



# Gender study 2016



## Introduction and data

---

This study looks at participation of women and men throughout the ECPR's governance and at all levels of participation in its activities.

The data has been collected primarily via the MyECPR database on the ECPR website

and is accurate at October 2016. Individuals wishing to take part in an ECPR event or join an email mailing list must create a MyECPR account.

In early 2016 the option to record gender was added to the sign-up page and a communications

campaign to encourage existing users to update their records was initiated. This is helping to provide a clearer picture of how female scholars participate and engage with the ECPR.

The document is split into the following sections:

1. Governance and leadership of the organisation
2. Marking achievement
3. Shaping events
4. Plenary sessions at events
5. Event Paper-givers and audience
6. Book and journal contributors
7. General ECPR engagement
8. Conclusions

# 1. Governance and leadership of the organisation

## Official Representatives / Council

The ECPR's highest level of governance is the Council, which is comprised of one Official Representative (OR) from each member institution.

Among current Official Representatives (unfortunately our system does not allow us to store historical data at present) a little over 33% are female.

Since the OR role is agreed at member institutional level, this is not something the ECPR could easily influence.

Nevertheless, ECPR and ECPR's Council could work to encourage member institutions to appoint women colleagues as Official Representatives.

Official Representatives	
Female	116
Male	232
No OR nominated at present	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>350</b>
Percentage female	33%

## Executive Committee

The Executive Committee is the group of elected trustees of the ECPR, responsible for the strategic direction of the organisation.

Of the twelve elected members, only three have been female over each of the past five terms (and prior to that, only two). The ECPR has only had one female

chair in its 46-year history: Simona Piattoni, who served in the role between 2012 and 2015.

Men continue to be significantly over-represented at this level of governance within the organisation (75% since 2003).

*\*First female Chair*

Executive Committee		
Year	Female	Male
2000–2003	2	10
2003–2006	3	9
2006–2009	3	9
2009–2012	3	9
2012–2015*	3	9
2015–2018	3	9

## Standing Group convenors

Standing Groups and Research Networks are formalised sub-groups of the ECPR, each concerned with a specific sub-field of the discipline.

Currently, the ECPR has over 50 of these groups, each with its own constitution and elected

Convenor/s and/or Steering Committee.

Because these groups (and their leadership) are influential in shaping the direction of the discipline, we looked at the gender of Standing Group convenors and found that 40% were female.

Standing Group convenors in 2016	
Female	41
Male	61
<b>Total</b>	<b>102</b>
Percentage female	40%

## Editors and editorial boards of publications

Publishing the research generated by ECPR's membership and the wider political science community is one of our key activities.

The organisation's portfolio comprises ECPR Press (the in-house

imprint, publishing c.15+ books each year), the Comparative Politics book series (published in association with Oxford University Press) and the journals *European Journal of Political Research (EJPR)*, *European Political Science*

*Review (EPSR)* and *European Political Science (EPS)*.

Editors of these publications are appointed by the Executive Committee after a public and competitive search and

selection procedure. Each editor serves a three- to six-year term. Mandated with the day-to-day running of these publications and their longer-term strategic development, these scholars hold influential positions in the organisation and wider community.

We looked at all editorial posts held over the past eight years and found that only 28% were held by women during this period; of particular note is that the *EJPR*, the ECPR's flagship publication, has had no female editors at all within this time.

The picture is similar on the editorial boards of our three journals; of the 82 scholars currently serving on the boards, only 29% are female. Interestingly, on the *EJPR* board we see a fairer male/female split, but on *EPS* and *EPSR*, women make up only around 17% of the board.

Editors of ECPR publications 2008–2015			
	Male	Female	Percentage female
<i>European Journal of Political Research (EJPR)</i>	5	0	0%
<i>Political Data Yearbook (PDY) of the EJPR</i>	5	2	28%
<i>European Political Science Review (EPSR)</i>	7	5	41%
<i>European Political Science (EPS)</i>	7	3	30%
ECPR Press (all series)	6	2	25%
Comparative Politics series	5	2	28%
Studies in European Political Science series (closed)	2	1	33%
Research Methods series (closed)	2	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>28%</b>

Editorial Board members (journals) 2016			
	Male	Female	Percentage female
<i>European Journal of Political Research (EJPR)</i>	11	13	54%
<i>European Political Science Review (EPSR)</i>	23	6	21%
<i>European Political Science (EPS)</i>	24	5	17%
<b>Total</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>29%</b>

## Leadership of the Methods School

The ECPR's Methods School (Summer and Winter Schools in Methods and Techniques) has a mission to train and develop the next generation of political scientists; it is therefore often the entry point into the organisation for young scholars. Because of this, the MS has an additional responsibility through its leadership to promote a more equal gender balance. The MS is led by a group of three Academic Convenors, comprising one who has been in post since the School was created and two who have been appointed through a public and competitive process.

Of the four Academic Convenors who have been in post since the MS began, all have been male; of the current Academic Advisory Board (the group appointed by the ACs which serves to advise them on the structure of the school) only one out of the five is female.

It is the Instructors, though, who are the face of the MS and have day-to-day contact with the students. Looking at the 2016 events (previous data was unavailable) only around a quarter of Instructors were female.

Instructors, Summer School 2016	
Female	15%
Male	43%
<b>Total</b>	<b>58%</b>
Percentage Female	26%

Instructors, Winter School 2016	
Female	9%
Male	27%
<b>Total</b>	<b>36%</b>
Percentage Female	25%

## 2. Marking achievement

The scholars whom the ECPR decides to publicly acknowledge through its prizes can send a powerful message throughout the discipline. Here, we look at the number of women who have received ECPR prizes over the past five years.

While the percentage of female/male nominees vary across prizes

and even across years within them, the number of women being awarded prizes is fairly low. Of the 24 prizes awarded in this period, only five went solely to women, with a further two awarded a prize jointly with a male colleague.

It is notable that no woman has ever won the Lifetime Achievement Award (and only

two women have ever even been nominated for it).

Nevertheless, we see a slight tendency that the higher number of women nominated, the higher the chance of being awarded a prize (see Stein Rokkan 2013, Wildenmann 2015, Jean Blondel 2014 and 2015, Hans Daalder 2008 and 2012).

Stein Rokkan Prize					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Male nominees	7	12	21	18	16
Female nominees	1	14	10	11	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>21</b>
Percentage Female	12%	54%	32%	38%	24%
Winner in year	Male	Joint m/f	Male	Male	Male

Lifetime Achievement Award					
	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015
Male nominees	1	3	9	10	7
Female nominees	0	1	0	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
Percentage Female	0%	25%	0%	0%	12%
Winner	Male	Male	Male	Male	Male

Rudolf Wildenmann Prize					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Male nominees	5	6	7	3	6
Female nominees	4	4	4	7	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>
Percentage Female	44%	40%	36%	70%	50%
Winner	Male	Male	Male	Female	Female

Jean Blondel PhD Prize					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Male nominees	24	15	18	13	17
Female nominees	13	13	24	13	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>33</b>
Percentage Female	35%	46%	57%	50%	48%
Winner	Joint male	Male	Female	Female	Male

Hans Daalder Prize					
	2008	2010	2012	2014	2016
Male nominees	1	12	7	26	9
Female nominees	1	6	12	6	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>16</b>
Percentage Female	50%	33%	63%	19%	44%
Winner	Joint m/f	Male	Joint m/f	Female	Female

## 3. Shaping events

The Workshop Directors and Section Chairs at ECPR events play a key role in steering the academic focus and direction of an event. We therefore looked at how these roles were filled over the past five years.

At the Joint Sessions and General Conference, women account for only c. 35% of all Workshop

Directors and Section Chairs. Interestingly, we saw a small increase in this figure for the 2015 General Conference, which was held in Montreal – it might be interesting to look further into whether the North American location influenced this.

As expected, the split is far more even (and actually in favour

of women) at the Graduate Student Conference. We might be optimistic and presume that an even gender distribution is a generational question. But nevertheless, as the participant numbers of the Graduate Student Conference below will show, a steady improvement cannot be taken for granted.

Workshop Directors – Joint Sessions					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Female	24	26	17	16	17
Male	37	49	28	32	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>47</b>
Percentage Female	39%	35%	37%	33%	36%

Section Chairs – General Conference					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Female	No Conference in 2012	43	43	59	49
Male		70	96	75	86
<b>Total</b>		<b>113</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>135</b>
Percentage Female		38%	31%	44%	36%

Section Chairs – Graduate Student Conference					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Female	26	No Conference in 2013	28	No Conference in 2015	24
Male	24		25		19
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>		<b>53</b>		<b>43</b>
Percentage Female	52%		53%		56%

## 4. Plenary sessions at events

In addition to the academic elements of our events, we also looked at the composition of their plenary programmes, gathering data on the gender of scholars delivering welcome addresses and plenary lectures, and those taking part in roundtables.

### General Conference

Over the past four events, only one Plenary Lecture has been delivered by a woman. Of the

11 roundtables across these four events, 41 of the participants have been men and only 13 women (31%).

### Joint Sessions

During the five years this study covers, not one Stein Rokkan lecture has been delivered by a woman. It should be noted, though, that the 2017 lecture in Nottingham was delivered by Margaret Levi (Stanford).

### Graduate Student Conference

Over the past three events not one Plenary Lecture has been delivered by a woman.

In the 11 roundtables, 23 of the participants have been men, and 20 women; a much better split, but note that levels of female participation were much higher at the 2012 and 2014 events than at the 2016 conference in Tartu.

General Conference			Roundtable participants (inc. Chair)							
			RT 1		RT 2		RT 3		RT 4	
Local Organiser / welcome address	Plenary Lecture		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
2013	Vincent Hoffmann-Martinot	Nonna Mayer	3	1	4	1				
2014	Maurizio Carbone. Welcome address by male representative from SNP after Nicola Sturgeon pulled out	Iain McLean	3	2	3	2				
2015	Christine Rothmayr Allison. Welcome address given by Frédéric Mérand	Michael Ignatieff	4	1	4	0	4	1		
2016	Petr Jüptner	Rogers Brubaker	5	0	5	0	4	1	2	4*

\*Roundtable dedicated to gender participation / representation

Joint Sessions of Workshops		
	Local Organiser	Stein Rokkan Lecture
2012	Petra Meier	Cas Mudde
2013	Kai Arzheimer	Jürgen Falter
2014	Manuel Alcantara	Scott Mainwaring
2015	Anna Sroka	Stanisław Filipowicz
2016	Donatella della Porta, Yves Mény and Luciano Bardi	Maurizio Ferrera

Graduate Student Conference			Roundtable participants (inc. Chair)							
			RT 1		RT 2		RT 3		RT 4	
	Local Organiser	Plenary Lecture	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
2012	Susanne Schmidt and Marco Verweij	Michael Zürn	1	4	4	1	3	2	1	4
2014	Gilg Seeber	Alan Scott	1	3	2	2	3	0	1	2
2016	Vello Pettai (plus two dignitaries from the University of Tartu and Rein Taagepera)	Christian Welzel	3	0	2	1	2	1		

## 5. Event paper-givers and audience

The figures below show participation at each of the ECPR's events – for the Joint Sessions, inclusion in a Workshop; for the General and Graduate Student Conferences, everyone who has registered and paid to attend. The latter two could also include some people who attended without presenting a paper.

The data is reliant on participants registering their gender in their MyECPR profile, and many still have not done so; hence the 'unknown' category –

where someone has either not completed the check box, or specified that they do not wish to say.

Participation levels seem to be fairly similar for the Joint Sessions and General Conference – both in the region of c.44% each year. There does not seem to be any pattern of increasing participation at this level.

At the Research Sessions, female participation has been the lowest. We would expect higher levels of participation at the graduate

events, but while the 2014 Graduate Student Conference saw a spike with nearly 70% of the participants being female, we saw a drop to below 50% again in 2016.

The numbers show that at events with comparably low threshold of participation, namely the conferences, women are better represented than at the Research Sessions, which are open to existing networks.

Women, it seems, still have difficulties becoming members of political science networks.

General Conference					
	2011	2013	2014*	2015	2016
Female	699	679	482	834	208
Male	887	876	636	1053	269
Unknown	397	451	360	252	60
<b>Total</b>	<b>1983</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>1478</b>	<b>2139</b>	<b>537</b>
Percentage Female of known gender	44%	44%	43%	44%	44%

\*General Conference changes from a biennial event to an annual one in 2014

Research Sessions					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Female	16	9	10	11	9
Male	43	16	29	26	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>25</b>
Percentage Female of known gender	27%	36%	26%	30%	36%

Summer School in Methods and Techniques					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Female			125	148	162
Male			98	152	138
Unknown			26	36	9
<b>Total</b>			<b>249</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>309</b>
Percentage Female of known gender			56%	49%	54%

Joint Sessions of Workshops					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Female	179	196	154	156	208
Male	236	253	162	202	269
Unknown	158	86	115	136	60
<b>Total</b>	<b>573</b>	<b>535</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>537</b>
Percentage Female of known gender	43%	44%	49%	43%	44%

Graduate Student Conference					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Female	138		143		140
Male	141		137		151
Unknown	97		125		27
<b>Total</b>	<b>376</b>		<b>405</b>		<b>318</b>
Percentage Female of known gender	49%		69%		47%

Winter School in Methods and Techniques					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Female			176	193	192
Male			144	160	169
Unknown			33	46	19
<b>Total</b>			<b>353</b>	<b>399</b>	<b>380</b>
Percentage Female of known gender			55%	54%	53%



## 6. Book and journal contributors

Publishing in an ECPR journal or book series is another key way that female scholars can engage with the organisation.

We do not currently have data on how many articles published within each volume are by women (this will be collected as of 2017), but we do have data on the number of women submitting manuscripts to our journals.

The figures are fairly low across all of the journals, though *EPS* reports the lowest, at only 13% in 2009. Interestingly, the percentage of authors submitting to *EPSR* were slightly higher, while there was a female co-editor (Donatella

della Porta, 2008–2013).

There were also two years (2012 and 2013) when the level of submissions was noticeably higher to *EPS*; this is when there were two female co-editors on this journal (there is now one). Hence, it would seem that female role models do encourage female political scientists.

When it comes to books published under the auspices of ECPR, we have data on published authors but not the number of manuscripts submitted. The percentage for the Comparative Politics series is very low at only 15%, but much healthier for ECPR Press.

Comparative Politics series: Published authors since the start of the series	
Total titles	63
Total Female*	16
Total Male	104
Percentage Female	15%

ECPR Press: Published authors, all series, since creation of the Press	
Total titles	123
Total Female*	180
Total Male	408
Percentage Female	44%

\*Includes female/male co-authored books

Articles submitted to <i>European Political Science Review (EPSR)</i>										
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Male			39	65	71	52	74	98	107	104
Female			18	29	27	23	29	36	35	29
Percentage Female			32%	31%	28%	30%	28%	27%	24%	22%

Articles submitted to <i>European Political Science (EPS)</i>										
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Male	50	47	36	40	68	65	50	47	52	52
Female	19	17	7	6	18	13	28	24	12	22
Percentage Female	28%	27%	16%	13%	21%	17%	36%	34%	19%	30%

Articles submitted to <i>European Journal of Political Research (EJPR)</i>										
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Male authors	131	164	156	195	202	226	217	187	192	256
Female	47	46	59	47	74	76	89	80	79	73
Percentage Female	26%	22%	27%	19%	27%	25%	20%	30%	29%	22%

Total articles submitted across all journals										
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Total articles	247	274	315	382	460	455	487	472	477	536
Total Female	66	63	84	82	119	112	146	140	126	124
Percentage Female	27%	23%	27%	32%	26%	25%	30%	30%	26%	23%

## 7. General ECPR engagement

MyECPR accounts (as subscribed to a mailing list and therefore considered engaged with the organisation)	
Female	6,559
Male	7,432
Unknown	5,841
<b>Total</b>	<b>18,832</b>
<b>Percentage female</b>	<b>33%</b>
Percentage Female of known gender	47%

Social Media followers, as at 15 August 2016			
	Female	Male	Unknown
Twitter Total followers 7,691	42%*	58%	
Facebook Total likes 5,690	47%	51%	2%

\*Twitter does not ask for account-holders' gender. Instead, it uses an algorithm, based on users' interests, to assign gender for the purposes of analytics and marketing. This data should therefore be interpreted loosely

## 8. Conclusions

Looking at grassroots participation in ECPR events, women comprise c.45% of all participants – slightly higher for the Graduate Student Conference (GSC). However, by the time it comes to organising a Workshop or Section, levels have fallen away to c.30% across the main events (higher for the GSC).

Participation in the ECPR's other key activity of publishing is startlingly low, particularly for the journals, with under 30% of all submitting authors being female.

What is more concerning, is that the figure has been on the decline for the past two years.

At the higher levels of the organisation, participation is lower still when it comes to editing a publication, delivering a plenary lecture, acting as an OR or being elected to the Executive Committee.