children, white men were more likely to have two or three children (rather than only one). Female respondents were more likely to have children under the age of both 18 as well as under the age of 5 years.

A large majority of the respondents (74%) were born in Canada but in keeping with the fact that Canada is an immigrant-receiving country, 26% were born abroad. Approximately 92% had Canadian citizenship; 4% had U.S. citizenship and an additional 1.3% were dual Canadian and U.S. citizens.

Approximately one-fourth (n=123) of the respondents were graduate students, the women among them constituting 28% of all women respondents, and the visible minority members 37% of all visible minority respondents. It is worth noting that a majority of graduate students (55%) have reported periods of interruption during their university studies. While the predominant reason listed for such interruptions related to finances/work, a number of female respondents specifically listed maternity and childcare responsibilities.

In terms of mother tongue, the majority of the respondents (74%) identified English as their first language and a further 18% identified French as their first language. Less than one in 10 respondents (8%) listed another language.

IV. THE EVOLUTION OF THE DISCIPLINE (Courses, Theses, Teaching and Research Priorities)

A comparison of course-enrolment history and teaching and research priorities across cohorts provides a lens through which to explore the extent to which the discipline has moved toward recognition of diversity. Here we look in particular at how many respondents in each of our major cohorts enrolled in political science courses, engaged in thesis research on women/gender, race/ethnicity, Aboriginal issues, sexuality, and disability, teach courses in these areas or hold them as key research priorities.

A total of 150 respondents, or nearly one-third, reported that they had enrolled in political science courses on women or gender issues. Given that such courses were not a common feature of the political science curricula, far fewer students (only 20) took gender-related courses in the 1970s and pre-1970s than in the three decades that followed (1980s-2000s), when 130 did so. Thesis research in this area of study expanded appreciably somewhat later, in the 1990s and 2000s, with 18 theses from those cohorts compared to only two from earlier cohorts.

Just under one third of respondents (155) had enrolled in political science courses on race and ethnicity, increasing steadily from 27% in the pre-1970s to 42% in the 2000s. Similarly, thesis writing in these research areas increased steadily as the decades progressed.

Given the small numbers of Aboriginal respondents, cohort analysis would be difficult to apply. However we can make a few statements that apply to courses and research. Among all respondents, 77 (16%) declared they have attended at least one course on Aboriginal issues — higher (28%) among current students than others (12%). Among all current students (again, Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal) 20 students (16%) are writing or have written a thesis on Aboriginal issues compared to 8% of non-students. All 5 Aboriginal respondents wrote their thesis on Aboriginal issues.

Course offerings on sexual diversity (LGBT issues) are few in number, and only 28 respondents (less than 6% of the total) reported that they had enrolled in a political science course specifically devoted to this area   Thesis research in this area is even scarcer, with only a handful (almost entirely by LGBT respondents).

Instruction and thesis writing in disability studies has made hardly any inroads in political science. Only five respondents have taken courses in this area in the past five decades, and a smaller number (only 2) have written (or are writing) theses.

The tendency for theses on equity issues to be more often written by members of groups most directly affected than by others is especially dramatic in the case of work on women in politics and LGBT issues. Disability issues have the dubious distinction of having drawn close to no scholarly attention at the thesis level. Aboriginal issues and those related to race and ethnicity have garnered more attention overall than other areas, and have drawn interest more substantially from outside the affected groups, particularly among current students and recent cohorts.

The survey questions on teaching priorities in political science reveal disturbingly low levels of interest in most of these issue areas. Among all respondents, only about 3% declared Aboriginal issues a priority (first and second priorities combined), a higher percentage than all other diversity-related topics but gender. Only 2% indicated a teaching priority in the area of race/ethnicity issues, and only 1% did so for both sexual diversity and disability. Religion is also an issue area attracting very small amounts of instructional attention. Only women and gender emerged as substantive teaching area attracting significant attention, though almost imperceptibly so among men.

The question on research priorities also allows for an interesting comparison between diversity-related topics. Again, gender is revealed to be a top first or second research priority for the largest number of respondents (15 %) followed by race (8.5%) and Aboriginal-related research (6%). Less than 1% respondents indicated that their top research focus was in the area of sexual diversity or disability. Moreover, research on sexual diversity is undertaken almost entirely by lesbians, gay men, bisexuals, and the transgendered.

To sum then, our overview of research and teaching suggests that while there have been shifts over time —particularly in the areas of gender, race/ethnicity and Aboriginal politics—this is far less the case for the areas of sexuality and disability. In addition, it is mainly the areas of race/ethnicity and Aboriginal politics that have drawn the attention of political scientists outside the directly affected groups.

V. TAPPING THE ATTITUDES OF POLITICAL SCIENTISTS

To further ascertain the respondents' perceptions of the discipline of political science and how equity and other minority groups are perceived to fare within the profession, a series of eleven agree-disagree items were included in the questionnaire (see Appendix A, page 42), some adapted from other professional surveys, others developed by the committee. Overall, about 83% of the respondents responded to these statements.

Our analysis shows that out of a total of 11 statements in the questionnaire, seven, reported in Table 2 below, yielded significant results. In the discussion that follows, we pay particular attention to gender differences in part because this is in keeping with a tradition of study of the profession attuned to the "status of women," but also because the numbers of female respondents, in comparison with other equity and minority groups, is relatively large.

To simplify the discussion, Table 2 shows the percentage distribution of those who agree with the particular statement (combining strength of agreement), for all the respondents and by gender (males/females). Notably, the table shows clear gender differences in response patterns, with an especially wide chasm over opportunities for women.

The results further show that opportunities for visible minorities and LGBT people are perceived to be far from being equitable, and the scale slides more intensely for people with disabilities and for Aboriginal people. Gender differences in response patterns are also clear, with women reflecting a dimmer view of opportunities for these four equity and minority groups.

There is a high level of agreement among the respondents (about 61%) that "More should be done to encourage ethnic minorities to enter the profession," but here again, gender differences are evident, as a higher the percentage of women (compared with men) agree with the statement. Finally, nearly one-half of the male and only about 28% of the female respondents are in agreement that the discipline provides support to new members.

These differences in attitudes and perceptions remain an issue for ongoing discussion. The relevance of gender and other dimensions of differences are also clear when we consider in more detail respondents' attitudes and experiences in the profession.

**Table 2. Perceptions of the Discipline of Political Science and
How Equity Groups Are Perceived to Fare Within the
Profession, by Gender (Male/Female)**

	Number of respondents		Percent agree		
Statement	Male	Female	All	Males	Females
1. In general, the discipline of political science provides support and encouragement to new members of the profession.	241	165	39.6	47.7	27.9
2. More should be done to encourage ethnic minorities to enter the profession.	239	165	61.2	56.1	68.5
3. Women have the same opportunities as men in the political science profession	239	164	38.4	50.6	20.7
4. Visible minorities have the same opportunities as others in the political science profession.	240	164	32.5	42.3	21.0
5. LGBT people have the same opportunities as others in the political science profession.	237	162	33.6	40.1	24.6
6. People with disabilities have the same opportunities as others in the political science profession	238	164	22.2	26.9	15.9
7. Aboriginal people have the same opportunities as others in the political science profession	239	164	26.6	33.9	16.5

VI. RESPONDENTS' ATTITUDES AND EXPERIENCES IN THE POLITICAL SCIENCE PROFESSION

The survey posed a number of questions about the extent to which members felt advantaged or disadvantaged because of one or another of the "differences" of interest to the Task Force: sex, Aboriginal status, visible minority status, sexual orientation (LGBT), disability, age, linguistic background, subject of research or methodological approach, and religion. The specific question asked, *mutatis mutandis*, was as follows: "As a student or member of the political science profession, do you feel you were advantaged/disadvantaged because of your [sex]?" For those who answered the question in the affirmative, they were further asked to describe the way they were advantaged and/or discriminated against.

Admittedly, the wording of the question, which refers to both advantage and disadvantage, creates some difficulty in reading the statistics, but an examination of the open-ended comments suggests that the overwhelming majority of the respondents from the particular equity or minority group relevant to the specific question (e.g., women respondents to the gender question) point to disadvantage. In most cases, there were also many open-ended responses pointing to disadvantage for the historically marginalized group.

Below are the proportions that responded affirmatively from the historically marginalized group, that is, responses that are overwhelmingly pointing to disadvantage:

° For women pointing to the impact of gender   68%
° For Aboriginal people pointing to the impact of race   80 %
° For visible minorities pointing to the impact of race   52%
° For LGBT minorities pointing to the impact of LGBT status   38%
° For people with disabilities pointing to the impact of disability   43%
° For younger age-groups and even older mature students
   pointing to the impact of age   23%
° For francophones pointing to the impact of language   49%
° For non-English, non-French speakers on the impact of language   32%
° For religious minorities pointing to the impact of religion   7%

We will explore the pattern of open-ended responses to this question later in this report.

The survey also asked "Have you ever considered leaving the profession (e.g. as a graduate student, professor, etc.)?" The responses indicate significantly higher percentages of affirmative responses among people with disabilities, women, Aboriginal people, and LGBT respondents than "majority" populations — and just fractionally more for visible minorities than others.

Women	62%	Men	46%
Aboriginal	67%	Non-Aboriginal	53%
Visible Minorities	55%	White	53%
LGBT	63%	Straight	52%
Disabled	75%	Able	52%

A few of the open-ended responses to this question point to perceived negative employment prospects, particularly during periods in which full-time appointments were scarce. However, a number of equity group respondents mention discrimination, hostile attitudes, department politics and work/life balance in relation to family. Examples:

> *Because of the racism and sexism. The energy that it takes to live with the racism and sexism takes away from research and teaching time, hence getting a balance with academic and non-academic life is increasingly disheartening.*

> *Lack of support, financial burden, racism, homophobia. The main reason is not that these things exist, but rather that there are not active, widely available means to address them or get help.*

> *The triple glass ceiling (female, black, Muslim)*

Having and raising children was also highlighted by female respondents as a particular reason for considering leaving the profession:

> *The administrative responsibilities can be too great and too early in the career. It is difficult to balance research, teaching and administration with a young family.*

> *I was not sure I could organize my life with kids at the same time as tenure and other demands (work /life balance).*

Overview of Gender

A total of 173 male, female and other respondents wrote in responses relating to perceived advantage/disadvantage in relation to gender, and this was by far the largest number of responses generated by open-ended questions across all questions.   We have grouped the concerns expressed in these comments into several key areas: structural advantages/disadvantages; childcare/relationships; workload; individual discrimination/harassment; and employment equity.

A total of 77 respondents wrote about structural advantages/disadvantages associated with gender. Such barriers were identified by mostly female respondents (54) followed by male (21) and respondents identifying as another (2).

Female respondents providing open-ended responses to this question identified a number of barriers relating to receiving adequate mentoring and support as students, as well as in making their way through the academy as faculty.   Here are some examples:

> *There were issues at both the graduate and undergraduate levels around a lack of diverse female professors (role models) and male professors who were often more comfortable with male students.*
>
> *Basically the men have a close network at my university. It has been hard to penetrate. Also, focusing on women tends to be tolerated, but not considered a core part of the program.*
>
> *Less access to informal professional networks; taken less seriously in macho academic debate culture.*

A total of 13 female respondents, and only 1 male respondent, listed disadvantages in the profession in relation to having children, and other relationships, and indeed as we noted in our demographic overview, female respondents were more likely to be single and childless than male respondents. Typical comments from female respondents included the following:

> *My choice to have children during my graduate studies was only supported by limited formal leave provisions but in the end made finishing my degree at the Ph.D. level extremely difficult, taking a lot of 'extra time.'*
>
> *The fact that I will have to take some time off to give birth and raise my kids is a huge disadvantage in the profession, as the requirements for tenure tend to underestimate such personal constraints that generally only affect women.*
>
> *It is exceptionally difficult for women on the tenure track to have a partner or family. Most women I know have no partner or a long distance relationship (myself included) while many men start tenure track positions with wife and family.*

A total of six female (and no male) respondents listed workload or pay inequities as an area of disadvantage in their departments in the spheres of teaching and administration (with women being asked to serve more in these areas). Comments included the following:

> *Male colleagues routinely dump extra administrative and supervisory load onto me and other young female colleagues.*

> *In my current dept. the women teach approximately 25% more than the men do and their salaries are much lower.*

A total of 22 female respondents (and no male respondents) listed individual discrimination and harassment in describing their disadvantage, as exemplified below:

> *Excluded by male colleagues socially. Sexually harassed by male colleagues and professors (mild and constant). No accommodations were made in view of my pregnancy and respecting workload or physical amenities.*

> *Assumptions about capabilities and skills (of the 'she's a dumb blonde' variety); mild forms of sexual harassment.*

Several (21) male respondents highlighted being male as a general advantage:

> *I'm a white male—practically all of my professors have been white males, nearly everything we read is written by white males, a great majority of university administrators are white males. I speak and am automatically granted credibility.*

> *The working and communication style of the discipline and academic context highly privileges an assertive and systematic approach that is subtly, but importantly, reflective of those traits that are encouraged more systematically in men.*

More men (31) focused on advantage/disadvantage associated with affirmative measures/employment equity. These male respondents, especially in the two most recent decade cohorts, identified being male as a form of disadvantage in relation to job opportunities. Given that the survey provided a number of questions relating to disadvantage, it is also notable that the question on gender advantage/disadvantage was the one that served as the lightening rod for perceived "reverse discrimination." Here are a few examples:

> *Was told in the '90s there were no jobs unless I was a visible minority.*

> *Being a white male in the current job market is undeniably a disadvantage. (I have been on hiring committees to know this to be a fact- 'all else being somewhat equal' and the opportunity/job goes to the woman/minority').*

> *I have been notified twice by shortlist committees that though my application was excellent they chose a) women b) person of colour for equity reasons.*

> *The push for gender diversity leads to a preference for female candidates— I was lucky to get a job offer here. But now that I'm here, most other faculty members are also men.*

The Diversity Task Force did not explicitly ask a question relating to views on Canada's employment equity policy, or affirmative measures to increase the representation of historically under-represented groups. However, it may be noted that a significant portion of males in the profession view affirmative measures as discriminatory; in contrast, of the few female respondents who listed it as an advantage, other forms of disadvantage were typically also given.

Overview of Aboriginal People

Only five respondents out of 484 self-identified as Aboriginal (1%), two of them graduate students. Aboriginal respondents are therefore underrepresented compared to their proportion in the overall population (4%). We should obviously be careful in drawing conclusions regarding the views and experiences of Aboriginal individuals in the profession based on such small numbers. Having said this though, four of the five Aboriginal respondents indicated that they were disadvantaged because of their status (race as a proxy), a much higher proportion than any other identified groups. Despite the previously noted growing interest for Aboriginal issues in the profession, the open-ended responses point to certain tensions between colonialism, the respondents' Aboriginal identity, and the functioning of universities as institutions of teaching, learning and research, For example:

> *As an indigenous person, I was disadvantaged by the colonial construction of my universities, and the very knowledge I was supposed to learn. My analyses and experiences were irrelevant. I was invisible.*

Given the underrepresentation of Aboriginal respondents in the survey, more work needs to be done in order to systematically assess the experience of Aboriginal political scientists in the profession. The pressing need to do this is further underscored by our earlier finding that Aboriginal political scientists are more likely than many others to have considered leaving the profession.

Overview of Visible Minorities

A total of 98 respondents provided open-ended responses to the question asking whether race/ethnicity was an advantage, disadvantage, neither or both. Of these 98 respondents, a total of 30 identified as being visible minorities. Major patterns can be grouped in relation to structural advantage/disadvantage; individual discrimination; and affirmative measures.

For a number of visible minorities (14 of 30), disadvantage was seen to be of a structural nature, as exemplified in the following observations:

> *The culture of the discipline is very white and liberal. For those outside of this culture, the discipline is quite exclusive, both intellectually and socially.*

> *It's not just about being disadvantaged, but about the whole racialized culture of academia. E.g., I have been mistaken as a server by a conference participant just because I am a young woman of colour.*

> *Racism—being mistaken for the custodial worker.*

> *As a student there was a lack of role models (minorities) in the profession.*

> *Felt invisible. There are so few women of colour in the discipline.*

Conversely, a number of respondents (36) from the white majority listed advantages or other forms of disadvantage associated with race/ethnicity. To exemplify:

> *As a white English-speaking person, I do see that some colleagues are more responsive to me than to non-white people who speak English as a second language.*

> *As a white person in a sea of white faces I don't need to think about how I am viewed or if I am being treated differently on those grounds. This is one less element I have to deal with as I move through my career.*

A number of visible minority respondents (9 of 30) expressed experiencing what they understood to be racist comments or remarks from both students as well as colleagues.   Exemplifying this experience is the observation one respondent:

> *I found it more difficult to be respected as both a student and as an academic. I have also experienced racist comments and questions as both a student and a professor. I felt it prevented me from getting particular jobs or opportunities.*

Ten respondents (fewer than in respect to gender) listed affirmative measures as an area in which white (males) experience disadvantage. In the words of one respondent, *"affirmative action programs led to an anti-white male bias."* Similar to the pattern evident in the area of gender, the one visible minority respondent who noted that racialized minority status as a possible advantage in employment also listed areas in which racialized minority status was a disadvantage.

Overview of Language and Linguistic Minorities

As noted, among all respondents, 340 (74% of those who answered the question) identified English as their first language, 83 (18%) French, and 38 (8%) another language. English speakers are therefore overrepresented in the survey compared to their overall proportion in the Canadian population (58% anglophone; 23% francophone and 19% allophone).

Fifty percent of francophones, and 31% of allophones, compared to 19% of anglophones, answered yes to the question of whether linguistic background had been a source of disadvantage or advantage. Open-ended answers revealed a mix of experiences among minority speakers, but with most citing disadvantage. Almost half (48%) of comments by francophones point to fluency of English as a key advantage, or the lack of it as an obstacle to their professional advancement. The following examples also point to the predominant place of English at major conferences (notably the CPSA conference) and the limited readership of French journals as obstacles:

> *A clearly insufficient number of my English Canadian colleagues are proficient in or understand French. The CPSA Conference clearly illustrates this point: if you present in French, no one comes to listen to you… if you publish in French journals, no one reads you.*

> *Speaking French in political science in Canada is like speaking a foreign language. Political science research in French is not treated at its fair value.*

As a francophone, you can provide a different perspective on issues because you have a different experience and/or access to different literature. But being a francophone in an anglophone world is not easy, since you cannot express your ideas as well, it is more difficult to write articles in English and to be comfortable in communicating orally in English. Nevertheless, written and oral communication in that language is an important tool for professional advancement.

Twenty percent of comments by allophones similarly suggested their language skills can be a disadvantage, but some also saw it as an additional skill for their own research or for employment purpose:

Speaking a different language added value to my overall education by letting me make connections and comparisons between what I studied and what was happening elsewhere.

Interestingly, 41% of anglophones who made comments pointed to fluency in French as an advantage or conversely mentioned their lack of fluency in French as a limiting factor:

It is obviously beneficial to be an English speaker, but not being able to speak French has cut me off from many interesting opportunities that I wish I could take advantage of.

I am advantaged because I am a bilingual anglophone who is capable of reading and commenting on articles/issues of Canadian politics in French.

Bilingualism is therefore also seen as an advantage for many English-speaking respondents. These comments are worth noting given the contrary trend in many teaching institutions to reduce the official languages requirements in graduate programs.

A small number of anglophone respondents (5% of those who made comments) also expressed frustrations over what they perceived as unfair treatment, notably resulting from official language requirements in hiring practices or, in at least two cases, the perception of "preferential treatment" for francophones by funding agencies.

Overall, the first language spoken does not seem to have a significant impact on the objective situation of members of the profession (for the few indicators we have), but it does have a significant impact on perceptions. The sense of being disadvantaged by a lack of proficiency in one or the other of the official languages is strongest for francophones, but is also present amongst anglophones.

Overview of Sexual Diversity

On examining responses to the question of whether LGBT people have the same opportunities in the profession as others, we find a pattern of divergent observations that is parallel with most other equity groups. Among LGBT respondents, 44 percent disagreed overall with the statement that they have the same opportunities; and 18 percent did so "strongly." Among straight respondents, only 23 percent expressed overall disagreement with the statement. Even though a smaller proportion of LGBT respondents expressed disagreement than the proportions of women and visible minorities responding in similar ways to analogous claims, the contrast with the perceptions of the majority group is similar. This reinforces the sense that there is a strong perceptual gap between minority groups and the majority.

What do we learn from responses to the open-ended question about whether LGBT status has created advantage or disadvantage? Among straight respondents, 23 elaborated on their response to the item. Three claimed the existence, in one or another form, of reverse discrimination, but 17 agreed that heterosexuality provided privilege. Among them were these two:

> *I remember having conversations with gay and lesbian grad students in my department who were nervous about bringing their partners to a departmental function, and I realize that I never had to worry about that.*

> *Not being homosexual allowed me closer access to some professors. I have had colleagues tell me in private that they are against homosexuality. One colleague even fired an assistant when told of this student's sexual orientation.*

Of the LGBT respondents, 13 provided commentary on this item. In one form or another, every one of them pointed to individual acts or a general climate that made them feel less than fully accepted. About half talked of hearing or being subjected to explicitly homophobic language, or knowing of discriminatory behaviour among academic colleagues, staff, or students. Others talked of the subtlety of this pattern — being considered heterosexual "by default," sensing an "unspoken code". What lies behind many of these comments is the comparative invisibility of sexual minorities within either their departments or the larger institution. Both the explicit acts and the subtle presumptions reproduce the "normalcy" of heterosexuality and the absence of sexual difference.

Overview of Disability

As noted previously, the relative silence about disability in political science is overwhelming. As an area of research and teaching, it remains almost entirely invisible, with no noticeable increase in attention among students. Less than half a percent of the total response set flagged disability as a priority; even fewer as a teaching priority. The questions posed about course-work and teaching do not allow for a textured exploration of the extent to which there is at least some attention paid to disability within courses touching on broader themes, but our own personal observations lead us to the view that it remains a policy issue virtually ignored in the discipline.

Of all respondents, 21 identified themselves as having a disability. It would be completely unreasonable to expect that they should bear the brunt of responsibility for undertaking scholarly work on disability, but it is still striking that so few of them do. This may, inappropriately, reflect a shared understanding that disability is not a politically relevant issue.

In answering questions about equal opportunity, people with disabilities expressed themselves in ways broadly similar to other minorities. A quarter disagreed strongly with the statement that persons with disabilities had the same opportunities as others in the profession, and just under half broadly disagreed. The distinctiveness here is that people without disabilities, in general, agreed with the statement, though fewer as strongly as those most directly affected.

In response to whether they had experienced disadvantage or advantage as a result of disability, only some provided elaboration, but all pointed to the difficulties of being fully accepted, or accommodated. Among the comments about institutional accommodation were these:

> *The constant reliance on others in order to participate fully in proceedings and classes results in me not often asking for help because it is so much trouble to do so.*
>
> *I had to take a reduced teaching load because the university would not find me a classroom where I could lecture without standing.*
>
> *My physical disability makes it difficult to interact with colleagues at conferences, which need to be more accessible.*

One also commented on the scholarly inattention to the issue area. To quote,*"a shunning of the political implications of disability into the discipline of Sociology."*

Overview of Religious Diversity

There are two somewhat distinct issues of relevance here. One is the degree to which people of faith in general feel accepted in the profession, in both scholarly and inter-personal terms. The other is the extent to which religious diversity is recognized.

The survey had only a limited repertoire of questions on religion, so there are only a few observations that can be made with clear evidence. On the first of the issues to address here, there can be little doubt that the political science profession, like most other academic disciplines, has a comparatively high number of people who would define themselves as secular or only moderately religious. In response to the question about specific religious faith, as noted earlier, 42% responded that they had none and another 47% identified as Christian, 6 percent as Jewish, and 5 percent as other.

Of all respondents, only 20 identified faith or religion as a priority research area; and a mere 4 as a priority teaching area. These are small numbers in a country in which religion and politics have long intersected. That is especially the case in light of the increasing political issues related to faith that are emerging as a result of multiculturalism and large immigration flows from China, South East Asian and African countries — countries where both Christian and non-Christian religious identity is relatively strong.

Among all respondents, 28 provided responses to the open-ended portion of the question about disadvantage/advantage. By far the largest group (11) commented generally on the explicit or implied marginalization of people of faith.

> *My faith is important to me and it shapes what I do and how I do it academically. But I don't feel like I could talk openly about that at a CPSA conference, for example, and still be taken seriously.*

> *Religion is the last bastion of accepted bigotry. My religious background, in addition to that of numerous others, is regularly defamed in public discussions. I can speak of numerous times in which people of faith were treated derogatorily.*

> *There is a structural bias against people of faith in general and serious Christians in particular in the conventional secular Canadian university.*

> *There is a vague disapproval that any educated person would practice a religious tradition.*

> *As an evangelical Christian who does not advertise his convictions, I have repeatedly observed bigotry both among senior administrators and faculty colleagues towards students, faculty members, and other members of the community.*

Of the remaining 17 responses, 4 talked of anti-Catholic sentiment or misguided assumptions made on the basis of personal knowledge of someone's Catholic faith. In a similar vein, a few respondents referred to their faith being stereotyped. Several comments were made by adherents of minority faiths either about prejudicial comments or the failure to accommodate (for example, in holidays). Two testimonials pointed to anti-Semitism; and five others, in either general or specific terms, pointed to experience of being from other religious minority groups.

Overview of Age

As noted the average age of respondents to the survey was 42.8 years. Age as an area of individual discrimination drew mixed responses, with respondents highlighting both youth and agedness as points of disadvantage.

For example, a number of respondents identified being young as a disadvantage for students, as well as professors, noting that this could intersect with gender.

> *As an older student, I do feel that I am taken more seriously than younger students. I have also been given more responsibilities as a teaching assistant than other students.*

> *Being junior and younger makes people not take you seriously. This is particularly the case with the older/senior boys' networks.*

> *Students (both graduate and undergraduate) disrespect a young, female professor.*

> *As a young woman who looks very young, I am generally taken less seriously. People feel that it is alright to ask me how old I am in some settings.*

On the other hand, some respondents identified being older as a disadvantage, particularly on the job market.

> *Returning to academia after a ten-year hiatus, I have been passed over for younger candidates.*

> *Obtaining an initial tenure-track position is not possible after 50.*

In distinction from individual discrimination, a number of respondents also identified a structural advantaged accorded to senior members of the profession:

> *Structure of the profession grants tremendous influence of senior*
> *faculty over younger faculty, especially untenured faculty.*
>
> *Of course age matters. It is a seniority-based culture. The younger*
> *you are, the more difficult it is to assert oneself, esp. vis á vis older,*
> *very established faculty.*

A few identified advantage/disadvantage as related to generational cohort, as typified by one respondent who described being *"stuck behind the boomer clog."*

VII. CAREER OPPORTUNITIES IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

The results of this survey show that nearly 43% of the respondents were employed in a tenured or tenure-track academic position in political science. Of these, about 27% were full professors, 35% associate professors, 36% assistant professors, and less than 2% were lecturers.

Many of these respondents have occupied a wide range of administrative positions (such as Dean or Associate Dean, Department Chair, head of an Interdisciplinary Studies Unit, Director of Graduate or of Undergraduate Studies, TA Coordinator, etc.). It is noteworthy that women were less likely to have served as department Chairs (16.4% of women compared to 31.9% of men) as were visible minorities (14.3 % of visible minorities compared to 28% of white majority). Women were much more likely to have served as graduate directors than men (35% of women compared to 20.1% of men), and visible minorities were much less likely to have served in this capacity (4.8% of visible minorities compared to 28% of white majority). Where visible minorities led the way in terms of administrative service was outside of political science departments, as heads of an interdisciplinary unit (19% of visible minorities compared to 13.7% of white majority).

Reflecting on the calibre of the respondents in terms of an often used Canadian marker of success, the results further show that nearly half of the respondents (48%) were recipients of SSHRC grants in their research area. A slightly larger proportion of women (53%) than men (44%) were successful grant holders and a much larger proportion of white (51%) than visible minority (33%) respondents were successful in SSHRC competitions.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECCOMMENDATIONS

Our earlier report on a survey of departmental chairs drew attention to issues that have emerged in the members' survey. We indicated then, as now, that there has been an important diversification among faculty and graduate students, but not on all equity dimensions. And not surprisingly, what the earlier report indicated is that there was better representation of women, Aboriginal people and visible minorities at junior ranks than at senior. Nonetheless, the findings from the survey of Chairs suggests that on no dimension of difference is the distribution of junior faculty positions in line with the demographic diversity of political science undergraduate populations.

Overall, our findings based on the members' survey concur with our analysis of the chairs' responses.   The members' survey adds detail to that picture, and also suggests that across all groups there are grounds for concern about the experience of members of historically disadvantaged groups in the academy.

As in social science analysis of diversity and equity outside the academy, we find indications that women and minority political scientists experience more challenges and disadvantages associated with difference than others do. This perceptual gap can easily lead to departmental inattention to issues of difference, and to misunderstandings that reinforce inequity. We take it as particularly significant that members of a few of the groups we have examined are more likely than others to have considered leaving the profession.

One source of concern across several of the dimensions we have surveyed is the slightness of scholarly and instructional attention paid to questions related to diversity. For example, the modesty of scholarly attention to sexuality —an area that has been a prominent subject of political debate in this country for some time is worthy of reconsideration, even if it is not the focus of as much political conflict in Canada now as it was during the 1980s and 1990s. With only a few exceptions, Canadian political scientists have been slow to recognize the relevance of sexuality to a broader range of analytical questions, and there seems no significant shift in that pattern evident among the current respondents. The survey results indicate that the systematic exploration of these issues is left almost entirely to members of the groups most directly affected by them.

There has been a shift toward greater academic inclusivity on a couple of fronts, but the disparity between levels of interest among political scientists most directly affected by these issues and others can too easily result in feelings of intellectual marginalization. The growing diversity of our students, and the steadily growing political complexity of issues associated with our country's diversity, also suggests that sidelining these issues is inappropriately unresponsive to the politics of our times. There is no obvious way to remedy this, but it suggests the need to think about ways of legitimizing the study of diversity.

We note with particular alarm the near invisibility of people with disabilities in faculty composition, alongside an inattention to political issues related to disability in teaching and research. This comes at a time when colleges and universities across the country, alongside other institutions, are facing legitimate pressures to move towards greater inclusivity on this ground, to better serve existing members of our scholarly communities and those who do not yet have effective access to our communities.

In this particular period of economic restraint and budgetary cutbacks, which carry implications for new jobs, as well as the workloads of those that have jobs, it can be especially tempting to shelve questions relating to "diversity" for a different, more propitious moment when there are fewer immediately pressing issues, or for when there is more time and resources.

We recall one of the concluding comments in our earlier report – about what we referred to as "the elephant on the table" -- the low response rate of Chairs/Departments to the earlier survey.

> It should be noted that this low response rate persisted despite ample opportunities over the course of 1 ½ years to fill out the survey, as well as efforts to streamline the survey to a bare minimum of just four questions in light of possible competing time and resource demands on Chairs (particularly in times of budgetary crisis). However, returning to where we started, with the fact that CPSA committees have made use of surveys of departments to garner information about the discipline, what can be observed is that in fact there has been an evident decline in responding to these surveys since the 1980s. The question of why this is the case deserves consideration, and this may be more or less pressingly felt once the online survey tells us more about the actual experiences of diverse CPSA members.

Rather than ignoring these issues, we would suggest that there needs to be a wider conversation at local/departmental and national levels in the profession about the issues which do (or are seen to) impede the abilities of all members of the profession to contribute their talents and feel valued and supported in their work, and in their aspirations to "balance" work in the discipline with other aspects of life.

Within many Canadian universities over the past decade, issues relating to attracting and retaining students and faculty have been on the agenda. Such discussions have variously identified ways in which support of diverse students, as well as the teaching and research excellence of faculty could be enhanced. Pertinent issues for consideration include course offerings and the identifiable research clusters within or between departments that may work to facilitate and enhance

teaching and research relevance, both for groups that have been historically marginalized, as well as for Canadian and international society.

Questions around workplace climate are highly relevant for both professors and students, and thinking about the inclusivity and supportiveness of this climate may entail consideration of everything from workload, to social activities, even to hallway banter.

Distinct from workplace climate is a broad sweep of issues related to work/life balance that have been on the agenda, especially for faculty unions and associations. Indeed the salience of these kinds of issues is underscored again by the responses of many respondents to obstacles they may encounter which may impact decisions to stay in, or leave, the profession. In this regard, discussions pertaining to the terms and generosity of leaves (e.g., maternity, elder care, bereavement etc.) as well as supports for students and faculty with disabilities, or access to quality childcare for parents, are especially pertinent.

Both in the survey directed at Chairs, as well as in many Canadian universities, mentoring has been increasingly identified as an important activity. Less featured has been the idea of targeted mentoring (designed for specific groups of students and faculty through the ranks). Responses to the member survey, in their diversity, suggest that there may be reason to consider more closely targeted mentoring (both of students and peers) because particular students and faculty may be more at risk of leaving the profession than others.

We would suggest that rather than re-inventing the wheel (or indeed ignoring the wheel) it is helpful to consider these kinds of ongoing discussions in relation to the implications for the profession of political science in Canada.

As a discipline, political science may be seen to be in transition both in relation to its teaching and research foci, as well as in the demographic composition of its members. The time is therefore especially critical to foster a dialogue that is attuned to different perceptions and experiences of members of the profession, and the mechanisms and processes which may benefit all members better.

APPENDIX A

Canadian Political Science Association
Questionnaire for Members of the Canadian Political Science Association

This study is designed to learn more about the experiences of groups of individuals who are currently under-represented in Political Science and how they compare to those of others in the discipline. The survey is meant for all members of the Canadian Political Science community whether you consider yourself to be a member of an under-represented group or not. It has received ethics approval from the Ethics Review Board at the University of New Brunswick. As required by this ethics approval, all responses will be kept in strictest confidence and the information gathered will not be presented in any way that could be used to identify either individuals or departments. While any information you provide will assist us in understanding the experiences of different groups of individuals, you are not required to respond to any questions you feel uncomfortable answering and you may end the survey at any time you wish.

Personal Information

1. Year of birth: _____

2. Country of birth: _____

3. Citizenship: _____

4. If you were not born in Canada, in what year did you move to Canada? _____

5. What is your first language (i.e. the first language that you learned and that you still understand)?

    English   ☐

    French   ☐

    Other (specify) _____

6. What is your sex?   Male ☐   Female ☐

                            Another ☐

7. Are you a non-White/Visible Minority? (*Visible minorities* are "persons identified according to the Employment Equity Act as being non-caucasian in race or non-white in colour. Under the Act, Aboriginal persons are not considered to be members of visible minority groups." Visible or Non-white minorities include individuals with the following ethnic background:Chinese, South Asian (e.g., East Indian, Pakistani, Punjabi, Sri Lankan), Black (e.g., African, Haitian, Jamaican, Somali), Arab/West Asian (e.g., Armenian, Egyptian, Iranian, Lebanese, Moroccan), Filipino, South East Asian (e.g., Cambodian, Indonesian, Laotian, Vietnamese), Latin American, Japanese, Korean and Other).)

Yes ☐   No ☐

8. Are you an Aboriginal person, that is, North American Indian, Métis or Inuk?

Yes ☐   No ☐

9. Are you lesbian/gay/bisexual or transgendered (LGBT)?

Yes ☐   No ☐

10. Do you have a disability?

Yes ☐   No ☐

11. What is your marital status?

single ☐   married/ common law ☐

separated or divorced ☐   widowed ☐

12. Do you have children?   Yes ☐   No ☐

13. If you have children,
How many are age 5 and under?   _____

How many are between the ages of 6 and 18?   _____

How many are over the age of 18?   _____

14. How many of your children live with you at present? _____

Educational Background:

15. Are you currently a graduate student?　　　Yes　　　　No

(This question will be used as a filter question. Those who are currently graduate students will then receive the 'are you/have you' questions, while those who are not graduate students get the 'were you/did you' versions of the questions.)

16. What is the highest university degree that you have earned?

　　　BA　　　　MA　　　　PhD

17. In what year did you receive this degree?

18. During your university studies did you have (have you had) one or more periods of interruption?

　　　Yes　　　☐　　　　　　No　　　☐

19. If yes, for how long? _____

20. What was the main reason for each period of interruption?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

21. Did you/ have you ever considered dropping out of graduate school?

　　　Yes　　　☐　　　　　　No　　　☐

If so, why? _____

22. While a student, were you granted (have you been granted) one or more major national, provincial or university scholarships?

　　　Yes　　　☐　　　　　　No　　　☐

23. As a student, did you ever attend political science courses on *women or gender* issues?

Yes ☐   No ☐

If yes, how many courses on *women or gender issues* have you taken in political science?

At the undergraduate level?   _____

At the graduate level?   _____

24. Are you writing (did you write) a thesis on *women or gender issues*?

Yes ☐   No ☐

If yes, check all that apply:

Ph.D. Thesis   ☐

M.A. Thesis   ☐

Honours BA Thesis ☐

25. As a student, did you ever attend political science courses on *Aboriginal politics*?

Yes ☐   No ☐

If yes, how many courses on *Aboriginal politics* have you taken in political science?

At the undergraduate level?   _____

At the graduate level?   _____

26. Are you writing (did you write) a thesis on *Aboriginal politics*?

Yes ☐ No ☐

 If yes, check all that apply:

Ph.D. Thesis ☐

M.A. Thesis ☐

Honours BA Thesis ☐

27.As a student, did you ever attend political science courses on *race or ethnicity* issues?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, how many courses on *race or ethnicity* issues have you taken in political science?

At the undergraduate level? _____

At the graduate level? _____

If yes, did any of these courses focus specifically on race or ethnicity in Canada?

Yes ☐ No ☐

28. Are you writing (did you write) a thesis on *race or ethnicity* issues?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, check all that apply:

Ph.D. Thesis ☐

M.A. Thesis ☐

Honours BA Thesis ☐

29. As a student, did you ever attend political science courses on *sexual diversity* studies?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, how many courses on *sexual diversity* studies have you taken in political science?

At the undergraduate level? _____

At the graduate level? _____

30. Are you writing (did you write) a thesis on *sexual diversity* studies?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, check all that apply:

Ph.D. Thesis ☐

M.A. Thesis ☐

Honours BA Thesis ☐

31. As a student, did you ever attend political science courses on *disability* studies?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, how many courses on *disability* studies have you taken in political science?

At the undergraduate level? _____

At the graduate level? _____

32. Are you writing (did you write) a thesis on *disability* studies?

Yes ☐   No ☐

 If yes, check all that apply:

Ph.D. Thesis   ☐

M.A. Thesis   ☐

Honours BA Thesis ☐

33. As a student or member of the political science profession do you feel you were ever advantaged or disadvantaged because of your sex?

Advantaged ☐   Disadvantaged ☐   Both ☐   Neither ☐

If yes, could you please describe in what way you were advantaged and/or discriminated against?

_____

_____

_____

_____

34. As a student or member of the political science profession do you feel you were ever advantaged or disadvantaged because of your *race or ethnicity*?

Advantaged ☐   Disadvantaged ☐   Both ☐   Neither ☐

If yes, could you please describe in what way you were advantaged and/or discriminated against?

_____

_____

_____

_____

(Respondents will only receive the following question if they answered that they were LGBT).

35. As a student or member of the political science profession do you feel you were ever advantaged or disadvantaged because of your *sexual orientation*?

Advantaged ☐   Disadvantaged ☐   Both ☐   Neither ☐

If yes, could you please describe in what way you were advantaged and/or discriminated against?

_____

_____

_____

_____

(Respondents will only receive the following question if they answered that they had a disability).

36.As a student or member of the political science profession do you feel you were ever advantaged or disadvantaged because of your *disability*?

Advantaged ☐   Disadvantaged ☐   Both ☐   Neither ☐

If yes, could you please describe in what way you were advantaged and/or discriminated against?

_____

_____

_____

_____

37. As a student or member of the political science profession do you feel you were ever advantaged or disadvantaged because of your *age*?

Advantaged ☐   Disadvantaged ☐   Both ☐   Neither ☐

If yes, could you please describe in what way you were advantaged and/or discriminated against?

_____

_____

_____

_____

38. As a student or member of the political science profession do you feel you were ever advantaged and/or disadvantaged because of your *linguistic background*?

Advantaged ☐   Disadvantaged ☐   Both ☐   Neither ☐

If yes, could you please describe in what way you were advantaged and/or discriminated against?

_____

_____

_____

_____

39. As a student or member of the political science profession do you feel you were advantaged/disadvantaged because of your *subject of research or methodological approach*?

Advantaged ☐   Disadvantaged ☐   Both ☐   Neither ☐

If yes, could you please describe in what way you were advantaged and/or discriminated against?

_____

_____

_____

_____

40. As a student or member of the political science profession do you feel you were ever advantaged or disadvantaged because of your *religion*?

Advantaged ☐   Disadvantaged ☐   Both ☐   Neither ☐

If yes, could you please describe in what way you were advantaged and/or discriminated against?

_____

_____

_____

_____

41. What best describes your religion, if you have one? Check all the apply:

> 1 Protestant
> 2 Catholic
> 3 Eastern Orthodox
> 3 Jewish
> 4 Muslim
> 5 Hindu
> 6 Sikh
> 7 Buddhist or other East Asian traditions
> 8 Mormon
> 9 Aboriginal spiritual tradition
> 10 Spiritual/religious but no particular tradition
> 11no religious faith
> 12 Other (specify) _____

Professional Experience (for those employed in sessional, term, tenure-track or tenured positions as well as those seeking academic positions)

42. Please identify those areas of Political Science in which you have done research. Mark 1 beside your primary area of research, 2 beside your secondary area of research and so on.

International Relations Politics	☐	Comparative Politics	☐	Canadian	☐
Public Policy /Administration	☐	Methodology	☐	Political Sociology	☐
Local Government	☐	Political Economy	☐	Political Philosophy	☐
Women /Gender & Politics	☐	Race / Ethnicity & Politics	☐	Sexuality / LGBT Politics	☐
Aboriginal Politics	☐	Politics of Disability	☐	Religion and Politics	☐

Other (please specify) _____ ☐

43. Have you ever received a SSHRC research grant for research in your primary area of research?

     Yes   No

44. Are you currently employed by a Department of Political Science?

     Yes   ☐   No   ☐

45. If not, are you currently employed in an academic position in a department other than in Political Science?

     Yes   ☐   No   ☐

Please specify   _____

46. Since completing your studies have you ever been unemployed?

Yes ☐ No ☐

47. If so, how many times have you been unemployed? _____

48. How long were you unemployed? _____

49. How many of these periods of unemployment were voluntary? _____

If you are currently unemployed please skip to question 55.

50. Is your current position a permanent position (ie tenured or tenure-track)?

Yes ☐ No ☐

51. In what year were you hired into this position? _____

52. What is your current rank?

Part-time ☐ Lecturer ☐

Assistant ☐ Associate ☐

Full Professor ☐

53. If you have tenure, in what year did you receive tenure? _____ ☐
NA

54. Please indicate the number of students you are supervising.

Honours Students _____ M.A. Students _____ Ph.D. Students _____

55. Please identify those areas of Political Science in which you teach. Mark 1 beside your primary area of teaching responsibility, 2 beside your secondary area of teaching responsibility and so on.

International Relations ☐   Comparative Politics ☐   Canadian ☐
Politics

Public Policy /Administration ☐   Methodology ☐   Political ☐
Sociology

Local Government ☐   Political Economy ☐   Political ☐
Philosophy

Women /Gender & Politics ☐   Race / Ethnicity & Politics ☐   Sexuality / ☐
LGBT Politics

Aboriginal Politics ☐   Politics of Disabilty ☐   Religion and ☐
Politics

Other (please specify) _____ ☐

56. Have you ever considered leaving the profession (eg. As a graduate student, professor, etc.?

Yes ☐   No ☐

If so, why? _____

_____

_____

57. Please check those administrative positions that you have held during your career.

How long did you hold this position?

Chair	☐	_____
Director of Graduate Studies	☐	_____
Director of Undergraduate Studies	☐	_____
TA Coordinator for your Department	☐	_____
Graduate Field Chair	☐	_____
Head of a Research Centre	☐	_____
Associate Dean/Dean or other Senior Administrative Position	☐	_____
Head of Interdisciplinary Unit	☐	_____
Other (specify _____)	☐	_____

The Political Science Profession

Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
In general, the discipline of Political science provides support and encouragement to new members of the profession.					
More should be done to encourage ethnic minorities to enter the profession.					
An academic career is attractive for people with families.					
Qualitative methodological approaches are less well regarded in the political					

science profession.					
Quantitative methodological approaches are less well regarded in the political science profession.					
Women have the same opportunities as men in the political science profession					
Visible minorities have the same opportunities as others in the political science profession.					
LGBT people have the same opportunities as others in the political science profession.					
People with disabilities have the same opportunities as others in the political science profession					
Aboriginal people have the same opportunities as others in the political science profession					
The political science profession discourages the open expression of religious faith.					