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gendERC project

- gendERC consortium:
  Helene Schiffbänker, Florian Holzinger: JOANNEUM RESEARCH
  Peter van den Besselaar, Claartje Vinkenburg: VU Amsterdam
  Lucia Polo, Ezekiela Arriziaga: tecnalia

- Project time: 04/2014 - 02/2016

- Aim of gendERC project:
  - **understanding** the sources of bias and the review process in order to
  - **improve transparency** in selection procedures and help
  - **select the most excellent** female and male researchers
StG 2014 as case to study

Scope of analysis: ERC StG 2014, Life Science panels (LS) studied

Share of female applicants and grantees per domain in ERC Starting Grants calls (2007 - 2013), Source: EC 2014
StG 2014 LS panels: success rates by step

Success pattern differ by panel: success rates in step1, step2, step1+2

- Differences success rates
  - step1: absolute difference of success rates (W compared to M)
  - step2: absolute difference of success rates (W compared to M)
  - step1+2: absolute difference success rates (W compared to M)
Why excellence?

“Scientific excellence is the sole criterion on the basis of which ERC frontier research grants are awarded” (ERC Work Programme)

- What is seen as scientific excellence? (How) is this gendered?
  - by ERC: **formalisation** of criteria
  - by panel members: **practicing** of criteria
  - by applicants: **perception** of ERC excellence

- Research approach: excellence is socially constructed, but: peer review needs to be based on personal judgement.

  “Excellence means nothing; excellence is a construction that helps to do **whatever you want**” (panel member) ???
Approach to analyse ERC excellence

ERC documents analysed

Linguistic analysis: Evaluation reports (n=3,030): which words are used to assess excellence of applicants (by sex)?

Interviews ERC StG 2014 panel members (n=32, 14 F) incl. panel chairs, interviews ERC (ScC, SOs, n=16)

Formalisation of criteria

Practicing of criteria

in general

by gender

Landscapes of excellence

in general

by gender
### ERC (StG 2014) formal criteria for assessing scientific excellence

#### Excellence only!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Investigator (PI)</th>
<th>research project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual capacity, creativity, commitment</td>
<td>Groundbreaking nature and potential impact of the research project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERC CRITERIA</th>
<th>ERC INDICATORS</th>
<th>Ability for ground breaking research</th>
<th>Evidence for independent thinking</th>
<th>Research achievements beyond the state of art</th>
<th>Commitment (time)</th>
<th>Addresses important challenges</th>
<th>High risk/high gain</th>
<th>Goes beyond the state of art</th>
<th>Feasibility + methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability for ground breaking research</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>At least 1 important publication without PhD SV</td>
<td>50% Time commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence for independent thinking</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research achievements beyond the state of art</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment (time)</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addresses important challenges</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High risk/high gain</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goes beyond the state of art</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feasibility + methodology</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scores: 4=outstanding, 3=excellent, 2=very good, 1=non competitive; by each panel member for each criterion

Source: ERC Frontier Research Grants Guide for Peer Reviewers (WP 2014)
Formal excellence criteria: general assessment & general practicing

- Lack of (clear) indicators which can be measured and compared:
  - Practicing: panel members use very **different indicators** to assess, e.g. independence: publications (single author, last author), own funding budget, team composition, motivation, topical distance to supervisor, different home institutions, establishing new research collaboration: => when independence is assessed, different achievements are assessed

- Lack of specification of the relevance of each criterion/indicator:
  - Practicing: rarely all criteria are addressed (‘egg-laying wool-milk-pig’)
  - **Different criteria** are weighed as **most important** by different panel members

- Informal criteria (not formalised) are used: mobility, host institution

- Lack of gender related criteria (see H2020 gender in research content)
excellence criterion 'independence': gendered assessment

- Source for assessment: literature, also interviewees!

- Panel members question ERC criteria/indicators, based on their own research experience and/or on gender stereotypes:
  “They were women and maybe they were less good at arguing with their SV and saying "I need to look more independent. I need my name alone on my paper. Nobody's going to believe me if my name isn't alone". (panel member, F)

- ‘publication without SV’ may not tell about independence, but about team dynamics: More assertive researchers insist on publishing without SV. These researchers are more often men. Consequently men more often, women less often publish without SV.

- What does this tell about the applicant’s excellence?
excellence criterion ‘independence’: gendered assessment

- Not independence (as criterion for excellence) is assessed, but assertiveness or competition: “Women are perhaps less brutal negotiating [for independence].” (panel member, F)

“The supervisor doesn’t want any competition. This competitiveness is still very dominant. And perhaps women think that they don’t want to work against their former boss. And men think: ‘I will show him!’.” (panel member, F)

- Indicator reflects inequalities originating from before the application: if this indicator is applied equally it disfavours women = indicator is gendered!!

- Gendered indicators reflect women’s excellence less!
excellence criterion 'independence': gendered practicing by panel members!

Criteria are applied differently to female and male applicants!

- Panel members check criteria/indicators more for female applicants (and not/less for men): shifting standards

- Women’s independence is more questioned than men’s:
  “It's more of a trademark for independence for female than for male. You’re not less independent as a female, just because you still co-publish with either your PhD or Postdoc supervisor than if a male would do it. But that is clearly seen upon as differently [by other panel members]. And the males come out much better than the females in that aspect” (panel member, F)

- ‘Dependent’ male researchers are favoured; same for mobility.

- Context-related: “A woman with 2 kids who performs equally should get the grant” (panel member, M)
Applicants’ perception of ERC excellence

Source: gendERC applicant survey, n=1.227 = response rate >40%

“Throughout the application process I was continually told to "big myself up", using superlatives and hyperbole to describe my achievements. I didn't feel very comfortable with that and I don't think it comes naturally to many female applicants (possibly not to many male applicants either, though)” (applicant F).

“To succeed at ERC, high level of self-promotion, elbow mentality, self-confidence and strong support by former supervisors helps a lot. Men are more frequently behaving in this pattern and it is more accepted if they do so” (applicant F).
Applicants’ perception of ERC excellence

Source: gendERC applicant survey, n=1.227 = response rate >40%

“Based on my personal experience as a man and conversations with both men and women, my guess would be that the entire concept of competition-based performance under severe time pressure works to the advantage of men” (applicant, M).

“Having to sell this entire team project as if it was MY OWN, as if I was a 'leader' when in fact I'm always collaborating and learning from everyone. I guess this is also a woman thing. It's really a perception. But an important one. I would have much rather said that x will do this, and y will do that, rather than 'I will deliver x...y,...'” (applicant, F)

Applicants perceive that ERC looks for excellent researchers with traits more attributed to male applicants, female applicants feel fitting less to this construction of ERC excellence
Findings

**Gender bias** in construction of excellence (criteria) may be due to:

- a general lack of formalisation of criteria/indicators: gives room for different practicing based on personal excellence **concepts**
- formalised criteria/indicators can be gendered, reflecting gender differences before application (position in science system, time) and fitting better to measure a masculine way of doing science
- Criteria are applied differently to female applicants
- ERC language may ‘attract’ male applicants more
- Personal bias (professional bias, stereotypes, norms) plays a role in how excellence is constructed by individual panelists (panels)
Conclusions

- More awareness of the gendered character of excellence criteria could help reduce gender differences in success rates!
- ERC-level: by rethinking formalisation of criteria: how much should be left to the individual choice of the panel members?
  - Specify formal criteria including appropriate (measureable, comparable) indicators and make them transparent and well known
  - Fix relative weight of criteria/indicators
  - Formalize responsibility for transitive use of criteria (each criteria for each applicant): panel chair? SO?
- Panel members: by being aware that professional culture, personal experiences, societal norms,… are part of peer reviewing: make them conscious, link them to formal criteria
Thanks for the attention!

Helene Schiffbänker
JOANNEUM RESEARCH
Sensengasse 1, 1090 Vienna/Austria
helene.schiffbaenker@joanneum.at
Different standards for female applicants (2): Mobility

Women don't move as soon and as long as men to another country to make part of their research there. At the same time I noticed that some men have never moved out of their university .... They start their PhD at the same university... And they also become professors at the same university. And everybody finds that they have an excellent CV. And for women it is sometimes mentioned that she didn't go abroad for her PhD or after her PhD.
**StG 2014:**

Success rates of women and men in LS

Graph: Success rates of female and male applicants in StG2014 in LS domain differentiated by evaluation phases

Source: ERC StG 2014, own calculations
gendERC: the project

Steps of analysis

(1) Policy Analysis: are processes gendered?

(2) Past performance (PP) control: is female applicants’ PP lower?

(3) Panel composition and network ties (cognitive distance): more female panel members (40%) = more female grantees?

(4) How is excellence constructed (formally and in practice)?

(5) How are decisions made in panels?

(6) Peer review (multi logic model): Which factors explain success?

(7) Recommendations for improving the process