



ecpr

Gender study 2017

Introduction and data

The ECPR conducted its first study into the participation and representation of women in its events and activities in 2016.

After considering the paper, the Executive Committee decided to make the monitoring and evaluation of this data an annual exercise, to track trends and build strategies to address imbalances.

This 2017 study therefore builds on the 2016 framework, with some additional data primarily around journals publishing.

The study looked at the following:

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
- c. Academic Convenors and Advisory Board of the Methods School
- d. Editors of all publications
- e. Editorial Board members of all publications

3. High-profile participation and recognition

- a. Joint Sessions
- b. General Conference
- c. Prize nominees and recipients

4. Governance and operations

- a. Executive Committee members
- b. Speaker of Council
- c. Official Representatives
- d. Standing Group Convenors
- 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 has been collected by the

respective editorial teams through online peer review systems and their own administrative systems, and then reported annually to ECPR's Publications Subcommittee. To supplement this data, further research has then been carried out by the ECPR, particularly into numbers of published articles and books.

Other data, such as prize recipients and editors of publications, is either already

published at www.ecpr.eu or, as with Standing Group Convenors and Official Representatives, held in ECPR's administrative systems.

All data collection, storage and processing practices and policies were thoroughly reviewed as part of our GDPR implementation project. ECPR's new [Privacy Policy](#) sets out more clearly how and why we use personal information, including for the generation of this study.



SUMMARY OF DATA AND COMPARISONS WITH 2016

Conclusions from the 2016 study

The 2016 Gender Study found that female participation in ECPR activities, leadership and governance of the organisation fell steadily the further up the organisation you went.

At graduate events women almost outnumbered their male colleagues, but these numbers fell slightly at the 'senior' events to around 45% and further still when we looked at those chairing Sections and Workshops.

The study also found that the percentage of women submitting articles to ECPR journals not only sat at just 30% in 2016, but had been declining for the past two years. In 2016 very few women held leadership roles within the organisation, as editors, Standing Group Convenors and plenary lecturers at events.

The lowest figures of all though, were at the highest level of governance – the Executive Committee – where still only three out of the twelve members were

women. It was also noted that in its history the ECPR has had only one female Chair, Simona Piattoni.

Below is a summary of the headline data from 2017 compared against 2016. Notable trends include a widening gap between the number of articles submitted and published by women to two of our academic journals, but an increase in representation as Section and / or Workshop Chairs, Roundtable participants and prizewinners.

	2016	2017	Variance
MyECPR account holders	33%	49%	up 16%
Authors submitting to journals	25–28%	22–31%	down 3%
Published authors in journals	31–46%	21–41%	down 10–5%
Published authors in books	26–40%	36–55%	up 10–5%
Participation in Joint Sessions / General Conference	44%	45%	up 1%
Attendance at a Methods School	54%	52%	down 2%

Section Chairs and / or Workshop Directors	35%	42%	up 6%
Methods School Instructors	26%	28%	up 2%
Methods School Academic Convenors and Advisory Board	14%	14%	no change
Editors of all publications	40%	39%	down 1%
Editorial Board members of all publications	29%	47%	up 18%

Delivered Stein Rokkan Lecture / General Conference Plenary Lecture	0	1	up 1
Roundtable Chairs / Speakers at the General Conference	24%	60%	up 36%
Prize nominees	45%	41%	down 4%
Prizewinners	50%	60%	up 10%

Executive Committee members	25%	25%	no change
Speaker of Council	0%	0%	no change
Official Representatives	33%	37%	up 4%
Standing Group Convenor	40%	44%	up 4%
ECPR staff, including managers	72%	70%	down 4%
Management staff at ECPR, including Director	50%	50%	no change

1. Grassroots participation

a. MyECPR account holders and social media followers

Every individual wishing to take part in an ECPR event or activity, or to sign up to a mailing list for organisational information, must create a MyECPR account.

Because sign-up indicates a basic interest in the organisation, we have used this as the first set of data measuring grassroots participation.

We looked only at those MyECPR accounts which have been logged into since 2016, because this indicates a relatively recent engagement, assuming that a scholar might attend an ECPR event every two to three years.

MyECPR account holders	All users	From Member institutions	From non-Member institutions
Female	7,344	4,525	2,819
Male	7,590	4,798	2,792
Undisclosed	708	414	294
Unknown	4,508	3,238	1,270
Total	20,150	12,975	7,175
% female of known gender	49%	49%	50%

Social media is a key way we share information with the ECPR community and is therefore another metric of basic engagement with our 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.

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, among 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 4% more positive, suggesting that 43% of our followers – of known gender – are, in fact, female.

Social media followers	at 15 August 2016		at 11 September 2018	
	Twitter	Facebook	Twitter	Facebook
Female	3,230	2,674	5,366	3,255
Male	4,461	3,016	8,392	3,390
Unknown				136
Total	7,691	5,690	13,758	6,781
% female	42%*	47%	39%*	48%

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

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

PUBLISHING IN JOURNALS

Publishing in an ECPR journal is a key activity for members of the community. The submission and publication data use the first author only as the identifier.

Submission data relates to all

articles received by the journal in that calendar year, while the publication data relates to all articles published in that same calendar year – the cohort of articles is therefore not the same because of the time taken

to process a manuscript.

All ECPR journals follow a double-blind peer review process. Based on the resulting reports, the editors make the final decision on whether to publish.

European Journal of Political Research

In 2017 *EJPR* and *EPSR* saw an increase in the number of article submissions by female authors, but, conversely, a decline

in the number of articles published by women.

On *EJPR* the number of published female authors fell by 8% between 2016 and 2017, and 14% from 2015's figures.

European Political Science Review

For *EPSR* the drop was greater, at 12% on 2016 figures and 17% from 2015.

	2015	2016	2017	2018
Female	96	14	128	11
Male	262	316	277	35
Total	358	45	405	46

	2015	2016	2017	2018
Female	36	9	59	6
Male	110	18	136	22
Total	146	27	195	28

Political Data Yearbook of the EJPR

PDY country reviews are commissioned by the editors each year, so the increase in female authors reflects the strategy of the editorial team to improve the gender balance of contributors. The percentage of female contributors in 2015 was 22%.

<i>Political Data Yearbook (PDY) of the EJPR</i>	2016	2017
	Authors	Authors
Female	9	12
Male	28	25
Total	37	37
% female	24%	32%

European Political Science

EPS published figures also include commissioned book reviews and

contributions to symposia, so they are not representative entirely of the pool of submitting authors. The figures show that the number of women submitting articles fell

by 6% between 2016 and 2017, and by 8% from 2015; and the number of published articles by women rose by 2% from 2015, but dropped by 5% from 2016.

European Political Science (EPS)	2016		2017	
	Submitted	Published*	Submitted	Published*
Female	27	25	17	19
Male	69	29	63	27
Total	96	54	77	46
% female	28%	46%	22%	41%

*Number of articles published includes book reviews

All journals	2016		2017	
	Submitted	Published	Submitted	Published
Female	27	25	17	19
Male	69	29	63	27
Total	96	54	77	46
% female	28%	46%	22%	41%

PUBLISHING IN BOOKS

OUP Comparative Politics series, and ECPR Press

We have counted all named authors and editors, but not contributors to edited volumes. We are mindful that this is not a perfect method and deeper analysis of the data might provide a clearer picture of trends.

However, based on this data women appear well represented in the Comparative Politics series in 2017 and there seems to be a growing percentage of female authors publishing with ECPR Press.

Publishing in books	2016	2017
Comparative Politics series		
	Authors	Authors
Female	2	5
Male	3	4
Total	5	9
% female	40%	55%
ECPR Press		
	Authors	Authors
Female	5	5
Male	14	9
Total	19	14
% female	26%	36%



c. Participation at events

Joint Sessions of Workshops and General Conference

The percentage of female participants at the ECPR's two key academic events is within

a few per cent of each other – in the mid to low 40s.

The Joint Sessions of Workshops saw a peak in female participation in 2014 (Salamanca, Spain) but this figure has dropped steadily since. The 2017 event in Nottingham had

the lowest percentage of female participants in the past six years.

The General Conference has seen almost identical levels of female participation over the past six years, with only a very slight dip in 2015.

Joint Sessions of Workshops						
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Female	179	196	154	156	208	123
Male	236	253	162	202	269	181
Undisclosed						5
Unknown	158	86	115	136	60	84
Total	573	535	431	494	537	393
% female of known gender	43%	44%	49%	43%	44%	40%

General Conference*					
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Female	699	679	482	834	702
Male	887	876	636	1053	882
Undisclosed					53
Unknown	397	451	360	252	367
Total	1983	2006	1478	2139	2004
% female of known gender	44%	44%	43%	44%	44%

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

Graduate Student Conference (biennial)

While there was no Graduate Student Conference in this period, it is worth including as a point of reference against the Methods

School, the Joint Sessions and the General Conference. Work is underway to redevelop the format of the Graduate event, and we will continue to monitor participation for that event in its redeveloped form.

Graduate Student Conference			
	2012	2014	2016
Female	138	143	140
Male	141	137	151
Unknown	97	125	27
Total	376	405	318
% female of known gender	49%	69%	47%

Summer and Winter Methods Schools

As with the Graduate Student Conference, we have generally seen higher levels of female

participation at the Methods School than other, 'senior' ECPR events; in fact, female attendance outweighs male at all but one of the events reported on below.*

Winter School in Methods and Techniques				
	2014	2015	2016	2017
Female	176	193	192	179
Male	144	160	169	153
Undisclosed				8
Unknown	33	46	19	50
Total	353	399	380	390
% female of known gender	55%	54%	53%	54%

*Data unavailable for 2012 and 2013

Summer School in Methods and Techniques				
	2014	2015	2016	2017
Female	125	148	162	159
Male	98	152	138	151
Undisclosed				12
Unknown	26	36	9	22
Total	249	336	309	344
% female of known gender	56%	49%	54%	51%

*Data unavailable for 2012 and 2013

2. Shaping ECPR activities

a. Section Chairs and / or Workshop Directors

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.

The figures for the Graduate Student Conference are included as a point of comparison between a graduate event, where the percentage of women outweighs men, and events which tend to attract more senior scholars.

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Female	24	26	17	16	17	16
Male	37	49	28	32	30	26
Total	61	75	45	48	47	42

		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Female	<i>No General Conference in 2012; event changed from biennial to annual in 2014</i>	43	43	59	49	64
Male		70	96	75	86	81
Total		113	139	134	135	145

	2010	2011	2012
Female	26	28	24
Male	24	25	19
Total	50	53	43

b. Methods School Instructors

While the share of *participants* at the Methods School is slightly in favour of women (51–54%) the percentage of women employed as Instructors at the two schools is almost half that.

c. Academic Convenors and Advisory Board of the Methods School

Female representation is even lower at the leadership level of the Methods School, where there have only ever been male Academic Convenors since

the School was established and where only one member of the board appointed to advise on the academic content of the School is a woman.

Methods School Instructors	2016		2017	
	Winter	Summer	Winter	Summer
Female	9	15	10	13
Male	27	43	29	36
Total	36	58	39	49
% female	25%	26%	25%	26%

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

d. Editors of publications

ECPR editors serve a maximum six-year term on a publication, so figures for 2008–15 have also been included to show a broader comparison of trends over time. While the percentage of female editors increased in 2016, it fell slightly in 2017 despite the new OA journal *Political Research Exchange* (launched autumn 2018) having two female Editors in Chief.

All editors are appointed by the ECPR after an open call.

Editors of ECPR publications	2008–2015	2016	2017
<i>European Journal of Political Research (EJPR)</i>			
Female	0	0	0
Male	5	2	2
<i>Political Data Yearbook (PDY) of the EJPR</i>			
Female	2	0	0
Male	5	3	3
<i>European Political Science Review (EPSR)</i>			
Female	5	4	4
Male	7	2	2
<i>European Political Science (EPS)</i>			
Female	3	1	1
Male	7	3	3
<i>Political Research Exchange (PRX)</i>			
Female	0	0	5
Male	0	0	6
ECPR Press (all series)			
Female	2	2	1
Male	6	2	3
Comparative Politics series			
Female	2	2	2
Male	5	1	1
Studies in European Political Science series			
Female	1	n/a	n/a
Male	2	n/a	n/a
Research Methods series			
Female	0	n/a	n/a
Male	2	n/a	n/a
Total	54	22	33
% female	27%	40%	39%

e. Editorial Board members of publications

The percentage of female Editorial Board members increased by 18% between 2016 and 2017. Editorial Board members are appointed by the editors of the publication and serve a maximum term of six years. This upward trend therefore reflects efforts of current editors to redress gender imbalance.

Editorial Board members	2016	2017
<i>European Journal of Political Research (EJPR)</i>		
Female	13	14
Male	11	9
<i>European Political Science Review (EPSR)</i>		
Female	6	13
Male	23	16
<i>European Political Science (EPS)</i>		
Female	5	8
Male	24	13
<i>Political Research Exchange (PRX)</i>		
Female	0	0
Male	0	0
Total	82	73
% female	29%	47%

3. High-profile participation and recognition

a. Joint Sessions

In the period 2013–2017, only one woman has given the Stein Rokkan Lecture: Margaret Levi, at the 2017 Joint Sessions in Nottingham.

Joint Sessions	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Stein Rokkan lecture giver	Male	Male	Male	Male	Female

b. General Conference

Gender balance on Roundtables – put together by the ECPR and local organisers – has improved over the past two years, from a low of 14% at the 2015 Conference to 60% at the 2017 event.

Only one Plenary lecture has been delivered by a woman: Nonna Mayer, at the 2013 General Conference in Bordeaux.

General Conference	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017	
Plenary lecture giver	Female		Male		Male		Male		Male	
Roundtable Chairs and Speakers	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Roundtable 1	3	1	3	2	4	1	5	0	4	1
Roundtable 2	4	1	3	2	4	0	5	0	2	4
Roundtable 3					4	1	4	1	1	5
Roundtable 4							2	4	1	2
Total	7	2	6	4	12	2	16	5	8	12
% female	22%		40%		14%		24%		60%	



c. Prize nominees and recipients

Prize nominees are put forward by the ECPR community, and winners selected by judging panels drawn from the ECPR's Executive Committee, editors and others.

In general, the percentage of female scholars nominated is on a par with their male colleagues.

One exception is the Stein Rokkan

Prize, which had only 23% female nominees in 2017.

In 2017, four of the six available prizes were awarded to women.

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

Lifetime Achievement Award – biennial						
	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017
Male nominees	1	3	9	10	7	11
Female nominees	0	1	0	0	1	9
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
Male nominees	5	6	7	3	6	11
Female nominees	4	4	4	7	6	9
Total	9	10	11	10	12	20
% female	44%	40%	36%	70%	50%	45%
Winner	Male	Male	Male	Female	Female	Female

Jean Blondel PhD Prize						
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Male nominees	24	15	18	13	17	4
Female nominees	13	13	24	13	16	7
Total	37	28	42	26	33	11
% female	35%	46%	57%	50%	48%	63%
Winner	Joint male	Male	Female	Female	Male	Female

Hans Daalder Prize – biennial					
	2008	2010	2012	2014	2016
Male nominees	1	12	7	26	14
Female nominees	1	6	12	6	10
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
Male nominees	11
Female nominees	5
Total	16
% female	31%
Winner	Male

4. Governance and operations

a. Executive Committee members

The ECPR's Executive Committee 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 then must receive at least five endorsements from Official Representatives (from full-Member institutions) to go forward to a final ballot, where ORs can then vote for their preferred candidates.

The current Executive Committee serving the term 2018–2021 has the highest proportion of female

scholars since the ECPR was established; but still only a third are women. Six new EC members were elected at the beginning of 2018, of whom two were women. Twelve eligible nominations were received for these seats, of which five were for women; all nominations for women went through to the final ballot.

Female	2	3	3	3	3	3	4
Male	10	9	9	9	9	9	8

b. Speaker of Council

The post of Speaker was established in 2013 and is the liaison point for members of Council vis-à-vis the ECPR. To date, the

post has been held by two male scholars: David Farrell (2013–2017) and Thomas Poguntke, who was elected to the role in spring 2018.

c. Official Representatives

Each member institution appoints an Official Representative as the key point of contact between the university and the ECPR – and to sit on the ECPR Council. Council has responsibility for electing the Executive Committee, Speaker

of Council and for approval of items such as constitutional reform.

2017 saw a small increase in the number of female scholars taking on this role, but the percentage is still lower than for their male colleagues.

Official Representatives	2016	2017
Female	116	128
Male	232	209
No OR nominated at present	2	
Total	350	337
% female	33%	37%

d. Standing Group Convenors

Governed by the Executive Committee, Standing Groups are integral parts of the ECPR. They play a vital role in growing the ECPR community and furthering its goals.

Standing Group Convenors,

are responsible for the direction and management of the Group.

The percentage of women taking on this role has increased since 2016 and is nearly on a par with male colleagues.

Standing Group Convenors	2016	2017
Female	41	57
Male	61	70
Total	102	127
% female	40%	44%

e. ECPR staff and operational management

The ECPR's operational and administrative offices are based in Colchester (formerly at the University of Essex). Staff are

responsible for the delivery of all ECPR's activities and services. The figures below include Managers, but not the Director. While the

percentage of female staff is significantly higher than male overall, it is notable that all male staff work in either IT or Operations.

Female	3	6	4	0	0
Male	0	0	0	4	1
Total	18				
*Communications department includes Membership, Standing Groups, Publications and Marketing					

The ECPR's Management Group, chaired by the ECPR Director, is responsible for the delivery of all activities and services and operationalisation of all Executive Committee strategies, as well as the running of the ECPR office.

Female	3
Male	3
Total	6

Conclusions

This second Gender Study confirms what had already become quite clear in the 2016 report. The ECPR is an organisation where – like in many others – the gender balance is quite good at grassroots level.

Women comprise about 45% of participants at the General Conference and Joint Sessions. In the Methods School there is a small majority of female participants. Yet if we move up the hierarchy and look at positions where a more active selection is

taking place – such as Workshop Directors, nominations for prizes or choices for plenary speakers – the picture is less bright. The Methods Schools deserves close attention in this respect, with women being extremely under-represented among the Academic Convenors, Advisory Board and Instructors.

The ECPR should develop a conscious strategy for getting the gender balance right in those positions where a choice can be made. For other areas of concern, like the too-limited

presence of female authors in certain publications, the evolution needs to be closely monitored, and investigating the possible mechanisms at work should be a standing item whenever reports from journals and publishers are being discussed.

There is still quite a way to go. Measuring the gender balance in all aspects of the ECPR on an annual basis remains very necessary to keep us aware of the efforts needed to move forward.

