SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

Gender Representation and Strategies for Panel Diversity:

Lessons from the APSA Annual Meeting

Sara Wallace Goodman
University of California, Irvine
s.goodman@uci.edu

Thomas Pepinsky
Cornell University
pepinsky@cornell.edu

A View from the Program Side

As the data show, there is still a long way to go. Compounded by general barriers to female participation at conferences,[1] what can conference organizers and program chairs do to improve representation? Our experience as Comparative Politics program organizers—the largest section at APSA 2017 with the largest panel allocation (56 panels)—invites us to reflect and offer a series of heuristics for how organizers may increase representation at different units of analysis. We recognize that the large number of submissions that we received enables us to emphasize diversity (just over forty percent of Comparative Politics section members are women, for example), in a way that is not accessible to smaller and less diverse sections. For program chairs, we suggest three deliberate steps: (1) prioritization a priori; (2) promotion; and, (3) assembly awareness.

---

[1] Women report higher rates of incivility, sexism and exclusion at professional conferences (Settles and O'Connor 2014). Women also report higher instances of performance anxiety around conference presentation formats, a result of internalizing stereotypical views of the gendered nature of public speaking norms (Mills 2006).

1. Prioritization invites program chairs and conference organizers to identify inclusion objectives prior to the call for submission. In other words, goals should not emerge organically once proposals have been received, but rather should be telegraphed before the call is distributed. Is the goal representativeness, equality, diversity, or some mix? How will you confront intersectionality? There are good reasons to avoid manels, but an organizer who wishes to achieve representativeness or who takes into consideration different dimensions may tolerate some manels in order to achieve these other objectives. Do not let the program call be a mere formality; use it as a strong signal to communicate program chair priorities. Make your goals explicit in the language of the call. In the 2017 APSA program section calls, based on feedback from program organizers,[2] only 9 out of 41 explicitly mentioned representation goals in their call for papers. Meanwhile, 33 out of 41 program organizers indicated they thought explicitly about representation as an organizing principle, even if it was not mentioned in their call for proposals.

2. Promotion requires not only circulating the call itself, but clearly communicating the goals of inclusion and expectations of proposed panel composition. This may be in explicit messaging that manels would not be accepted. Goals can also be communicated by expanding the networks in which you circulate your call. In explaining how a roundly criticized Hoover Institution conference could feature an almost entirely white male roster, organizer Niall Ferguson responded that the high-profile women he had invited were unable to attend.[3] Among the many problems this reveals, one is the cloistered professional networking circle of the

---

[2] We contacted the 2017 program chairs for each division in April 2018. Cornell University's Institutional Review Board determined that because we are studying the operation of the American Political Science Association, this research does not qualify as Human Subjects research.

[3] See https://www.nytimes.com/2018/03/17/us/stanford-conference-white-males.html.

organizer. Encouraging applications from underrepresented minorities, by deliberately reaching out to new networks, or simple emails to the membership signal preferences and priorities.[4]

3. Programs and panels can be *assembled with awareness* to representation needs. Organizers may strive for diversity within each panel, or panel diversity within each section. In other words, achieving diversity within each panel may be hard, particularly for sections with few panel allocations. Organizers may also choose to prioritize certain panels to be representative, such as high-attendance panels and panels featuring senior scholars. This points to the issue of intersectionality and the multiple dimensions upon which a panel or program might strive for representation. Beyond gender, salient dimensions include professional rank, race and ethnicity, and institution. A panel with four papers is less likely to be able to simultaneously achieve gender, racial, and rank diversity than it is to achieve only one of these. If we strive not just for diversity but also intersectional diversity, the challenges are harder still. Considering different presentation formats that increase the number of participants, like roundtables, workshops, and mini-conferences, is also an available strategy.

Importantly, not all dimensions are equally observable. Institution and rank are easier to identify than gender, which is easier still to identify than race and ethnicity. Although we think that all forms of representation matter, it will almost certainly prove more difficult for program organizers to achieve their goals of diversity and representation based on the limited information that they have from the submission software (basically, name and institutional affiliation) for race and ethnicity than for gender. Progress on these and other dimensions would probably require that program chairs have information on other characteristics of the paper submitter;

---

[4] This also points to the importance of membership more generally, and encouraging membership uptake.

making these available to program chairs as a matter of course would almost certainly require a broader disciplinary conversation.

Assessing our own panel construction, we prioritized representation as we constructed our program. It was not hard to avoid manels because very few were submitted to us as organized panels. In our experience, it is easier for program chairs to avoid manels—and to achieve greater representation more broadly, across multiple dimensions besides just gender—when program chairs construct panels from individual submissions. But because pre-submitted panels tend to be more thematically coherent than panels created from individual submissions, program chairs will often face a tradeoff between organizer discretion and the ease of accepting well-thought-out full panel submissions.

Despite our intentions, in the end we had two manels out of a total of 56 panels, for a manel rate of just under 4%, although that number rises to six manels (11%) if we count only authors and presenters. How did we end up with six manels, especially given our concern for authors and participants in particular? One source of confusion was ambiguity in participants' names; applicants do not self-report gender identification with submission. Another challenge was attrition between paper acceptance and the final APSA program. Additionally, we report panel composition that includes non-presenting co-authors. The "in person" panel may look different than the program. Finally, because we rely on self-reported demographic information to identify participants' gender, those who do not provide a gender identity as part of their APSA membership are excluded from our analysis. All of this recommends caution when inferring program chair motivations from outcomes.

That said, we offer two more suggestions for representative panel construction, with an eye toward building long-term inclusion. Program chairs for each APSA rotate every or every

other year. To build an enduring practice of representation and a section reputation for inclusion, we suggest program chairs record submission information in real time (including first and second choice submissions). Although it is possible to scrape this information from submission management software, it is even harder to get it retroactively; having access to this information makes it easier to build diverse panels from the outset rather than trying to create diverse panels later. APSA and other disciplinary organizations may, in fact, be in better position to allocate time and resources in order to record submission information and make it available to division chairs and associated sections. The APSA Council's Meetings and Conferences Policy Committee has begun to collect and analyze data on representation at the annual meeting, and such a committee might also take responsible for collecting and maintain records of submission information across the annual meeting.

Second, and relatedly, we suggest that program chairs pass on notes from year to year. These internal audits can create institutional memory, which is important for helping each new program chair to understand the challenges associated with building that section's program *in advance*. Our own experience is instructive. Although we each had experience building the program for an APSA section prior to our joint work with the 2017 Comparative Politics section, we were unprepared for the particular challenges of organizing such a large section, and one in which regional and thematic coverage varied so widely. We confronted these issues in the context of our own efforts to construct a diverse program across many dimensions; guidelines and suggestions from past Comparative Politics program chairs might have alerted us in advance to the kinds of challenges that we would face.