

A photograph of two young women in a classroom. The woman on the left is wearing glasses and a dark blazer, smiling and looking towards the right. The woman on the right is also wearing glasses and a dark blazer, smiling broadly. They appear to be engaged in a discussion or activity. The background shows a chalkboard and a wooden ledge.

ecpr

Membership Survey 2020

▪ ecpr.eu

1. General remarks and description of the sample

The survey was sent direct to all Official Representatives (ORs) and promoted across our community via links in emails and social media. Several questions were specifically for ORs. These have been reported below as such.

The response rate was rather low. Of our 320 ORs, only 116 completed the survey, along with 422 others.

Tables 1 & 2

We asked for respondents' age and gender. 58.8% were male – this is partly due to the fact that 68% ORs are men. Among the other respondents, 56% were male.

We found that age and gender are not

	%
-35	30.2
35–55	51.5
55+	21.8

	Female	Male
-35	44.9	55.1
35–55	43.7	56.3
55+	27.7	72.3

Permanent	53.4	Full time	75.8
Non-permanent	46.6	Part time	24.2

unrelated – among the older age group, almost 75% of respondents were male.

ORs are also older – only 5% are under 35, and that is reflected in the male dominance.

Table 3

We asked about career positions – to a large extent these measure the same as respondents' age. Female respondents were somewhat less likely to be senior than men.

Table 4

We asked respondents what type of contract they have with their university.

Again, this is strongly related to seniority (and therefore also to age). Of the senior academics 89% have a permanent contract, against only 26% of juniors and 7% of students.

Part-time contracts are most likely to be held by students: 62% have a part time contract or no employment contract at all.

Among senior scholars, 92% have a full-time contract.

Table 5

We asked respondents which country they work in. Those from outside Europe are older (i.e. more senior) than the average, and more of them than average are men.

		-35	35–55	+55	Female	Male
Student	26.7	68.4	10.5	2.2	30.6	23.6
Junior	22.2	29.7	24.4	3.3	28.6	18.4
Senior	51.1	1.9	65.1	94.6	40.8	50.8

		-35	35–55	+55	Female	Male
Western Europe	74.1	75.3	76.2	65.9	79.4	69.9
East-Central Europe	12.8	13.3	13.3	10.2	12.2	13.6
Outside Europe	13.2	11.3	10.5	23.9	8.5	16.4

Analysis of the data

Seniority, age and contract type are closely related, so we use only age as a background variable. We have analysed each question and present differences for the background variables if they are statistically significant. We check for age (seniority), gender and

region, and differences between ORs and other respondents. Given the dominance of the more senior group among ORs, seniority most often explains their differences of opinion. Only when there is a difference between ORs and other respondents not also visible through seniority do we mention explicitly the position of ORs.

2. The first event

Table 6

We asked respondents which ECPR event they first participated in. Interestingly, 14% of respondents have not (yet) participated in any. For the others, the Joint Sessions (JS) and General Conference (GC) are the two most important 'entries' into ECPR events, followed by the Methods School.

Among the older generation, the JS was the first event in which they discovered the ECPR; for the 35–55 age group, the Methods School (MS) is number one. For affiliates from East-Central Europe and

from outside Europe, the GC rather than the JS is the most important entry point.

Tables 7 & 8

We asked those who had never taken part in an event why. Lack of financial means was the key reason. Financial problems are a greater barrier to participation in East-Central Europe and outside Europe, and for women. Low numbers mean there is no significant difference between age groups. It also means we cannot look for variation between subgroups for each response; we have checked only for

'I do not have the financial means to participate in ECPR events' [Table 8].

Table 9

We asked the status of participants at the time they first participated in an event. The JS and GC are almost equally important (GC a bit more) entry points for early career scholars. The MS is of course the most important entry point for them, but also are the activities of Standing Groups, and especially their summer and winter schools.

Table 6: The first event in which affiliates have participated

	%	Region			Age			Gender	
		Western Europe	East-Central Europe	Outside Europe	-35	35–55	+55	Female	Male
Joint Sessions of Workshops	30.0	33.6	16.4	27.0	32.2	8.2	60.9	23.0	34.6
General Conference	28.5	27.2	36.1	28.6	33.3	25.9	18.5	33.3	25.4
Methods School	15.2	16.0	18.0	11.1	8.9	31.6	5.4	15.5	14.9
Graduate Conference	4.6	5.3	1.6	1.6					
Research Sessions	0.8	0.3	3.3	1.6					
Summer or Winter School of SG or RN	3.7	4.2	3.3	0.0					
Conference of a SG or RN	3.3	2.5	4.9	4.8					
I have yet to participate in an ECPR event	14.0	10.9	16.4	25.4	10.7	21.5	10.9	14.6	13.2

Table 7: Reasons for not yet participating in ECPR events

	%
I do not have the financial means for participating in ECPR events	63.5
My paper proposals have so far never been accepted	13.5
I do follow what happens in the ECPR but I do not intend to participate myself	9.6
I have yet to find something that might be interesting or useful for me	13.5

Table 8: Percentage mentioning lack of financial means as a reason for not yet participating in ECPR events (overall: 63.5%)

Western Europe	East-Central Europe	Outside Europe	Female	Male
53.8	62.5	90.0	70.0	60.7

Table 9: Status at the time of first participation

	Student	Junior	Senior
Joint Sessions of Workshops	54.9	28.8	16.3
General Conference	62.9	22.4	14.7
Methods School	89.6	10.4	
Graduate Conference	100.0		
Research Sessions	25.0	50.0	25.0
Summer or Winter School of a SG or RN	94.4	5.6	
Standing Group or Research Network Conference	64.7	23.5	11.8

3. Frequency of participation

Table 10

For each of the major events we asked about frequency of participation. The GC is the event in which people are far more likely to participate several times; the JS, too, has frequent participation.

Table 11

We built a simple additive scale measuring overall participation in the events currently on offer (JS, GC and MS) and Standing Group events. For the latter we count the summer and winter schools and conferences but give them together the same weight as each of the other events. The scale was then recoded to a range between 0 and 10.

The average frequency of participation

Table 10: Frequency of participation in ECPR events

	Never	Once	Several times
Joint Sessions of Workshops	37.3	25.6	37.1
General Conference	15.3	24.2	60.5
Methods School	61.0	22.4	16.6
Graduate Conference	85.9	11.8	2.4
Research Sessions	87.2	10.4	2.3
Summer or Winter School of a SG or RN	83.8	11.3	5.0
Standing Group or Research Network Conference	60.1	19.3	20.5

Table 11: Overall frequency of participation in ECPR events

Western Europe	East-Central Europe	Outside Europe	-35	35-55	+55
6.1	5.6	5.7	5.3	6.3	6.6

score for all respondents is 6.0. Table 11 breaks that figure down across regions and age groups (for other subgroups there is no significant difference). More frequent participants are generally older (more

advanced scholars) and participants from Western Europe are clearly different from those outside Europe but also from those in East-Central Europe. The difference is not large, but it is statistically significant.



4. Advantages of participating

Tables 12 & 13

We asked about the importance of several potential benefits of participating in ECPR events and activities. We found that networking beyond one's own country is clearly the most valued benefit.

To compare responses between subgroups, we take the percentage that answers 'important' as the reference point. In Table 13 we added overall frequency of participation (recoded into three groups) to the list of background variables.

'Possibilities to meet colleagues from other universities in my country' and 'Improving my methodological skills' are overall less important than the other items, but these responses show significant differences

Table 12: Benefits of participating in ECPR events

	Important	Neutral	Not important
Possibilities to meet colleagues from other countries	95.2	4.1	0.7
Building or expanding my academic networks	91.5	8.1	0.5
Receiving feedback on my work	82.8	16.0	1.2
Possibilities to meet colleagues from other universities in my country	52.4	30.5	17.0
Improving my methodological skills	49.9	38.2	11.9

between the subgroups.

Meeting people from other home-country universities is most important for West European participants, and more important for women than for men. Improving methodological skills is more important for East Central Europe, for

younger participants and (strongly) more for women.

Female participants also hope more than men to build and expand their academic networks. Meeting colleagues from other countries is somewhat more important for the more senior scholars.

Table 13: Variations in the benefits of participating in ECPR events

	Total	Region			Age			Gender		Frequency of participation		
		Western Europe	East-Central Europe	Outside Europe	-35	35-55	+55	Female	Male	Low	Medium	High
Possibilities to meet colleagues from other countries	95.2				89.9	97.0	98.1					
Building or expanding my academic networks	91.5							96.0	87.1			
Receiving feedback on my work	82.8											
Possibilities to meet colleagues from other universities in my country	52.4	55.1	36.7	36.4				61.1	46.3	88.1	97.8	99.1
Improving my methodological skills	49.9	47.9	66.0	43.5	69.7	53.1	31.3	61.4	41.5	62.9	45.9	43.5

5. Funding

Tables 14 & 15

We asked about the funding available to attend ECPR events and found that 80% of respondents receive funding from their own university or from other sources. Participants from East-Central Europe and from outside Europe receive less funding than those from Western Europe.

While there are no significant differences between the age groups, ORs are better

funded than the other respondents, and there is a clear link with the frequency of participation. Those who participate more frequently in ECPR activities receive funding more often; this probably means that having access to funds encourages event participation.

Those who receive funding generally have their travel and accommodation covered (Table 15). That is less the case for subsistence costs. When travel and accommodation are covered, we see

Table 15: Type of funding received

	Travel	Accommodation	Subsistence
Not	3.1	3.7	25.4
Partially	16.6	19.2	37.6
Full	80.3	77.1	37.0

a large gap between those with access to funding and those without and who must therefore cover all expenses themselves (or participate less, or not at all).

Table 14: Receiving funding for participating in ECPR events

	Total	Region			Status		Frequency of participation		
		Western Europe	East-Central Europe	Outside Europe	Official Representative	Other	Low	Medium	High
Yes, from my department or university	71.1	77.6	56.0	55.3	78.7	68.6	58.7	70.9	87.2
Yes, from other sources	11.0	10.7	10.0	10.6	13.9	10.1	9.5	14.9	8.3
No. I generally have to cover my expenses myself	17.9	11.7	34.0	34.0	7.4	21.3	31.7	14.2	4.6

6. Other organisations

Table 16

We asked whether respondents also take part in other organisations' activities and found that they certainly do. They are most likely to attend events run by national political science associations, followed by APSA, IPSA, ISA and EPSA.

The 'multiple participants' (measured by a sum scale) are the older groups and hence also the ORs. There is no significant overlap with gender or region but a significant correlation of .38 between frequency of participation in ECPR events and participation in events run by other organisations.

Table 16: Participating events run by other organisations

	Often	Sometimes	Never
Your national political science association	37.1	40.5	22.4
American Political Science Association (APSA)	10.3	30.5	59.2
International Political Science Association (IPSA)	6.9	38.8	54.3
International Studies Association (ISA)	6.2	16.6	77.2
European Political Science Association (EPSA)	5.3	17.8	76.9
Council for European Studies (CES)	5.1	25.3	69.7
The Academic Association for Contemporary European Studies (JACES)	3.1	15.1	81.8
European International Studies Association (EISA)	2.5	10.9	86.6
International Sociological Association (ISA)	0.6	9.7	89.6

7. Social media and communication

Tables 17, 18 & 19

We asked respondents how they receive ECPR information. Two-thirds receive and read the news bulletins. Younger generations are more likely to do so – 72% of those under 35 receive and read them both, while only 36% of those over 55 do. Among ORs, only 42% receive and read the news bulletins.

The numbers are much lower when we ask about following the ECPR on social media (see Table 18), though Twitter is the most popular platform.

Twitter is ECPR's most popular social media platform overall, but there are striking differences between the different subgroups. Table 19 compares the percentage of those who say they follow 'actively' or 'once in a while'. It is

no surprise that age matters, but that is actually only the case for Twitter, and strongly so. And ORs are also less active on social media.

Women are more active on the three media, especially on Facebook and LinkedIn. There is also an important regional difference, with East-Central European respondents less active on Twitter and much more on Facebook.

Table 17: Receiving and reading ECPR's e-Bulletins

	%
I receive them and read them both	64.8
I receive them but only read the jobs bulletin	7.8
I receive them and only read the news bulletin	8.8
I receive them but do not read either	7.0
I do not receive them	11.7
Total	100.0

Table 18: Following ECPR on social media

	Actively	Once in a while	Never
Twitter	20.1	28.7	51.2
Facebook	5.8	19.0	75.2
LinkedIn	2.3	13.3	84.4

Table 19: Following social media 'actively' or 'once in a while'

	Total	Region			Age			Gender	
		Western Europe	East-Central Europe	Outside Europe	-35	35-55	+55	Female	Male
Twitter	48.8	50.4	35.8	46.5	61.3	49.8	25.0	51.0	48.1
Facebook	24.8	19.5	50.0	23.7	28.1	23.2	24.2	28.1	22.9
LinkedIn	15.6	12.9	19.6	19.3	17.8	13.2	16.2	20.2	13.0



8. Standing Groups

Tables 20 & 21

We asked about involvement in ECPR Standing Groups and Research Networks. Nearly a third of respondents are not

members of a SG or RN, though 45% of them have joined more than one. There are differences between age groups, but they are not perfectly linear. More junior scholars do, however, tend to participate less in the Standing Groups.

That tendency is strongly reflected in the ORs' score: 81% are members of at least one Standing Group, against 65% of the others. The strongest differences are, however, between the frequent and less frequent participants in ECPR events.

Table 20: Membership of Standing Groups and Research Networks

	%
Not a member	30.9
Member of one Standing Group or Research Network	24.1
Member of several Standing Groups or Research Networks	45.0
Total	100.0

Table 21: Variations in membership of Standing Groups and Research Networks

	Age			Frequency of participation		
	-35	35-55	+55	Low	Medium	High
No Standing Group or Research Network	42.4	25.1	28.9	46.7	15.0	10.0
One Standing Group or Research Network	19.4	24.3	31.1	20.5	27.1	23.4
Several Standing Groups or Research Networks	38.8	50.6	40.0	32.8	57.9	66.4

9. What should ECPR do?

Table 22

We asked respondents to evaluate the relative importance of our current activities. Table 22 presents the answers, with activities ranked from most to least important. Events and networking are at the top; methods training and publications are ranked somewhat lower.

More political activities like being a leading example on gender equality and lobbying public authorities are seen as less important; defending academic freedom a little more so.

Offering funding to help scholars participate in our events is also seen as fairly important.

For each of these items, we asked whether respondents were satisfied with the way each activity is realised by the ECPR.

Table 23

Table 23 shows the levels of satisfaction voiced by those who ticked 'important' on the previous question.

The overall picture is one of great satisfaction with the conferences and the creation of a community. For our other activities, opinion is more neutral, with only the offering of funding receiving a few more negative evaluations.

To compare the evaluation of ECPR activities between the different groups, we use the percentage for 'important' as the reference point.

Table 24

Table 24 shows that there are indeed important and relevant variations,

particularly between age groups. Younger and more junior scholars are more in favour of our offering funding, defending academic freedom, defending gender equality, lobbying public authorities and offering methods training.

Female scholars are more in favour of defending gender equality and offering funding. Scholars from East-Central Europe score quite low on defending gender equality and higher (together with those from outside Europe) on publications.

Very active participants in ECPR events value the organisation of events extremely highly.

After evaluating ECPR's current activities, we asked respondents to indicate which other activities we might develop in the future – first ticking one or more possibilities from a list.

Table 22: Importance of ECPR's different activities

	Important	Neutral	Not important
Organise events like the Joint Sessions and the General Conference	93.8	5.4	0.8
Allow for networking between political science researchers	92.7	6.5	0.8
Create an active community of political scientists	85.2	13.9	0.8
Offer funding to scholars who would otherwise not be able to participate in ECPR activities	78.3	19.7	2.1
Speak out actively to defend academic freedom	77.0	19.5	3.5
Offer methods training	76.1	20.0	4.0
Publish journals and books	64.9	31.3	6.9
Be a leading example on gender equality	62.0	28.8	9.2
Lobby national and international public authorities on policies related to scientific research	50.5	40.7	8.8

Table 23: Satisfaction with ECPR's different activities

	Satisfied	Neutral	Not satisfied
Organise events like the Joint Sessions and the General Conference	80.0	16.8	3.2
Allow for networking between political science researchers	74.2	22.3	3.5
Create an active community of political scientists	64.3	31.4	4.3
Offer funding to scholars who would otherwise not be able to participate in ECPR activities	31.0	51.7	17.3
Speak out actively to defend academic freedom	27.8	62.6	9.6
Offer methods training	73.4	24.9	1.8
Publish journals and books	66.6	31.4	2.1
Be a leading example on gender equality	37.3	52.7	10.0
Lobby national and international public authorities on policies related to scientific research	19.1	69.5	11.4

Table 24: Variation in the degree of importance of ECPR activities (percentage rated 'important')

	Total	Region			Age			Gender		Frequency of participation		
		Western Europe	East-Central Europe	Outside Europe	-35	35-55	+55	Female	Male	Low	Med	High
Organise events like the Joint Sessions and the General Conference	93.8									87.4	97.7	100.0
Allow for networking between political science researchers	92.7											
Create an active community of political scientists	85.2											
Offer funding to scholars who would otherwise not be able to participate in ECPR activities	78.3				85.2	76.5	72.2	84.7	73.8			
Speak out actively to defend academic freedom	77.0				80.9	78.7	65.9					
Offer methods training	76.1				83.1	75.2	67.4					
Publish journals and books	64.9	57.9	64.8	75.0								
Be a leading example on gender equality	62.0	62.9	46.7	65.5	73.0	60.6	48.3	77.7	50.4			
Lobby national and international public authorities on policies related to scientific research	50.5				52.1	54.6	36.0					

Tables 25 & 26

Table 25 ranks potential ECPR activities from high to low. Offering training to young academics is number one, followed by offering access to resources and data. We once again see differences in response between the age groups. The more junior scholars are significantly more in favour of almost all suggested activities and – of course – especially of offering specific opportunities for junior academics.

Respondents from East-Central Europe and from outside Europe place more value on

access to data and resources, and funding to engage in their own research. The latter is also more valued by female scholars. Frequent ECPR participants tend to be less in favour of developing new activities; events appear to be sufficient for them.

These two questions about what the ECPR is currently doing, and about what it might do in the future, were followed by an open question where respondents could contribute additional ideas.

While several respondents warn us that we might already be doing too much, there are many concrete suggestions.

Most of them refer to support that ECPR might offer, especially for young scholars, those from less privileged institutions, and those from the Global South. There are also suggestions for offering services on teaching, for more training, for organising a job fair, and for greater collaboration with other political science associations.

Several respondents urge ECPR to be more politically active, taking a position, or taking action, to defend academic freedom, protect scholars against the big publishers, to champion (mostly younger) scholars in precarious academic positions, and to defend gender equality.

Table 25: Which other tasks and activities should ECPR develop?

	%
Support, train and offer specific opportunities for junior academics.	61.9
Offer access to resources and data	54.5
Offer support with research funding applications	41.4
Offer funding to help scholars engage in their own research	38.3
Develop a preprint server where papers can be uploaded and receive comments from colleagues	32.0
Support and develop the next generation of political scientists by funding and giving grants to undergraduates	28.6
Offer funding to scholars to attend other organisations' activities	19.7

Table 26: Variation in support for the development of other ECPR activities

	Total	Region			Age			Gender		Frequency of participation		
		Western Europe	East-Central Europe	Outside Europe	-35	35–55	+55	Female	Male	Low	Med	High
Support, train and offer specific opportunities for junior academics.	61.9				71.6	59.3	54.1					
Offer access to resources and data	54.5	53.3	69.4	59.4								
Offer support with research funding applications	41.4				48.1	40.2	34.7			52.8	42.2	37.6
Offer funding to help scholars engage in their own research	38.3	16.7	27.4	23.4	53.1	35.1	23.5	46.7	33.0	55.1	37.8	26.6
Develop a preprint server where papers can be uploaded and receive comments from colleagues	32.0											
Support and develop the next generation of political scientists by funding and giving grants to undergraduates	28.6				34.0	29.3	18.4					
Offer funding to scholars to attend other organisations' activities	19.7				29.6	17.0	11.2			32.3	14.8	11.0

10. ECPR membership

Tables 27, 28 & 29

We asked respondents (not the ORs) whether their institution is an ECPR member. For 75% of respondents that is indeed the case. We also reached a good number of respondents who do not belong to membership institutions. Interestingly, 6.5% of respondents who are close enough to ECPR to fill in a questionnaire do not know whether they work or study at a member institution.

If respondents were not from a member institution or do not know whether they are, we asked whether their institution

has been a member in the past. Again, a surprisingly high 38% do not know.

We also asked those from member institutions whether they know who their OR is. 42% do not know.

To those from institutions with lapsed membership, we asked why they had stopped being members. Several respondents said they did not know, but the most frequently cited reasons related to cost: noting that the fee is too high, or there were budget cuts, or it doesn't represent good value for money.

Other answers refer to the fact that the

university is not in Europe, or that there are not enough political scientists in the department to make membership cost effective. Not being a member can also be almost an accident: the professor who was responsible has retired, for example.

Being a member and renewing the membership annually is a routine decision in many cases (Table 30); there are, however, also institutions where discussions about being or remaining a member are taking place. The two most important topics in these discussions are the level of the fee and the number of scholars that might profit from membership.

Table 27: Is your institution an ECPR member?

	%
Yes	75.4
No	18.1
I do not know	6.5
Total	100.0

Table 28: Has your institution been an ECPR member in the past?

	%
Yes	8.8
No	52.7
I do not know	38.5
Total	100.0

Table 29: Do you know who your Official Representative is?

	%
Yes	57.7
No	42.3
Total	100.0



Tables 30, 31, 32 & 33

We asked whether an alternative membership model would be better for the ECPR. The answers are quite mixed – only 10% were in favour of a pure

individual membership model, the others split between the current institutional membership and a mixed model.

There are no significant differences between the subgroups, except for 'Region'.

The current model is the preferred one for Western Europe but not for the other regions, where the mixed model scores higher, especially among respondents from outside Europe who also score somewhat higher for individual membership.

Table 30: Are there conversations about joining or leaving ECPR, or remaining an ECPR member?

	%
No	71.5
Yes, sometimes	21.7
Yes, regularly	6.8
Total	100.0

Table 31: Content of discussions about ECPR membership

	%
The price of the membership fee	81.3
The number of scholars in my institution that might profit from the membership	73.1
The price of event fees	40.0
The type of activities offered by ECPR	38.1
The fact that other organisations are more important for us	15.7
ECPR's focus on specific theoretical or methodological approaches	9.0
The quality of ECPR publications	6.0

Table 32: Which membership model would be best?

	%
The current institutional membership is a good model	46.8
Individual membership is a better model	10.0
A mix of individual and institutional membership could work well to deliver	40.0
ECPR benefits	43.1
Total	100.0

Table 33: Regional variations in preferences for a membership model

	Western Europe	East-Central Europe	Outside Europe
The current institutional membership is a good model	51.3	43.2	23.2
Individual membership is a better model	8.6	9.6	16.1
A mix of individual and institutional membership could work well to deliver ECPR benefits	40.1	47.2	60.7



12. Official representatives

Tables 36, 37 & 38

We asked the Official Representatives most of the same questions as we did the other respondents. In some cases, ORs gave answers that differed from the 'general public'. This is directly related to the fact that the ORs are generally more senior and that a majority of them are men.

A few questions were asked to ORs only, about how they see their role. They told us that making sure the membership fee is being paid and informing colleagues about events, activities and possibilities for funding are their most / very important

tasks. They place less importance on EC elections, nominations for prizes, and participating in Council meetings. Responses paint a picture of ORs being the contact point in their department, but not of them playing an active role in ECPR's organisation.

These opinions do not differ significantly between age groups or gender. There are, however, geographical differences.

For the three items rated of lowest importance overall, ORs outside Western Europe (Table 37) rate these items even lower. That is logical for non-European

members, since many are associate members and do not have voting rights. The lack of attention for nominating candidates for prizes in East Central Europe and outside Europe, however, is a matter of concern.

A second question for the ORs presented a few statements about their commitment to ECPR and how they receive the information they need. Table 38 presents the results, which show that ORs basically agree with each statement, with hardly any variation. Interestingly, though, the item ranked lowest is knowledge of the role of an Official Representative.

Table 36: How do ORs perceive their role in ECPR?

	Important	Neutral	Not important
Making sure that the annual membership fee is being paid	90.7	8.4	0.9
Encouraging my colleagues to participate in ECPR activities	78.7	17.6	3.7
Making sure that my colleagues are informed about ECPR activities and events	78.5	18.7	2.8
Informing young scholars about the possibilities to receive funding for attending ECPR activities	73.8	22.4	3.7
Participating in Executive Committee elections	57.0	34.6	8.4
Participating in ECPR Council meetings	46.3	45.4	8.3
Nominating candidates for ECPR prizes	27.4	56.6	16.0

Table 37: Regional variation in the perception of an OR's role

	Overall % important	Western Europe	Eastern Europe	Outside Europe
Participating in Executive Committee elections	57.0	63.0	60.0	29.4
Participating in ECPR Council meetings	46.3	51.4	53.3	17.6
Nominating candidates for ECPR prizes	27.4	34.7	6.7	11.8

Table 38: ORs' opinions about ECPR

	Agree	Neutral	Do not agree
I know where to find information about ECPR	89.0	10.1	0.9
I believe that ECPR membership is a good thing for my institution and its scholars	88.9	11.1	0.0
I am happy with the level and frequency of information that I receive from ECPR	78.0	17.4	4.6
I approve of ECPR's mission	77.6	22.4	0.0
I would recommend ECPR membership to other institutions	77.1	22.0	0.9
I know what my role as Official Representative of the ECPR means	66.1	31.2	2.8

12. Conclusions

For many of the questions posed, response patterns are clear. But the answers we received reveal some striking differences that paint a more nuanced picture of the ECPR community – one that might call for policies better tailored to these subgroups' needs and demands.

Age matters

First, the age of our affiliates matters, because it tells us at which stage they are in their academic career. Younger and early career scholars have reported very specific opinions and expectations.

Young scholars are more likely to attend the General Conference before the Joint Sessions, while students' 'entry point' into ECPR is often taking part in the summer or winter schools of our Standing Groups.

Younger scholars are

- less likely to participate in ECPR events and those of other associations
- more likely to need to develop their methodological skills and therefore to expect methodological training
- less likely to be members of

one or more Standing Groups

- more active on social media, especially on Twitter
- in favour of more funding: grants for participation, and funding to support their own research
- more in favour of a more politically active ECPR, defending academic freedom and gender equality

Gender differences

Men and women responded differently to certain questions. This is partly because female scholars in our sample tended to be younger than the men. The first event women attend is more likely to be the General Conference than the Joint Sessions.

Female scholars are

- in greater need of financial support
- more in favour of an ECPR that defends gender equality
- more open to online meetings and training

- willing to limit their travel

Variation by geography

The geographical region in which respondents work makes a difference. Western Europe and East-Central Europe are not two homogenous blocks, but there are striking variations between them.

Scholars from East-Central Europe are

- more likely to take part in the General Conference before either the Methods School or the Joint Sessions
- less likely to participate in events generally
- less likely to receive funding from their universities and therefore more in need of financial support
- more active on Facebook and less on Twitter
- less supportive of an ECPR defending gender equality
- more likely to favour an ECPR that gives access to data and resources, and help for publishing

