



ecpr

Gender Study 2019

Introduction and data

We are delighted to publish for the fourth consecutive year, our study into the participation and representation of women across all ECPR activities, governance and operations. The 2019 Study follows the same format as previous years, allowing comparison of trends and also a review of progress against the markers set by the Gender Equality Plan (GEP) published by the Executive Committee in 2018.

The Study is therefore divided into the following sections:

1. Grassroots participation

- a. MyECPR account holders and social media followers
- b. Authors submitting to, and publishing in, journals and book series
- c. Participation at events

2. Shaping ECPR activities

- a. Section Chairs and / or Workshop Directors
- b. Methods School Instructors, Teaching Assistants, Convenors and Advisory Board
- c. Editors and Editorial Board members of all publications

3. High-profile participation and recognition

- a. Plenary lecturers and Roundtable speakers at the Joint Sessions and General Conference
- b. Prize nominees and recipients

4. Governance and operations

- a. Executive Committee members
- b. Speaker of Council
- c. Official Representatives
- d. Standing Group and Research Network Steering Committee Members
- e. ECPR staff and operational management

Collecting and processing the data

Data relating to event participation and some other areas of interaction with the organisation have been drawn from the MyECPR database, where users are invited to note their gender within their profile.

Where users have not noted their gender, or have chosen not to specify, these

groups are identified as 'unknown' and 'undisclosed' respectively.

Data relating to publishing trends have been collected by the respective editorial teams through online peer review platforms and their own administrative systems, and then reported annually to our Publications Subcommittee.

Other data, such as prize recipients and editors of publications, are either already published at www.ecpr.eu or, as with members of Standing Group and Research Network Steering Committee Convenors, held in our administrative systems.

All data is collected, stored and processed in line with [our Privacy Policy](#).

Summary of data, and comparisons with 2018

The data from 2019 shows some significant areas of improvement on 2018, alongside some small areas of decline in participation and representation. Under each section below is the target set in the Gender Equality Plan (GEP) and the progress made in 2019 against that

Staffing and operational leadership

The area where women outnumber men most significantly is in the operational leadership at ECPR HQ, where the appointment of Tanja Munro as Director in September 2019 and a redistribution of roles on the Management Group led to a composition of four women and one man. Overall, ECPR staffing remains at 74% women.

Training

Attendance at the Methods School remains an area where female participation outweighs male; 55% of participants across the Winter and Summer Schools in 2019 were women, which is a continuation of the trend we have seen at graduate and early career-focused events since the study began in 2016.

Gender Equality Plan target and action → for training

- To increase the proportion of female Academic Convenors, Methods School Instructors, and members of the Methods School Academic Advisory Board

- The Methods School leadership remains predominantly male. All Academic Convenors, and all but one member of the Academic Advisory Board, are men. This year did, however, see some improvement in the representation of women as Instructors at the Methods School, with a small increase to 36% on 2018's figures. Conversely though, 2019 saw a reduction in women employed in Teaching Assistant roles at the Summer and Winter Schools – a drop from an average of 50% (2016–2018) to 37%.

Events

Participation at the Joint Sessions and General Conference remain relatively stable at 43% for both events. These figures remain the same for the JS against 2018, but represent a small drop for the GC.

Gender Equality Plan targets and actions → for events

- To create a more equal gender distribution of Workshop Directors at the Joint Sessions and of Section Chairs at the General Conference
- The percentage of women acting as General Conference Section Chairs

continues to increase year on year, rising to 47% in 2019 – an increase of 8% on 2018 and 11% on 2016. The number of female Workshop Directors at the 2019 Joint Sessions was 48%, an increase overall of 12% against 2016 when we started collecting this data.

- To create a more equal gender distribution of speakers at plenary events of the Joint Sessions of Workshops and the General Conference

- Invited Roundtable speakers at the General Conference increased from 53% to 68% in 2019, and all Roundtable Chairs at the Wrocław General Conference were women. This is particularly noticeable against the 2016 figure of 24% and shows considerable progress in this area. The Stein Rokkan Lecture was delivered by a woman in 2019, and the General Conference plenary by a man.

Publishing

A key area of improvement of female representation is across the editorial boards of ECPR journals – from 2016 we have seen an increase of 24%, taking the average

across all journals to 53%. Since the 2018 Publications Retreat, all editorial teams have been working on cross-publication initiatives to increase the numbers of women submitting to, and being published within, our journals and book series. This is starting to bear fruit, and in 2019 we saw an increase across all journals of 5% and 6% respectively on the 2018 figures.

Gender Equality Plan targets ☉ and actions → for publications

- ☉ **To achieve gender balance among editors of journals by the end of 2020**
- As at the end of 2019 this target has been achieved. 50% of all journal editors are women, or 40% of all editors of journals and book series. Whilst there is not a gender balance on every publication (the PDY editorial team, notably, is still all-male), the picture across the portfolio is positive and improving.

☉ **To establish a gender balance amongst the referees of articles submitted to journals by the end of 2020**

- All editorial teams began work on improving this in earnest after the 2019 Retreat. The data for 2020 reflects their initiatives, with an improvement from 28% to 34% female reviewers.

particular for the Stein Rokkan Prize, Lifetime Achievement Award and Hedley Bull Prize

- The data for 2019 shows there is still an under-representation of women in this area of activity, so work will continue to improve the balance.

Governance

The number of women on the ECPR Executive Committee increased by one in 2019 when Oddbjørn Knutsen sadly passed away and was replaced by Hana Kubátová, bringing the composition to five women and seven men.

Gender Equality Plan target ☉ and action → for governance

- ☉ **To appoint a higher proportion of women to the Executive Committee**
- 2019 saw the highest composition of women on the Executive Committee in ECPR's history, nearly reaching parity.

Prizes

In 2019 we awarded the Stein Rokkan, Rudolf Wildenmann, Jean Blondel, Hans Daalder and Hedley Bull Prizes. The percentage of women being nominated fell in 2019 to 32% from 51% in 2018 across all prizes, and only one prize – the Jean Blondel PhD Prize – was awarded to a woman.

Gender Equality Plan target ☉ and action → for prizes

- ☉ **To achieve a more equal gender distribution of prizewinners, in**



	2016	2017	2018	2019	Variance 2018–2019
MyECPR account holders	no data	49%	48%	47%	down 1 %
Authors submitting to journals	26%	30%	25%	30%	up 5%
Published authors in journals	35%	30%	28%	34%	up 6%
Published authors in books	36% / 67%	14% / 100%	47% / 0%	37% / 67%	down 10% / up 67%
Participation in Joint Sessions	44%	40%	43%	43%	no change
Participation in General Conference	44%	44%	45%	41%	down 4%
Attendance at a Methods School	51%	53%	51%	53%	up 2%

Joint Sessions Workshop Directors	36%	38%	45%	48%	up 5%
General Conference Section Chairs	36%	44%	39%	47%	up 8%
Methods School Instructors	26%	26%	28%	35%	up 7%
Methods School Academic Convenors and Advisory Board	14%	14%	14%	14%	no change
Editors of all publications	39%	38%	37%	40%	up 2%
Editorial Board members of all publications	29%	47%	52%	53%	up 1%

Delivered Stein Rokkan Lecture at Joint Sessions or General Conference Plenary Lecture	0	1	0	1	up 1
Roundtable participants at the General Conference	24%	60%	53%	70%	up 17%
Prize nominees	41%	43%	51%	32%	down 19%
Prizewinners	50%	60%	50%	25%	down 25%

Executive Committee members	25%	25%	33%	42%	increase by 9%
Speaker of Council	0%	0%	0%	0%	no change
Official Representatives	33%	37%	39%	37%	down 2%
Standing Group Convenors	40%	44%	50%	52%	up 2%
ECPR staff, including managers	76%	72%	74%	74%	no change
Management staff at ECPR, including Director	50%	50%	50%	80%	up 30%

*Hana Kubátová replaced Oddbjørn Knutsen in September 2019



1. Grassroots participation

a. MyECPR account holders and social media followers

We have measured the most basic level of engagement with the organisation by the number of active MyECPR accounts held by men versus women. Given that any person participating in an ECPR event or wishing to sign up to one of the email lists must have an account, this data, if limited to those accounts which have been accessed since 2018, gives us a sense of the size of the active ECPR community.

As was seen last year, both the total number and percentage of female users continued to fall slightly against the previous year. In 2018 the percentage of women from member institutions with MyECPR accounts increased by 5% to 54%, but 2019 saw this fall to 47%.

Social media is a key way we share information with the ECPR community and is therefore another metric of basic engagement with the organisation. In comparing data from Facebook and Twitter, it must be noted that Twitter does not ask for account-holders' gender. Instead, it uses an algorithm, based on the content of users' tweets, to assign gender for the purposes of analytics and marketing. Another consideration is that many of our Twitter followers are accounts belonging to University departments, NGOs and the like, which may have several user admins of different gender. Twitter generated gender data cannot, therefore, be treated as being scientifically accurate. Based on this data the percentage of

female Twitter accounts has grown to 50% in 2019, against 35% in 2018; while Facebook has stayed relatively stable.

However, with the aim of gaining a clearer picture, we compared the Twitter-generated data with the results of an online tool at www.proporti.onl, which uses, amongst other things, pronouns in profile descriptions and user names, to determine account-holders' gender. It also ignores (typically, institutional) accounts which are gender non-specific.

Using this more accurate profiling method, the picture is slightly less positive, suggesting that 43% of our followers are female.

	MyECPR account holders								
	Last log-in 2016 onwards			Last log-in 2017 onwards			Last log-in 2018 onwards		
	All users	From Member institutions	From non-Member institutions	All users	From Member institutions	From non-Member institutions	All users	From Member institutions	From non-Member institutions
Female	7,344	4,525	2,819	8,595	6,104	2,401	8,048	5,249	2,799
Male	7,590	4,798	2,792	9,198	5,151	4,047	8,906	5,922	2,984
Undisclosed	708	414	294	883	477	356	891	530	361
Unknown	4,508	3,238	1,270	541	322	219	1,076	359	717
Total	20,150	12,975	7,175	19,217	12,054	7,023	18,921	12,060	6,861
% female of known gender	49%	49%	50%	48%	54%	37%	47%	47%	48%

	Social media followers					
	at 15 August 2016		at 5 June 2018		at 30 April 2019	
	Twitter	Facebook	Twitter	Facebook	Twitter	Facebook
Female	3,230	2,674	4,435	3,094	7,748	3,405
Male	4,461	3,016	8,236	3,292	7,747	3,547
Unknown				198		142
Total	7,691	5,690	12,671	6,584	15,495	7,094
% female	42%*	47%	35%*	47%	50%*	48%

*Data taken from Twitter audience insights, and subject to caveats listed above

b. Authors submitting to, and publishing in, journals and book series

Publishing in our journals

Data on the number of women submitting to and being published in our journals provides a useful insight into the representation of women in this key part of academic life in our community. Data for 'submitted' and 'published' articles relates to articles submitted to and published in the journal during the calendar year 2019. Because of the time elapsed between submission and publication of an article, the cohort of submitted versus published authors is likely to differ to some degree.

As in previous years there are some differences in how each journal reports the gender composition of authors: the *EJPR* and *EPSR* report the lead / submitting author only, while *EPS* and *PRX* record all authors of each article.

As we have reported in each Gender Study, women are consistently under-represented as submitted and published authors across our journals portfolio. As an average across all journals we have seen small increases in women submitting year on year, growing steadily from 23% in 2015 to 30% in 2019 (albeit with a drop to 25% in 2018); the percentage of published female authors has not seen the same growth, reporting at 35% in 2015, dropping to 28% in 2018 and recovering to 34% in 2019. These trends, while not dissimilar to other journals of our profession, have caused concern and this has been a focus of discussion for the Executive Committee and our journal editors.

In 2019, the annual Publications Retreat, which brings together all editorial teams across our full publishing programme, focussed on this issue. As a result,

editorial teams of the *EJPR*, *EPSR* and *EPS* looked deeper into their data and, in April 2020, published a symposium on the issue of gender bias in our professional journal, *EPS*.

To investigate deeper, in 2018 we began collecting data on the number of women carrying out reviews for the journals. At the 2019 Retreat, several initiatives were agreed upon to increase the number of women being invited to review submitted articles, though it was noted that the relatively smaller pool of female reviewers means that these scholars would experience added pressure on their time.

Despite this we are happy to report that we have indeed seen an increase in the number of women agreeing to carry out reviews, up from 27% in 2018 to 34% in 2019.

European Journal of Political Research (EJPR)*												
	2015		2016		2017		2018			2019		
	Submitted	Published	Submitted	Published	Submitted	Published	Submitted	Published	Reviewers (accepted)	Submitted	Published	Reviewers (accepted)
Female	73	18	96	14	128	11	110	18	157	141	17	183
Male	256	30	262	316	277	35	302	31	382	289	40	357
Total	329	48	358	45	405	46	415	49	539	433	57	541
% female	22%	37%	27%	31%	31%	23%	27%	37%	29%	33%	30%	34%

*All EJPR figures refer to lead / submitting author only

Political Data Yearbook (PDY) of the EJPR										
	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
	Authors		Authors		Authors		Authors		Authors	
Female	8		9		12		19		19	
Male	29		28		25		37		37	
Total	37		37		37		56		56	
% female	22%		24%		32%		34%		34%	

European Political Science Review (EPSR)												
	2015*		2016*		2017*		2018**			2019*		
	Submitted	Published	Submitted	Published	Submitted	Published	Submitted	Published	Reviewers (accepted)	Submitted	Published	Reviewers (accepted)
Female	29	10	36	9	59	6	37	10	60	62	10	119
Male	104	16	110	18	136	22	133	38	176	128	19	209
Total	133	26	146	27	195	28	170	48	236	190	29	328
% female	22%	38%	25%	33%	30%	21%	22%	21%	25%	33%	34%	36%

*Figures refer to gender of lead / submitting author of each published manuscript **Figures include all co-authors of a manuscript

European Political Science (EPS)												
	2015		2016		2017		2018			2019**		
	Submitted	Published	Submitted	Published	Submitted	Published	Submitted	Published	Reviewers (accepted)	Submitted	Published	Reviewers (accepted)
Female	22	19	27	25	17	19	20	21	24	22	29	13
Male	52	30	69	29	63	27	80	53	59	64	62	32
Total	74	49	96	54	80	46	100	74	83	86	91	45
% female	30%	39%*	28%	46%*	21%	41%*	20%	28%*	29%	26%	32%	29%

*Number of articles published includes book reviews **Figures refer to all authors of each article

Political Research Exchange (PRX)*						
	2018			2019		
	Submitted	Published	Reviewers accepted	Submitted	Published	Reviewers accepted
Female	12		8	15	3	22
Male	26		36	54	13	64
Total	38		44	69	16	86
% female	32%		18%	21%	19%	26%

*Figures refer to all authors of each article

All journals														
	2015		2016		2017		2018		2018			2019		
	Submitted	Published	Submitted	Published	Submitted	Published	Submitted	Published	Submitted	Published	Reviewers	Submitted	Published	Reviewers
Female	132	56	27	25	17	19	179	48	179	48	249	240	59	337
Male	441	105	69	29	63	27	541	122	541	122	653	535	174	662
Total	573	161	96	54	77	46	720	170	720	170	902	777	233	999
% female	23%	35%	28%	46%	22%	41%	25%	28%	25%	28%	27%	30%	34%	34%

Publishing in books

OUP Comparative Politics series, and ECPR Press

Currently we collect data only on the number of women authors being published across the ECPR Press and Comparative Politics book series, but

not on the gender of authors of all submitted manuscripts.

With such a small number of books published under the Comparative Politics series in particular, the percentages can vary wildly year on year. However, taking both outlets together, the percentage of books with a female

author or editor sits at between 38% and 43%; with 2019 seeing a small increase.

Looking at a breakdown of authorship since 2016, of the 62 books published, 20 had a single male author, 17 were all-male edited collections, and 12 had a single female author.

ECPR Press	Start of series until 2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Co-authored / edited: all male	13	4	1	4	5
Co-authored / edited: all female	4	0	0	0	3
Co-authored / edited: mixed	17	1	1	2	1
Single-author / editor: male	47	5	5	5	2
Single-author / editor: female	18	4	0	6	0
Total books published	99	14	7	17	11
% of books with female author / editor	39%	36%	14%	47%	37%

Comparative Politics Series	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Co-authored / edited: all male	1	1	1	0	2	0
Co-authored / edited: all female	0	0	0	0	0	0
Co-authored / edited: mixed	0	0	1	2	0	2
Single-author / editor: male	1	0	0	0	2	1
Single-author / editor: female	1	0	1	1	0	0
Total books published	3	1	3	3	4	3
% of books with female author / editor	33%	0%	67%	100%	0%	67%



c. Participation at events

Event participation statistics are a good indicator of how different groups of scholars engage with our organisation. As reported in previous years, the percentage of women attending events designed for graduates and early career researchers is consistently higher than for the Joint Sessions and General Conference, at an average of 54% for both the Methods School and the Graduate

Student Conference, which ran biennially until 2016.

Participation of women in the Joint Sessions and General Conference, however, sits at around 10% below this – an average of 44% for both events since we began collecting data.

The figures in this report for events

with a competitive application process (i.e. the Joint Sessions and General Conference) relate to the number of participants who had a paper accepted and then paid the registration fee.

We do not currently include data on submitted vs accepted papers for these events, but this too would yield interesting data so we aim to include it in future years.

Joint Sessions of Workshops								
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Female	179	196	154	156	208	123	194	191
Male	236	253	162	202	269	181	256	248
Not disclosed						5	2	9
Not known	158	86	115	136	60	84	8	
Total	573	535	431	494	537	393	460	448
% female of known gender	43%	44%	49%	43%	44%	40%	43%	43%

General Conference*							
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Female	699	679	482	834	702	1,054	749
Male	887	876	636	1053	882	1,285	999
Not disclosed					53	77	56
Not known	397	451	360	252	367	45	6
Total	1,983	2,006	1,478	2,139	2,004	2,461	1810
% female of known gender	44%	44%	43%	44%	44%	45%	43%

*Changes from a biennial event to an annual one in 2014

Winter School in Methods and Techniques*						
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Female	176	193	192	179	205	228
Male	144	160	169	153	186	191
Not disclosed				8	7	19
Not known	33	46	19	50	1	
Total	353	399	380	390	399	438
% female of known gender	55%	54%	53%	54%	52%	54%

*Data unavailable for 2012 and 2013

Summer School in Methods and Techniques*						
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Female	125	148	162	159	169	204
Male	98	152	138	151	174	155
Not disclosed				12	4	20
Not known	26	36	9	22	1	
Total	249	336	309	344	348	379
% female of known gender	56%	49%	54%	51%	45%	56%

*Data unavailable for 2012 and 2013

Methods School Combined						
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Female	301	341	354	338	374	432
Male	242	312	307	304	360	346
Not disclosed				20	11	39
Not known	59	82	28	72	2	
Total	602	735	689	734	747	817
% female of known gender	55%	52%	51%	53%	51%	55%

Graduate Student Conference (biennial)*			
	2012	2014	2016
Female	138	143	140
Male	141	137	151
Not known	97	125	27
Total	376	405	318
% female of known gender	49%	69%	47%

*Event has not taken place since 2016

2. Shaping ECPR activities

a. Section Chairs and / or Workshop Directors

Workshop Directors and Section Chairs play a key role in shaping the academic programme of the Joint Sessions and General Conference, and therefore also to a certain extent the agenda for the discipline in that time period. Workshops and Sections are selected by the Executive Committee based on a competitive process, with external peer review sought for the Joint Sessions.

Since 2012 the percentage of female Workshop Directors increased steadily (with the exception of 2015), reaching 48% in 2019.

The ratio of female Section Chairs at the General Conference has been far more fluid, increasing and then decreasing year on year, with 2019 seeing an all-time high of 47%.

In the first Gender Study, which looked at 2016 figures, we reported a noticeable difference in the representation of women in Workshop Director and Section Chair roles, as compared to grassroots event participation. It is encouraging that women were more represented as Workshop Directors and Section Chairs than as Panel Chairs or paper givers at both events in 2019.

Workshop Directors – Joint Sessions								
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Female	24	26	17	16	17	16	25	28
Male	37	49	28	32	30	26	30	30
Total	61	75	45	48	47	42	55	58
% female	39%	35%	37%	33%	36%	38%	45%	48%

Section Chairs – General Conference								
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Female	No General Conference in 2012; event changed from biennial to annual in 2014	43	43	59	49	64	60	67
Male		70	96	75	86	81	96	75
Total		113	139	134	135	145	156	142
% female		38%	31%	44%	36%	44%	39%	47%

Section Chairs – Graduate Student Conference (biennial; event withdrawn after 2016)			
	2012	2014	2016
Female	26	28	24
Male	24	25	19
Total	50	53	43
% female	52%	53%	56%

b. Methods School Instructors, Teaching Assistants, Convenors and Advisory Board

As reported above, women continue to be more equally represented as participants at the Winter and Summer Methods School than at any other event or activity, consistently making up over 50% of attendees. Yet among Methods School

leadership – the Academic Convenors who design the programmes for each school; the Instructors who deliver the courses; and even the Teaching Assistants who provide additional support for students – women continue to be under-represented.

2019 saw an increase in the percentage of female instructors across both schools, from 28% to 36%, but the percentage of female TAs fell from 50% to 37%.

Methods School Instructors	2016		2017		2018		2019	
	Winter	Summer	Winter	Summer	Winter	Summer	Winter	Summer
Female	9	15	10	13	11	8	14	11
Male	27	43	29	36	25	23	23	21
Undisclosed					1			1
Total	36	58	39	49	37	31	37	33
% female	25%	26%	25%	26%	31%	25%	38%	34%

Methods School academic leadership, 2005–to date		
	Male	Female
Academic Convenors	3	0
Academic Advisory Board	4	1
Total	7	1
% female (all)	14%	

Methods School Teaching Assistants	2016		2017		2018		2019	
	Winter	Summer	Winter	Summer	Winter	Summer	Winter	Summer
Female	16	8	19	5	16	9	13	7
Male	11	13	12	13	13	12	25	9
Total	27	21	31	18	29	21	38	16
% female	59%	38%	61%	28%	55%	43%	34%	43%

Methods School Instructors	2016	2017	2018	2019
	Both Methods Schools	Both Methods Schools	Both Methods Schools	Both Methods Schools
Female	24	23	19	25
Male	70	65	48	44
Undisclosed			1	1
Total	94	88	68	70
% female	26%	26%	28%	36%

Methods Teaching Assistants	2016	2017	2018	2019
	Both Methods Schools	Both Methods Schools	Both Methods Schools	Both Methods Schools
Female	24	24	25	20
Male	24	25	25	34
Total	48	49	50	54
% female	50%	49%	50%	37%

c. Editors and Editorial Board members of all publications

Editors of ECPR publications play a high-profile and responsible role in the community. They help shape the research agenda and profile of the discipline through their day-to-day editorial work and cross-publication initiatives, which develop wider organisational strategies or policies.

In 2019 the overall percentage of female editors increased slightly to 40% with the appointment of an additional female editor to the *EJPR*; a female replacement for a male Associate Editor on the *EPSR*; and a reduction in the number of editors on the Comparative Politics series from three to two (and the replacement of one male and one female editor with one male). The *PDY* remains the only journal with no women on the editorial team.

The number of women acting as members of an Editorial Board for our journals increased slightly again to 53% in 2019. This upward trend from 29% in 2016 has been due to initiatives by all editorial teams to invite more women scholars to join the boards when vacancies arise.

Editors of ECPR publications	2008–2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
<i>European Journal of Political Research (EJPR)</i>					
Female				1	2
Male	5	2	2	1	1
<i>Political Data Yearbook (PDY) of the EJPR</i>					
Female	2				
Male	5	3	3	3	3
<i>European Political Science Review (EPSR)</i>					
Female	5	4	4		1
Male	7	3	3	3	2
<i>European Political Science (EPS)</i>					
Female	3	1	1	2	2
Male	7	3	3	2	2
<i>Political Research Exchange (PRX)</i>					
Female			5	5	5
Male			6	6	6
ECPR Press (all series)					
Female	2	2	1	1	1
Male	6	2	3	3	3
Comparative Politics series					
Female	2	2	2	2	1
Male	5	1	1	1	1
Studies in European Political Science series					
Female	1				
Male	2				
Research Methods series					
Female	0				
Male	2				
Total	54	23	34	30	30
% female	27%	39%	38%	37%	40%

Editorial Board members	2016	2017	2018	2019
<i>European Journal of Political Research (EJPR)</i>				
Female	13	14	14	14
Male	11	9	10	10
<i>European Political Science Review (EPSR)</i>				
Female	6	13	13	15
Male	23	16	17	15
<i>European Political Science (EPS)</i>				
Female	5	8	12	13
Male	24	13	10	10
<i>Political Research Exchange (PRX)</i>				
Female	0	0	7	6
Male	0	0	5	6
Total	82	73	88	89
% female	29%	47%	51%	53%

3. High-profile participation and recognition

a. Joint Sessions and General Conference

Very often the most visible people at an ECPR event are those invited to deliver a lecture, take part in a Roundtable or receive a prize. To date, the Plenary Lecture at the General Conference has only once been delivered by a woman: Nonna Mayer at Bordeaux in 2013. The General Conference Plenary Lecturer is traditionally selected by the host institution, so this is an area where ECPR can exert limited

influence. The Joint Sessions' Stein Rokkan Lecture has been delivered by two female speakers in the past seven years: Margaret Levi in 2017 and Donatella della Porta in 2019. The dearth of women speakers over the years has been a source of criticism.

Alongside the Plenary Lecturer, Roundtable Chairs and invited Discussants at the General Conference

are also clearly visible indicators of female representation at a high level in ECPR. The organisation (and composition) of these Roundtables is shared between the Executive Committee and the host organisation, with each group responsible for selecting two participants.

In 2019 70% of Roundtable participants, and all Roundtable Chairs, were women.

Joint Sessions	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Stein Rokkan lecturer	Male	Male	Male	Male	Female	Male	Female

General Conference	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
Plenary lecture giver	Female		Male		Male		Male		Male		Male		Male	
Roundtable Chairs and Speakers	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Roundtable 1	1	3	2	3	1	4		5	1	4	1	3	3	2
Roundtable 2	1	4	2	3		4		5	4	2	2	2	4	1
Roundtable 3					1	4	1	4	5	1	3	2	4	1
Roundtable 4							4	2	2	1	3	1	3	2
Total	2	7	4	6	2	12	5	16	12	8	9	8	14	6
% female	22%		40%		14%		24%		60%		53%		70%	

b. Prize nominees and recipients

The ECPR awards a number of prizes each year to recognise and celebrate achievement across the discipline, and across different scholarly career paths. Prizes are awarded

for papers presented at events, articles, and books published, outstanding PhD theses, excellence in teaching at our Methods School, and for general career achievement.

Despite this breadth of opportunity, the number of women nominated for prizes in 2019 fell from 51% to 32%, with three out of the four prizes awarded to men.

Stein Rokkan Prize

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Female nominees	1	14	10	11	5	17	13	15
Male nominees	7	12	21	18	16	26	6	32
Total	8	26	31	29	21	43	19	47
% female	12%	54%	32%	38%	24%	23%	32%	32%
Winner in year	Male	Joint m/f	Male	Male	Male	Male	Female	Male

Lifetime Achievement Award – biennial

	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Female nominees	0	1	0	0	1	9	No award in 2019; postponed to coincide with 50 th anniversary in 2020
Male nominees	1	3	9	10	7	11	
Total	1	4	9	10	8	20	
% female	0%	25%	0%	0%	12%	45%	
Winner	Male	Male	Male	Male	Male	Female	

Rudolf Wildenmann Prize

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Female nominees	4	4	4	7	6	9	7	3
Male nominees	5	6	7	3	6	11	14	9
Total	9	10	11	10	12	20	21	12
% female	44%	40%	36%	70%	50%	45%	67%	25%
Winner	Male	Male	Male	Female	Female	Female	Male	Male

Jean Blondel PhD Prize

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Female nominees	13	13	24	13	16	7	13	7
Male nominees	24	15	18	13	17	4	7	12
Total	37	28	42	26	33	11	20	19
% female	35%	46%	57%	50%	48%	63%	35%	37%
Winner	Joint male	Male	Female	Female	Male	Female	Female	Female

Hans Daalder Prize – awarded biennially at the Graduate Student Conference; withdrawn 2016

	2008	2010	2012	2014	2016	2018
Female nominees	1	6	12	6	10	Not awarded; no Graduate Student Conference
Male nominees	1	12	7	26	14	
Total	2	18	19	32	24	
% female	50%	33%	63%	19%	58%	
Winner	Joint m/f	Male	Joint m/f	Female	Female	

Hedley Bull Prize in International Relations

	2017	2018	2019
Female nominees	5	0	2
Male nominees	11	5	4
Total	16	5	6
% female	31%	0%	33%
Winner	Male	Male	Male

4. Governance and operations

a. Executive Committee members

The ECPR's Executive Committee (EC) is its Board of Trustees and therefore has ultimate responsibility for the running of the organisation. The EC comprises twelve members, each serving a six-year term, with elections staggered every three years.

Any scholar from an ECPR full member university can nominate themselves for election; they must then receive sufficient endorsements from Official Representatives

to go forward to the final ballot in which all ORs are invited to vote.

The current EC serving the 2018–2021 term has the highest proportion of female members since ECPR was established: five women and seven men. When Oddbjørn Knutsen sadly passed away in 2019 he was replaced by Hana Kubátová who had been the candidate with the next highest number of votes from the 2018 election.

New electoral rules will apply for the 2021–24 term elections onwards, providing for two parallel ballots, one for female candidates and one for male, to be run after the endorsement stage, ensuring that equal numbers of male and female candidates are elected. The cohort appointed in 2021 will join the ongoing six members – three male and three female, so parity will be reached.

	2	3	3	3	3	3	4 (5)
	10	9	9	9	9	9	8 (7)

*Hana Kubátová replaced Oddbjørn Knutsen in September 2019

b. Speaker of Council

The Speaker of Council post was established in 2013. It is the liaison point between the Executive Committee and ECPR's Council, which is comprised of

one Official Representative from each member institution. To date, the post has been held by David Farrell (2013–2017) and by Thomas Poguntke (2018–).

Thomas was appointed as a result of an open call, to which no female candidates applied, followed by an election.

c. Official Representatives

Each member institution appoints an Official Representative (OR) as a key point of contact between the university and the ECPR, they act as a figurehead within their institution for ECPR membership and also have a seat on Council, which has a range of powers and responsibilities.

Official Representatives	2016	2017	2018	2019
Female	116	128	126	110
Male	232	209	197	195
No OR nominated	2			
Total	350	337	323	305
% female	33%	37%	39%	37%

d. Standing Group and Research Network Steering Committee Members

Under the auspices of the ECPR sit more than 50 thematic groups, covering a broad and diverse range of topics and sub-fields of political science.

These Standing Groups and Research Networks have their own memberships and activities, including events and publications. They are vital for nurturing

and developing all corners of the discipline, ensuring that ECPR remains a fully inclusive 'broad church'.

Each group is governed by a Steering Committee, on which one member acts as Chair, overseeing the running of the group and acting as a liaison point with the Executive Committee and ECPR

staff. These people are in an influential position to shape and steer the work of the ECPR broadly, and their field of research specifically.

In 2019 52% of all Steering Committee members were female, which represents a continuation of an upward trend.

	2016	2017	2018	2019
	41	57	80	108
	61	70	79	99
	102	127	159	207

e. ECPR staff and operational management

ECPR's operational and administrative offices are based in Colchester, Essex, in the East of England.

Staff are responsible for the delivery of all ECPR activities and services and are organised across four departments, each headed by a Manager who sits on the

Management Group, which is chaired by the Director.

In 2019 the ECPR employed 19 members of staff, 74% of whom were women. There was a strong bias towards women in the departments of Events and Communications where no men

were employed in 2016–2019; while all members of the IT department were male.

The composition of the Management Group (not including the Director) is three women and one man. Martin Bull served as ECPR Director from 2013 until October 2019 and was replaced with Tanja Munro.

ECPR staff by department*	2016		2017		2018		2019	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Finance	3		3		3		2	1
Events	6		6		6		6	
Communications	4		4		4		4	
IT		3		4		4		4
Operations		1		1	1	1	1	
Director		1		1		1	1	
Total	13	5	13	6	14	6	14	5
% female	72%		68%		70%		74%	

*Staff count made in December each year

Director*		1		1		1	1	
Operations Manager**		1		1		1		
Finance Manager	1		1		1		1	
Events Manager	1		1		1		1	
Communications Manager	1		1		1		1	
IT Manager		1		1		1		1
Total	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	1

*Tanja Munro replaced Martin Bull on 1 October 2019 **Role ceased to exist in 2019

Conclusions

In 2018 the ECPR adopted a Gender Equality Plan. Inspired by the Gender Studies of 2016, 2017 and 2018, it identified the places where the gender balance in the organisation was poor, and acknowledged that it could only be redressed by consciously taking action. Several clear targets were identified and action plans to reach them were adopted. This Gender Study of 2019 shows that this was a good strategy – but that it must be further expanded and refined.

For ECPR events, the Plan aimed to achieve 50% female presence among Workshop Directors at the Joint Sessions, and among Section Chairs, Roundtable Chairs and Roundtable participants at the General Conference. That target was clearly reached. The Executive Committee has furthermore adopted new rules for its election, which means that after the renewal of the Executive

Committee in 2021 it will be – at last – perfectly balanced.

For publications the target was 50% of all editorial boards and all editorial teams. Improvement was made, but with 60% of all editors now being men and one journal still having a male-only editorial team, the effort needs to be continued. In publications the number of female authors remains low, and that mainly reflects a lower number of submissions from female authors. All editorial teams are aware of that, and are closely monitoring the gender balance of submissions, evaluating its causes and trying – among other ways by inviting more female reviewers – to increase the numbers. The publications in our book series and journals reflect the gender balance in the discipline, and we do not have all the instruments that would allow us to radically change the situation.

The latter is also the case for nominations for ECPR’s different prizes. That remains a weak point. More male scholars are nominated for prizes and they are also much better represented among the prize winners. While we must rely on nominations, we should, however, make the juries of the prizes more aware of this bias.

The Gender Equality Plan will be evaluated in 2020, and new targets and action plans will be defined. There are indeed still areas in the ECPR where progress is needed, and can be made. Looking back at what the first Gender Equality Plan has achieved, we should be confident that we can keep on moving in the right direction.

Kris Deschouwer
ECPR Chair, 2018–2021