

# The European Social Survey

## Round 11 Question Module Design Teams (QDT)

### Stage 2 Application

Applications **MUST** be submitted by 14:00 (UK time) on Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> May 2020

Applications should be emailed to [ess@city.ac.uk](mailto:ess@city.ac.uk)

<b>Is this application for a new or a repeat module</b>	
<b>New module</b>	

#### Proposed title for the Module

**Gender in Contemporary Europe: Rethinking Equality and the Backlash**

#### Abstract (Max 250 words)

Decades of policy efforts and campaigns by governments, international organizations and social movements have brought significant progress towards gender equality. Many would argue, however, that gender equality still remains largely out of reach. Furthermore, there are visible backlashes against gender equality partly driven by the rhetoric of the radical right against “gender ideology”. Additionally there is evidence there has been retrenchment on key indicators measuring the status of women in society. In response to these seemingly countervailing trends, we propose a module that will allow researchers to examine contemporary attitudes about gender and gender equality, sexism, gender-based discrimination and policy responses to gender equality. We propose measuring five dimensions: identity, sexism, experiences, salience and policy instruments. While these five dimensions draw on a wealth of existing measures about gender attitudes, the proposed module would, we argue, redress some blind spots in current cross-national survey items such as experiences of gender-based discrimination, perceptions of masculinity and femininity; and attitudes about the role of gender equality in society.

#### Principal Applicant

<b>Name</b>	<b>Susan Banducci</b>	
<b>Position</b>	<b>Professor</b>	
<b>Institution (including name of University School or Department)</b>	<b>Politics, University of Exeter</b>	
<b>Address for correspondence</b>	<b>Exeter Q-Step Centre</b> <b>Clayden Building</b> <b>Streatham Rise</b> <b>Exeter EX4 4PE</b> <b>United Kingdom</b>	
<b>Telephone: +44 (0)7540234383</b>	<b>Email: <a href="mailto:s.a.banducci@exeter.ac.uk">s.a.banducci@exeter.ac.uk</a></b>	

**Please refer to the application checklist on the reverse before submitting your application.**  
**Checklist for Stage 2 applications for Round 11 QDTs**

**Please ensure that your application includes:**

- ☐ A completed Stage 2 application cover sheet - Mark on the cover sheet whether you are applying for a new or repeat module
- ☐ The main body of the application (max. 20 sides A4) including sections covering:
  - The rationale for fielding the module on the ESS in 2022/23
  - How the module can be implemented on the ESS
  - Team expertise and experience
  - Dissemination plans
- ☐ Bibliographic references (max. 3 sides A4)
- ☐ CVs (max. 2 sides A4 each) for up to five proposed QDT members, including contact details

**Please also ensure that:**

- ☐ Your application is in PDF format (other formats will NOT be accepted)
- ☐ It is written in Arial font size 11 pt
- ☐ Page margins are at least 2cm
- ☐ All pages are numbered
- ☐ All sections of your application are combined into a single document
- ☐ The proposed team includes people from at least three ESS countries (including an ESS ERIC member or observer country)

## **Gender in Contemporary Europe: Rethinking Equality and the Backlash European Social Survey - Stage 2 Module Proposal**

### **1. Rationale**

Decades of policy efforts and campaigns by governments, international organizations and social movements have brought significant progress in women's economic and political status.<sup>1</sup> This transformation is most evident in Europe where the EU remains an exceptional driving force in its commitment to gender equality. The goal of gender equality, however, still remains largely out of reach, as illustrated by the recent wave of highly visible women's protests against sexual harassment, assault and gender violence such as the #MeToo movement. Case in point, we have witnessed worrisome backsliding in gender equality performance in some European countries (e.g. Poland, Hungary and Lithuania) in recent years.<sup>2</sup>

In parallel to calls for increased gender equality, a counter wave of mobilisation against gender equality has appeared in the public discourse. Conservative, authoritarian and populist voices in many democracies are now contesting the equal participation of men and women in society under the auspices of a "war on gender ideology" (Graff 2014). This backlash against women's empowerment carries considerable implications for anti-discrimination laws, policies protecting women against domestic violence, reproductive health and the establishment of gender quotas, even fuelling an increase in hostility towards prominent female political figures (see for instance Krizsán and Roggeband 2018; Brescoll et al. 2018). We are facing a critical moment for capturing the attitudinal bases of support and resistance to these policies across Europe. Our proposed module would provide a gender perspective to illustrate and understand the recent illiberal turn in politics.

We believe such a gendered lens provides a crucial perspective to examine the societal impacts of the ongoing COVID-19 crisis. The lockdown has impacted the day-to-day experiences of women and men in the home unequally, increasing caring responsibilities and domestic violence experienced by women since families are forced to hunker down together. Times of deep crisis are more likely to set the stage for a backlash against women's progress. One hypothesis is that traditional gender roles are reinforced as a consequence of the lockdown coupled with school closures and the lack of availability of extended family members (due to the risk of exposure to the virus). The additional childcare burden is likely to be assumed by women, given the already unbalanced division of childcare duties between working mothers and fathers, not to speak of single mothers or one parent working households.

The seemingly opposing forces—for and against gender equality—provide a unique and timely setting to revisit and broaden our knowledge about gender attitudes. Existing research has relied on the implicit assumption that attitudes about gender equality would develop in a linear fashion; towards ever more gender equal societies, without setbacks. Consequently, we have been blind to a crucial societal development of anti-genderism. Ackerly et al. (2019) describe this anti-genderism, often invoked by the radical right, as "sexism, patriarchy, and misogyny in concert with other forms of bigotry based on citizenship status, ethnicity,

---

<sup>1</sup> Gender equality is a stand alone sustainable development goal (SDG5) and one thought to underpin all other SDGs. See The UN Women's Report on the SDGs Available at <https://www.unwomen.org/en/news/in-focus/women-and-the-sdgs>.

<sup>2</sup> See the European Institute For Gender Equalities report Available at: [https://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/session\\_1\\_index\\_conf\\_15\\_10\\_2019.pdf](https://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/session_1_index_conf_15_10_2019.pdf). The most recent report of Human Developed Perspectives also shows that progress towards gender equality is slowing down around the world.

religion, and sexual and gender identity” (p. 165). Based on system justification theory, Jost et al. (2017) conjecture a rise in reactionary, anti-feminist attitudes when patriarchal structures are threatened by increasing women’s presence in politics or the implementation of policies to remedy discrimination. So far, we still know little about the sources of these challenges to gender equality values many had assumed to be consensual. Given these recent developments, we believe that a module on gender is both timely and well-suited for the European Social Survey’s (ESS) cross-national approach, particularly given the inclusion of countries that differ in the degree of gender equality at the societal level.

#### Aims of the Proposed Module:

Our proposed module captures five dimensions of gender attitudes: feminine and masculine identities, sexism, perceptions of gender discrimination, salience of gender equality and attitudes toward policy responses to gender inequalities. While these dimensions have been fielded individually in single or multi-country studies, they have never been combined in a single instrument. We have three aims in proposing to combine these five dimensions. First, this module will allow drawing a comprehensive cross-national mapping of gender attitudes in Europe that contributes to identifying and explaining societal change. The second aim is to propose new and innovative ways of measuring gender identity and gender salience. Third, the module will provide measures of gender attitudes that can be used to explain cross-national variation in a range of policy relevant attitudes, behaviours and outcomes (e.g. health, happiness, life satisfaction, political attitudes and social values) regularly measured by the ESS in its core questionnaire.

First, our proposed module will allow a better understanding of contemporary gender attitudes in Europe through the mapping of feminine and masculine identities, sexist attitudes, and perceptions of gender-based discrimination. This module will make it possible to investigate how these attitudes are interconnected, and more interestingly, how they can lead to or act as a barrier to progressive attitudes about policies to improve gender equality. The five interconnected dimensions are: (i) feminine and masculine identities that indicate adherence to male and female role orientations and feminine and masculine social norms, including their salience; (ii) sexism—gauging benevolent, hostile and modern sexism as prejudice against women and against progress toward gender equality; (iii) perceptions of gender sex-based discrimination indicating the extent to which discrimination against women exists across various social institutions (e.g. work, family, politics); (iv) salience of gender equality as a social value; (v) preferences about policies to redress social inequalities driven by gender power differentials as expressed through traditionally gender roles. See Table 1 for an overview of our proposed dimensions of gender attitudes and their summary definitions.

Second, we suggest innovative and cross-culturally relevant measures of feminine and masculine identities. To date, cross-national studies of gender attitudes have relied on questions about appropriate gender roles focusing on women’s roles as carers, reluctant labour force participants, and suitability for political office (e.g. World Values Survey). As societies adapt to increased women’s participation in various public arenas, we need to shift our attention to the ways in which citizens see themselves in terms of masculine and feminine traits (see Gidengil and Stolle Forthcoming). With this in mind, we propose to measure feminine and masculine traits, that is, beliefs and behaviours that capture underlying norm acceptance and rigidity in these beliefs. We also propose measures of sexism beyond hostile and benevolent that also capture “modern-sexism” — the denial of and resistance to evidence about the persistence of gender-based discrimination. Additionally, we suggest measuring “gender equality salience” — perceptions of the importance of gender equality as a human value. These indicators move the state of the art beyond conventional “gender equality scales” (such as the scale used by Inglehart and Norris 2003). They allow for a broader conception of gender and gender equality, account for

contemporary expressions of sexism and are not solely focused on the traditional role of women in society.

Third, we aim to produce new opportunities to analyse how sexism, perceptions of discrimination and gender equality operate at the societal level, and how they shape broader social and political views. Our proposed module will also allow researchers to link outcomes of gender equality in different spheres at the societal level (contextual data) with distinct attitudes and experiences at the individual level. Moreover, our module will encourage the exploration of new avenues of research in the field such as cross-cultural variations in political attitudes, gender identity and sexism.

<b>Concept</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>i. Masculine/ feminine identity</b>	Self-ascribed adherence to traits typically seen as male and female and measuring flexibility in the ascription of these traits.
<b>ii. Sexism</b>	A multidimensional concept that reflects structural inequalities and discrimination and at the individual level measuring prejudice, typically against women, on the basis of sex. Hostile, benevolent and contemporary sexism capture the different manner in which prejudice can be evidenced at the individual level.
<b>iii. Experiences and Perceptions of Discrimination</b>	Personal experiences of prejudicial or harmful treatment on the basis of gender. And perceptions of the extent of group discrimination on the basis of gender.
<b>iv. Salience of gender equality</b>	Perceptions of the importance of gender equality to societal development.
<b>v. Attitudes towards policies</b>	Support for a number of specific policies/measures addressing existing gender inequalities regarding different dimensions of the daily life of citizens and the political sphere.

**Table 1. Measuring Contemporary Gender Attitudes in Europe -- Femininity/Masculinity, Sexism and Gender Equality**

## **2. Research Context and Theoretical Background**

What are the major social and political barriers to gender equality? Across European societies, which values and attitudes are linked to greater support for gender equality? To answer these questions, our theoretical approach links attitudes at the individual level (i.e. social psychological measures of identity and sexism) and experiences with gender discrimination, to perceptions and preferences about the role of gender equality in society. Theories on the motivations underlying the gender backlash, the rise of populism and the conservative turn in gender attitudes can be tested using items included in the proposed module. Linked to contextual indicators of gender equality in society, our module allows an updated account of the state of gender attitudes and the social, economic, political and

policy conditions under which identities and attitudes are more likely to inhibit progress on gender equality in Europe.

The proposed set of indicators will make it possible to tackle a series of research questions of both scholarly and societal relevance: How do citizens perceive gender equality across countries? Are perceptions of the extent of gender (in)equalities in society linked to specific policy outcomes? Why is gender equality a focal issue for some people, but irrelevant for others? What are the determinants of people's opinions about gender equalities in their own societies? What is the role of gender identities, stereotypes and sexism in shaping public views about gender equality? Do these factors (e.g. sexism, discrimination, salience of gender equality) have equal explanatory power across countries? What are the political consequences of gender attitudes? Are gender attitudes linked to specific political attitudes or behaviours? How are gender attitudes linked to other characteristics such as health, well-being and socio-demographic characteristics?

Below we describe how our proposed module contributes to (1) theory building in social research on gender, (2) innovation in measuring gender attitudes, and (3) the comparative study of social attitudes, behaviours and outcomes across Europe.

## **2.1 Gender in Contemporary Europe: Generating and Improving Theory**

This module brings together concepts and dimensions of gender attitudes, experiences of discrimination and gender identity. To the best of our knowledge, no single comparative survey collects systematic information about all these dimensions simultaneously. This will permit us to offer a general framework of potential motivators for policy attitudes linked to gender equality, including individual experiences of discrimination. The opportunity to theorize and test linkages between these dimensions of attitudes about gender, and to do so in a cross-national comparative perspective, can serve as a stepping stone for theory building in social science research on gender and gender identity and related attitudes, bridging the fields of psychology, sociology and political science.

We contend that deeply rooted sexism can contribute to preserving gender inequalities in societies, even in a subtle way. There has been much progress on gender equality with policies intended to reduce the inequalities in society, for instance, in work and access to education (Walby 2011). Backlash is a response to and reaction against progressive social change that challenges existing hierarchies of power. The presence of a backlash against women's progress in social and political spaces raises two questions about our existing understanding about the role of social attitudes in shaping gender equality. First, can existing theories linking economic modernisation or culture (Inglehart and Norris 2003) to the rise of gender equality properly account for the backlash? Second, what value does society place on gender equality and does valuing gender equality play a role in sustaining social change through support for gender equality policies?

In order to address these questions, we propose a model that brings together psychological constructs and attitudinal measures of gender identity, sexism, and perceptions of sex-based discrimination. We argue that these are inter-related but are also crucial to explain resistance to gender equality and the policies that lead to gender equal societies.

With this in mind, there are two major areas of research questions our module intends to address — the first is more descriptive and the second more explanatory. First, descriptively, what is the demand for change in society to reflect greater gender equality? Can we think of gender equality as a social value? Do citizens' values and policy preferences for gender equality vary across countries in systematic ways? Second, what are the antecedents, predispositions, experiences and motivations explaining and underpinning these values and

preferences. For example, how far does sexism and perceptions of discrimination prove to be a barrier to recognition of the importance of gender equality and remedies for gender equality? To what extent are these relationships influenced by variations in identities and the salience of these identities?

There is a complex relationship between psychological constructs, attitudes and context that explain why progress toward gender equality has seemingly stalled and in some areas experiences backsliding. We argue that personal experiences of gender discrimination are crucially linked to gender identities. Social norms cover different aspects of citizens' identities (like gender or age). The experience of discriminatory social norms can potentially reinforce gender identities and shape women's and men's behaviours, perpetuating traditional social norms, those that in turn create specific expectations for socially acceptable masculine and feminine behaviour.

Both sexism and gender identity might create demand (or a lack of demand) for social change, that is, attitudes toward the salience of gender equality and gender policy. Or put it another way: all of these underlying attitudes would influence whether gender equality is seen as salient for democracy and ultimately influence attitudes towards specific policies addressing gender inequalities. Understanding how sexism, feminine and masculine identities, and experiences of gender discrimination are associated or contribute to predict other attitudes and outcomes is relevant because they shape public perceptions about the relevance of gender inequality at the societal level as well as attitudes towards women in the public sphere (Glick and Fiske 1996).

Research on values and value change has uncovered that attitudes on gender equality are linked to authoritarianism insofar these attitudes reflect support for conformity to rigid roles, or openness to diversity in role congruence (see for example Norris and Inglehart 2019). Whether individuals polarize in their conceptions of their own masculine and feminine traits (i.e., hypermasculinity and hyperfemininity, see Gidengil and Stolle Forthcoming) is therefore likely to undergird their larger attachments and support for authoritarianism. Likewise, whether individuals are more fluid in conceptions of their own masculine or feminine traits is likely to be the basis on which their larger attachments and support for core social values such as openness, individualism and diversity rest.

We explicitly link citizens' social attitudes, measuring values and role orientations, to the salience they attach to gender equality and to their policy preferences. Social attitudes provide a criterion to evaluate the current context, leading to greater demands and salience. Whether these are translated into policy outcomes provides an important marker of democratic responsiveness. For instance, benevolent sexist and non-egalitarian gender role attitudes can generate harmful evaluations of female candidates for political office and, at the same time lower levels of support for gender equality (Lizzotte 2018). Understanding the sources and possible effects of attitudes toward women is relevant to public policy and scholars in gender studies, social psychology, sociology, and political science.

## **2.2 Innovation in Measures**

Our understanding of this fundamental social issue has been helped by cross-national surveys but faces serious limitations which we intend to redress. First, the bulk of cross-national surveys have placed their focus on acceptance of equal participation of women in society, and in the workforce in particular (such as the items included in the ESS, International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) and World Values Survey (WVS)). Some of the more in-depth investigations have looked at family dynamics of women's entry in the labour market. While the existing projects capture an important aspect of cultural norms about the position of women, they are the tip of the iceberg, insofar as we are missing the

**attitudes and psychological predispositions** underpinning these norms, namely identity, stereotypes and prejudices.

Second, studies tend to focus on gender equality and the role of women rather than the role of gender. They also tend to focus on how women balance dual roles as workers and mothers, or their public versus private roles. In other words, they reinforce socially constructed and gendered dilemmas (for example, who should get a job or who has the right to a job) or pit women against men. They also ask women and the role of women to be evaluated in the context of motherhood. These questions presume gendered roles rather than asking more broadly about the underlying construction of gender roles in society linked to prejudice, the symbolic manifestations of these perceptions and the role of gender equality as a social good. By symbolic we mean the type of **sexism** measured in the ambivalent sexism inventory (e.g. Glick and Fiske 2001) where overt sexism is not evident. Hostile and benevolent sexism are two sides of the same coin: traditional gender relations. While benevolent sexism supports women who stick to traditional roles, hostile sexism penalizes women that break with gendered traditional norms.

Third, absent from cross-national surveys are measures of the salience and the **experiences of discrimination** in the everyday lives of men and women. The existing survey data have not allowed researchers an opportunity to evaluate in a systematic way the extent to which experience of discrimination shapes the **salience of attitudes towards gender equality**, or the strength of feelings people hold about gender and gender equality. Individuals might ascribe a more traditional role to women without feelings of hostility or accept women's equal position but, if salient, these may be held at the price of resentment.

Finally, by integrating norm orientations about both women and men our project proposes a more holistic view of how sexism and prejudice operate at the societal level rather than a one-sided view where women are the only targets.

### **2.3 Gender Based Explanations for Social Attitudes and Outcomes**

Our suggested module is highly relevant for the ESS community and wider not just for scholars of gender. The module will be of broad interest to those working on cultural and social values as aligned to the human values scales and measures of populism. The module can also be leveraged to expand the analysis capabilities of the core questionnaire. Specifically, this module would link to key variables in other existing modules: 1) Socio-economic characteristics (e.g. household structure, socioeconomic conditions, or education) to explain individual variation in all five dimensions introduced above; 2) The Politics Core Module (e.g. political allegiances and engagement) can be linked to assess, for example, the relationship between hostile sexism and support for populist radical right/green parties or the political leanings of feminine/masculine identities; 3) Items included in the Human Values section (H) (e.g. importance to follow traditions and customs, important to do what is told and follow rules) and also religiosity (included in Section C) are expected to be connected to the dimensions of identity and salience; 4) Links between the dimension of identity and questions on gay rights (Politics Core Module). There is evidence for strong links between traditional gender roles and attitudes about LGBTQ+ in society (Inglehart and Norris 2003; Whitley 2001; Henry and Wetherell 2017); 5) Personal questions about happiness, subjective wellbeing, and mental health (included in Section B of the core ESS questionnaire). For example, links between the dimensions of identity and/or experiences of discrimination and well-being or mental illness are expected (e.g. Nadal and Haynes 2012).

The dimensions are also well suited for a cross-national comparative survey where contextual variations in social norms, economic conditions, family and labour market policies can be leveraged to understand fluctuations in these dimensions at the individual and country levels. The countries participating in the ESS offer interesting contextual differences



to investigate the role of policy contexts, but also socioeconomic and historical environments on attitudes about gender and gender roles. Different historical, religious, social and political contexts influence the way people learn about gender roles and constrain their behaviour and are likely to relate to variations in the five proposed dimensions across countries. For example, we expect our dimensions to be linked to the cross-national variation in authoritarianism and populist attitudes (Fish 2002; Donno and Russett 2004; Norris and Inglehart 2019); representation of women in legislatures (Alexander 2012); electoral success of radical right populist parties (Wodak 2015); family and labour market policies (Fortin 2005); and education policy (Brooks 2018).

### **3. Implementation: Indicators of Gender Attitudes**

Gender differences, that is, average differences between men and women in political attitudes and behaviours have been documented at length in the scholarly literature. The module will allow pushing the state of the art by making it possible to investigate the contribution of sexism, gender identities, and experiences of gender discrimination to the explanation of the documented gender differences in political attitudes and behaviours. In Table 2, we detail how we will operationalise the five core dimensions outlined in Table 1.<sup>3</sup> In doing so, we draw on well documented scales of gender roles and sexism. We also propose supplementing these well-tested scales with new measures that capture more contemporary understanding of gender and gender traits. In addition, we provide operationalisations for new dimensions on experiences, salience and attitudes toward policy responses to address gender inequality.

#### **3.1 Feminine and Masculine Identities**

Gender scholars have long recognized gender as an inherently non-binary concept (West and Zimmerman 1987). An individual's recognition of "being" a gender (e.g., "I am a man") cannot be understood outside its social meaning, both in terms of interpersonal interactions and broader social-cultural/institutional frameworks (Risman 2004). Moreover, a broadening recognition of the non-binary character of sex and gender is linked with greater respect for the rights of persons to identify as non-binary and/or transgender (Hyde et al. 2019). This has amounted to calls in work on the measurement of gender and identity for the incorporation of new, noncategorical ways of measuring gender (Westbrook and Saperstein 2015). Our approach is to measure the extent to which individuals perceive themselves as masculine or feminine in today's society (Spence 1984).

We operationalise feminine and masculine identities in two ways that capture adherence to male and female role orientations and feminine and masculine norms: a) self-assessment of typical masculine and feminine traits and b) self-assessment of overall masculinity and femininity. Both measures can be used to assess to what extent the general self-assessment scale (b) is linked in a similar way to the self-assessment of typical masculine and feminine traits (a) among women and men and across different cultural contexts.

##### ***3.1a Respondents' self assessment of typical masculine and feminine traits***

To capture gender in more nuanced ways than in a binary (woman/man) fashion, we will measure respondents' self assessment of typical masculine and feminine traits. In particular, we will present each respondents four traits, of which two reflect qualities seen as stereotypical feminine traits (sympathetic and sensitive to others) and 2 as stereotypical

---

<sup>3</sup> We will work with the ESS team on the exact items and wording. We have experience in working on large collaborative cross-national surveys.

masculine traits (strong personality and forceful) in contemporary Western societies. This format, which is in line with the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem 1974), allows these masculine and feminine traits to vary independently and as graduating concepts. Individuals can thus possess a certain degree of the expressive/feminine traits and some degree of the instrumental/masculine traits, rather than being uncompromisingly feminine or masculine. Respondents are asked to assess how often a given personality trait applies to their character, with the possible answers ranging from 1 'never or almost never true' to 7 'always or almost always true.' An explorative analysis using data from the Dutch Longitudinal Internet Studies for the Social Sciences (LISS) revealed that the four suggested characteristics load strongly on the respective BSRI masculine and feminine scales, which confirms that they offer a good indication of typical instrumental/masculine and expressive/feminine characteristics. Based on this exploratory analysis, the items we recommend as traits to capture masculinity or femininity are: sympathetic (F), sensitive to other's needs (F), strong personality (M) and forceful (M).

### *3.1b Respondents' self-assessment of their masculinity/femininity*

Self-assessed femininity and masculinity. Scholars working with surveys of the Swedish population have approached the measurement of non-categorical gender with just two scales that do not impose stereotypical definitions of femininity and masculinity (Nilsson and Holmberg 2006; Wängnerud et al. 2019). The question is: "Sometimes, one talks about individuals having both female and male characteristics. To what extent would you say that you have female and male characteristics, respectively?" Respondents then assess their characteristics on two scales, one for masculine and another for feminine characteristics. Each scale ranges from 0 = "I have few of such characteristics," to 10 = "I have many such characteristics." In other words, respondents rate themselves on both masculine and feminine characteristics and are not given any instructions as to what constitutes "male" or "female" characteristics. The published studies of data based on these scales demonstrate that this measurement of non-categorical gender is a strong correlate of categorical gender but also varies considerably among those identified or who identify as a woman or man (Wängnerud 2018). Scholars also show that this measurement is important for understanding variation in important social attitudes, such as those related to social anxiety, beyond categorical gender (Wängnerud et al. 2019). Similar items have been fielded successfully in the United States suggesting they are appropriate for cross-national studies and are not context dependent (Gidengil and Stolle Forthcoming).

The two measures of masculine/feminine identity have - in different formats - previously been included in surveys (see Table 2 below), showing the validity of both measures. However, these measures have been mostly included in national surveys which has made it impossible to engage in cross-national comparisons. In addition, both measures have so far never been included simultaneously in one survey. Including these scales (self-assessed femininity/masculinity and the four characteristics of masculinity/femininity) will enable us to study the link between respondents' own assessments of the extent to which they have male and female characteristics and the degree to which they assess instrumental/masculine and expressive/feminine traits apply to their character. The addition of these items will make it possible to test, for example, whether respondents who identify as strongly male also tend to score high on strong personality and forceful, and whether this link is similar in different social and cultural contexts.

Additionally, capturing gender identity will allow us and other researchers to explicitly account for feminine and masculine traits and their impact on social and political attitudes. Relying on respondent sex as an operationalisation of these underlying traits essentialises gender, conflates sex and gender and reproduces the gendered practices in survey research and analysis. Westbrook and Saperstein (2015) recommended combining respondent sex with measures of masculinity and femininity. To the best of our knowledge, no comparative

survey has gone beyond asking for the respondents' sex as a category. Our proposed module would represent an innovative step forward in the survey methodology to study gender differences in attitudes and behaviours. For example, prior research using masculine and feminine measures of identity shows that support for democrats in the US is driven by femininity, while citizens' engagement is driven by masculinity (McDermott 2016). We expect these measures to be relevant not only for the other dimensions in the proposed modules, but also to a number of political attitudes and social values. A deeper analysis of "gender gaps" in human values (a core component of ESS surveys) can be provided which examines how feminine and masculine traits are linked to these values rather than postulating links between social values and gender identity and relying on respondent sex (Schwartz and Rubel-Lifschitz 2009).

### *c. Salience of one's gender identity*

Because we are interested in how these identities shape attitudes and behaviour, we also propose to include a measure of the salience of these identities for the respondent. Salience identity is intended to capture the prominence respondents give to defining themselves as a member of a group. The salience of gender identity might condition the relationships between gender identity and attitudes (see Randel 2004). For example, Bittner and Goodyear-Grant (2017) find that the gender gap in political attitudes across a range of topics is non-existent for women who do not have salient gender identities. The measure gender identity salience, we propose an item that has previously been fielded, see for example Gustafsson Sendén et al. (2015).

## **3.2 Sexism**

Sexism can be defined as "... a special case of prejudice marked by a deep ambivalence, rather than uniform antipathy, toward women" (Glick and Fiske, 1996, 491). It defines gender-based discrimination, stereotypes and prejudice; it is also a property underpinning patriarchal social systems (Manne 2017). Burns and Gallagher (2010) argue that sexism has been overlooked as a predisposition in explaining attitudes about women and gender equality because it did not seem relevant. Recently, however, the backlash against women, the increase in misogyny in the public sphere and stalled progress on women's issues has renewed interest in sexism as an explanation for attitudes and behaviours. For instance, hostile sexism is related to support for President Trump (Ratliff et al. 2019) as well as to the acceptance of gender income inequality (Connor and Fisk 2019).

Our intent is to capture sexism as expressed through individual attitudes denoting negativity toward women based on the perception that they are subordinate. Rather than treating gender attitudes as unidimensional, ranging from negative to positive attitudes towards women in society, we propose to systematically consider the existence of different conceptual dimensions that characterize gender attitudes. We draw on the rich history of measuring sexism in social attitudes with the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) distinguishing hostile sexism and benevolent sexism (Glick and Fiske, 1996) coupled with the Modern Sexism Scale (MSS) (Swim et al. 1995, Valentino et al. 2018).

The ASI is composed of two dimensions. The first, hostile sexism, understands men and women's relationship as competitive and a zero-sum, whereby if women gain power, it is at men's expense. It involves antagonism toward women obtaining special favours in the workplace, the belief that women are exaggeratedly susceptible to potential sexist statements, and that women use their sexuality to "control" or "dominate" men. The second dimension, benevolent sexism, is rooted in the belief that women should be protected by men and that essentialist sex differences (determined by biology) give women advantages in domestic duties. Benevolent sexism encompasses positive prejudices about women. Such stereotypes reinforce women's subordinate position relative to men, contributing to maintain existing patterns of gender inequalities and traditional gender roles in society. While men are

more likely to endorse hostile sexism, women often advocate benevolent sexism and contest hostile sexism (Glick and Fiske 2001).

Many studies have found overt sexism to be declining and supplanted by more subtle or modern forms of sexism (e.g. benevolent sexism) (Swim et al. 1995). The same way scholars now recognize that measures capturing overt racism are no longer appropriate to depict how racism is currently expressed (Valentino et al. 2005), the conventional Attitudes Toward Women Scale (Spence and Helmreich 1972) started to lose analytical relevance to predict gender-relevant policy attitudes in the 1990s (Spence and Hahn 1997). Valentino et al. (2018) highlight the differences between old and new sexism. For this reason, we find it important to include this modern component in conjunction with the ASI. Elements of this contemporary expression of sexism are: ascribes to innate gender differences, denial of discrimination against women, see remedies for gender inequality as “special favours” and are angry about complaints about sex-based discrimination (Lewis 2018).

Deployed in the American National Election study, the MSS is based on a series of questions that, unlike the ASI scale, ask respondents about women without making comparisons to men. We argue that questions asking about women directly will capture antagonism toward women as a group without making that relative to men. We therefore propose including three items of the MSS as a third dimension to the ASI. Our selection of 4 items from the ASI is based on a personal exchange with Peter Glick [May 7 2020] supplemented by an exploratory factor analysis on available cross-national data.

### **3.3 Experiences and Perceptions of Gender-Based Discrimination**

Personal (significant others and family members) and societal (social and political institutions) discrimination are critical for understanding social attitudes. From group identity theory, discrimination occurs when members of an “ingroup” are rejected or devalued by members of a more powerful and privileged outgroup (Tajfel and Turner 1986). While personal experiences of gender-based discrimination, such as insults or exclusion, affect general wellbeing (Schmitt et al. 2003) as well as mental and physical health (Pascoe and Smart Richman 2009), there are a number of theories that link personal and group-based experiences of discrimination.

Theoretical frameworks such as system justification theory (Jost et al. 2017) suggest that individuals may defend existing social, economic, and political arrangements inequalities to reduce dissonance or anxiety. Even if experience personal discrimination, beliefs about social structures can underlie passive acceptance of existing inequalities and prejudice, particularly when challenging the status quo can be costly. Personal-group discrimination discrepancy (e.g. Crosby 1982) suggests that individuals perceive themselves as less susceptible or vulnerable to discrimination than the members of their group.

Given personal experiences of discrimination and perceptions of group discrimination can be linked, it is important to measure both in the module. We suggest they may be important for understanding how gender identities may be made salient through both perceived discrimination at the individual level as well as the group level. Experiences of discrimination may also have an impact on identity formation and in turn influence perceptions of femininity and masculinity. These perceptions of discrimination are also pivotal in societal change.

The European Social Survey has previously asked about individual experiences of discrimination (ESS4) and group-based discrimination (from ESS5-9). The wording for the individual experiences of discrimination used as part of the Ageism module in 2008 reads, “Using this card please tell me how often, in the past year, anyone has shown prejudice against you or treated you unfairly because of... ..your sex/age/ethnicity?” Responses range from 0” Never” to 4” Very Often” where end points of scale are labelled. Results from

this round indicate low prevalence of perceived gender discrimination, but a significant gender gap in these perceptions (Ayalon 2014). From ESS5, respondents were asked about group-based discrimination in the following way; “Would you describe yourself as being a member of a group that is discriminated against in this country?” If respondents indicated they were a member of a discriminated group, they were asked the basis of the group discrimination and could tick all that applied. Categories included -- colour, race, gender, sexuality, disability, colour/race, language, religion.

Currently, the ESS, does not allow a comparison of individual and group-based discrimination. For this reason, our module sets out to include both group based and individual experiences of discrimination. The Eurobarometer series does include examples of where the two measures have been asked. Eurobarometer surveys have fielded questions (e.g. Eurobarometer 65.4 and 69.1) has asked respondents to express opinions about discrimination across several categories: “For each of the following types of discrimination [sex, age, religion, ethnic origin, disability], could you please tell me whether, in your opinion, it is very widespread, fairly widespread, fairly rare or very rare in *your country*? (from 69.1)” Respondents are also asked (and given the same categories):” In the past 12 months have you personally felt discriminated against or harassed on the basis of one or more of the following grounds? Was it a discrimination on basis of...(sex etc..)? Please tell me all that apply.” Because we wish to measure perceptions of group-based gender discrimination on a scale (and relative to other group discrimination), we propose items that are similar to the Eurobarometer rather than the existing ESS questions.

Our own analysis of the data from EB69.1 reveals that perceptions of group discrimination on the basis of sex are correlated with individual experiences. For example, in Spain almost 12 percent of the respondents report that discrimination on the basis of sex is very widespread and 3 percent report personal experience. Ireland has a similar level of reported individual experience of sex-based discrimination but only 3 percent report sex-based discrimination is very widespread. In Table 2 we propose a question wording using gender-based discrimination as that more accurately captures the theme of the module and our focus on gender attitudes. We also propose asking about discrimination on the basis of two other categories (age and ethnicity) to allow for comparisons across types of discrimination. Measuring gender-based discrimination as relative to other types of discrimination, will allow us to better understand the relationship between discrimination and other attitudes we measure. Additionally, it will give us the ability to compare to ESS2004 measures in terms of individual experiences of discrimination (with the exception of gender as sex was used in 2004).

### **3.4 Salience of Gender Equality**

A vast interdisciplinary literature by academics and key intergovernmental organizations evidences the importance of understanding gender roles and combating gender inequality for all major aspects of societal development (UN Women 2019), including that related to politics (Inglehart and Norris 2003; Esarey and Schwindt-Bayer 2019), economics (Klasen and Lamanna 2009; World Bank 2012), the environment (Kassinis et al. 2016; UNEP 2016), peace (Hudson et al. 2012), and disease (Raviglione and Maher 2017). Scholars and practitioners consider this understanding fundamental to efforts to identify the sources of sustainability challenges, grasp the scope of those challenges and design policy to combat those challenges. It is this understanding of gender and gender inequality that has merited its status as one of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG no. 5).

However, to our knowledge, just one large-scale survey project made a limited attempt to measure public awareness of the importance of increasing gender equality for societal development. The Eurobarometer (EB 465) fielded just two questions asking respondents how important gender equality is 1) to ensure a fair and democratic society and 2) for

companies and the economy. We propose a new battery of items that are more nuanced and varied to expand our measurement in this area. We will measure respondents' assessments of the importance of gender equality across key domains of development, covering economics, politics, environmental sustainability and life/work balance. We propose these indicators because they focus on domains that are highly relevant to contemporary sustainability debates and particularly applicable to Europe.

### **3.5 Attitudes Towards Policies Addressing Gender Inequality**

Finally, measuring attitudes toward policy responses to gender equality is necessary in order to assess the potential for these gender attitudes to shape societal change or reflect macro-social developments. To date studies have tended to focus on public support for policies that are relevant to women such as family and childcare (Valarino et al. 2018) and abortion (Jelen et al. 1993) or equal roles for men and women (Bolzendahl and Meyers 2004). When thinking about gender policies, scholars distinguish between policies aimed at extending rights to women or policies that promote role change for women but categorization as one or another type of policy is not fixed but context dependent (Burns and Gallagher 2010). For example, recent studies on support for policies to increase the representation of women on company boards or in political office (e.g. Bolzendahl and Coffé 2019; Möhring and Teney 2019) could be seen as opening these opportunities for women or as representing a role change for women. To fill this gap, we suggest asking respondents' level of support for a number of specific policies and measures regarding three specific dimensions, namely: work, family and politics.

We claim that it is important to measure separately public opinion about a general principle (in this case gender equality) from opinions about specific policies that try to solve or at least address part of the problem raised by the principle. For example, scholarship studying opinions towards affirmative action observes that public validation for the principle of racial equality does not always encompass support for specific policies aimed at correcting racial inequalities (Kinder and Sanders 1996). In the case of gender equality "the principle-policy puzzle" might be specially relevant, since the logic of ambivalent sexism implies the possibility of rejecting equality by defending gender complementarity and the maintenance of traditional gender roles while at the same time supporting policies to promote, for instance, women representation

In the design of the questions, we distinguish between work, family and politics since individuals might have different ideas about normative gender equality in each of these realms. It is indeed possible that someone supports gender equality in the political domain, but at the same time is against policies targeting gender-based violence, given its intimate character. The distinction between family (or private) life, work life, and political life intends to demarcate a conceptual continuum ranging from the most public (politics) to the most private (partner/family relationships). These aspects have high theoretical relevance for the study of gender issues (Lizzote 2018)

Through studying the origins of citizens' opinions about gender equality in each of the suggested dimensions (work, family and politics), the module will contribute directly to the scattered evidence on the roots of public preferences for gender policies in general. In addition, the suggested diverse measures on gender identity will allow a more detailed analysis on how gender (and gender identities) relate to support for policies to address gender inequalities in different domains. Other potential links to policy preferences are personal or family experiences of gender discrimination.

Variants of the items we propose to include in our module have been previously tested in various international and national survey projects such as Special Eurobarometer 465,

General Social Survey in the US (see specially the gender module of 1996), Polnat in Spain, and IMAGES. However, we propose to adapt this list of items to the current situation regarding gender inequalities in Europe, in particular those that are of more relevance in the media across different countries.

Our proposed list of survey items in Table 2 links the three aforementioned dimensions (work, family and politics) with the following five specific domains: politics (women representation in parliaments/political parties), economic resources: money (equal pay for women and men), work (sexual harassment in the work-place), family (childcare/ distribution of household chores) and gender violence. These five domains correspond to those composing the gender equality index collected by the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE): violence, health, work, power, time, money and knowledge. This implies a relevant theoretical connection that will be particularly useful when analysing contextual correlates of citizens' support regarding gender equality policies. Our expectation here, as an example, is that levels of support for these kinds of policies will be greater in countries presenting higher levels of gender equality.

### **3.6 Gender Equality in Context: Proposed Country Level Data Collection**

We have considered a range of contextual indicators that are important to understanding heterogeneity in the relationships among our concepts/dimensions across countries as well as to explaining the cross-country variation in our measures. These contextual variations in general achievements in gender equality in politics, labour force, and other domains constitute an important control in terms of the supply of gender equality in each of the participating countries. In addition, contextual indicators might be useful for analysing the relevance of the consequences of gendered attitudes on political attitudes, and behaviours; on feelings of health conditions, happiness, etc., but also serve as key mechanisms conditioning the effects of attitudes.

The ESS has been a leader in offering a broad array of contextual data to supplement its survey data: the survey offers a broad set of contextual variables mapping demography, education, employment, socio economic developments and political system features (Rydland et al. 2007) both at the national and the regional level. The previous waves of the survey already contain a series of indicators pertaining to gender, for instance in terms of educational attainment, health, and indices mapping gender inequality as well as political and economic rights (United Nations Development Programme Gender Inequality Index - GII) and Physical Integrity Rights Index. Rates the level of government respect for a variety of internationally recognized human rights).

To these highly aggregated measures, we feel the following additions would provide more fine grained contextual insights: the adoption of legal measures for the promotion of women in politics, a more detailed set of indicators mapping gender equality in various domains like work, money, knowledge, time, power, health, as well as violence. The inclusion of indicators maps the situation of women in terms of presence, not only in legislative assemblies (already included by ESS), but also in executives, political parties, public administration, judiciary bodies, economic and financial institutions, NGOs, the media, as well as in research sectors. Last, we propose a series of indicators tracing the policy context of gender equality by looking at social protection policies like maternity/paternity leave, childcare expenditures, and presence in the labour force.

We have compiled a series of contextual indicators (see appendix) with their (publicly available) sources of high quality including some of which have already been included in the ESS in prior modules.

#### 4. Team expertise and experience

The Questionnaire Design Team (QDT) brings together expertise in survey research, cross-national comparative public opinion research, and comparative research on gender and society. Each team member brings experience in managing, designing and implementing national and cross-national surveys and all QDT members are thus aware of the opportunities, challenges, and practicalities. The team includes expertise in conducting national surveys (Banducci and Coffé for the New Zealand Election Study); cross-national surveys (Fortin-Rittberger for the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems; Banducci for the European Election Study), and the design of question modules for the German Longitudinal Election Study, the Finnish Candidate Survey and the Dutch Longitudinal Internet Studies for the Social Sciences (Coffé), the World Value Survey (Alexander) and the Spanish Barómetros (Fraile). Fraile has won national awards for the best Survey Questionnaire Proposal at Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas in 2005 and 2012 and Banducci supported the development of ESS items on measuring the news through media exposure.<sup>4</sup>

Additionally, members of the team have published on measurement and design issues in survey research, on the challenges of supplementing cross-national survey data with contextual data, and with a specific focus on issues related to measurement of gender. All members of the team have published extensively using cross-national survey data and are at the forefront of the growing and robust body of evidence about the social and political role of gender. Alexander's work on women's empowerment draws on the WVS. Coffé's work on gender and political participation and citizenship norms draws on ISSP. Fraile's work on gender, political engagement and knowledge uses similar cross-national surveys such as the European Election Studies or the Latin American Public Opinion Project. The CVs for the QDT provide further details on relevant publications. Furthermore, the proposed QDT has used the ESS as evidence for their own research and publications. This experience of publishing with the ESS means the QDT is well placed to integrate the proposed module with other modules. Beyond these academic publications, the team has experience in and values dissemination to non-academic audiences. For example, members of the QDT regularly publish blog posts and opinion articles in national newspapers such as *El País* (Spain), *De Standaard* (Belgium), *London School of Economics (EUROPP)*, the Political Studies Association Women and Politics Specialist Group, *Politicsblog*, etc.

While the design team is limited to five members, we had a dedicated "critical network" of colleagues who acted as an advisory board and were critical to the development of this ESS module proposal, both the theoretical case and the case for particular indicators. We have relied on their published work as well as their comments on the proposal itself. We envision their full engagement in the use and analysis of the data as well as our dissemination plans. Our advisory board includes Dr. Hannah Wass (University of Helsinki and Finnish Election Study, Finland), Professor Elisabeth Gidengil (McGill University, Canada), Professor Catherine Bolzendahl (Director of the Social Policy Centre, Oregon State University, USA), Dr. Katharine Thomas (University of Aberdeen, UK & European Survey Research Association Board Member), Professor Dan Stevens, (University of Exeter, UK) and Professor Eva Anduiza (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain). We acknowledge their input by naming them in the proposal. They have, in the capacity of an advisory network, agreed to advise on the implementation of the module, collaborate on research outputs and

---

<sup>4</sup> ESS Round 8 – New Core Items Concept: Time spent consuming news media.



policy reports, identify and engage with third sector organisations on disseminating results and contribute to special issues and edited volumes.

Members of the QDT team have collaborated previously on research outputs and projects. Over the past 8 months we have strengthened the collaboration for all QDT members. In the development of the first stage proposal, we secured funding to host a face-to-face workshop where we developed the core ideas of the proposal. However, given current restrictions on travel we have successfully moved to online collaboration for regular team meetings. Given the uncertainty on travel in the future, if our proposed module is selected for inclusion, we plan to continue regular meetings online to develop the module. We will organise at least two meetings with the advisory network in advance of the fieldwork. The purpose of these meetings with the advisory network is to consult on the module items but also to develop and deliver our dissemination plans (see section 5 below).

## **5. Dissemination, Engagement and Support**

We also expect there to be a great deal of interest amongst the community of policymakers. International organisations such as the United Nations, the World Economic Forum and the OECD are seeking indicators of gender equality, attitudes towards policy instruments and the economic, societal and security implications of gender equality. The European Union, the European Institute for Gender Equalities (EIGE), and national governments need evidence of experiences of discrimination, its underlying causes and possible policy solutions. Our suggested ESS module will provide high quality and relevant comparative data to these organisations and governments. This evidence can also be used by NGOs and social organisations to highlight where governments are failing to address issues.

We have identified four main beneficiaries of our proposed ESS module: social science scholars (gender, political scientists, sociologists, psychologists), researchers working in comparative survey research, students and practitioners (NGO and governmental, gender equality bodies) in Europe working in the area of gender equality or analysing the political, social, and behavioural consequences of existing sexism and experiences of discrimination in Europe. We will engage with these groups of beneficiaries to co-produce research and impact, and to disseminate the data and key insights more broadly.

Social Sciences scholars: Firstly, we will propose a special issue on gender attitudes in Europe to the European Journal of Politics and Gender (EJPG) (QDT member Fortin-Rittberger is incoming EJPG editor from Summer 2020 and Alexander is currently an editor of a forthcoming EJPG special issue). Secondly, a special issue in a generalist journal in Europe is long overdue and would make it possible to engage a broader set of scholars (for example in West European Politics or the European Journal of Political Science). Our advisory board and the wide network of gender scholars will be invited to participate in these special issues.

Thirdly, we plan to organise two panels at European conferences to present the initial results from the module. One panel will be organised for the European Conference on Politics and Gender and a second panel at the European Survey Research Association Conference. In each of these activities we will place a special emphasis on engaging with early career researchers in order to build capacity. Within each QDT members' own research centres, the use of the data will be promoted through masterclasses. For example, in Spain two research groups led by Marta Fraile (at Spanish National Research Council) and Eva Anduiza (at Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona) will intensively use the evidence produced. Marta Fraile is creating a multidisciplinary network on the study of gender in Spain.

Comparative Survey Researchers: Again working with the QDT, our advisory board and wider network of both junior and senior gender scholars, we will propose a third conference panel or series of papers at the International ESS Conference. We are also in contact with Dr. Kathrin Thomas, board member of European Survey Research Association, about a proposal for a sub-group on studying the impact of gender in comparative survey research.

Undergraduate and postgraduate students: All QDT members use ESS data in their teaching and for student research papers. To undertake and facilitate the training of future European social researchers we will use the gender attitudes module as evidence in our classes and for student research. Given the increased likelihood of online teaching, the use of the online data analysis tool will be particularly relevant. We will plan and develop a data analysis exercise on gender attitudes in Europe for our taught students. This online exercise will follow the format of the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research's (ICPSR) Exercise Modules that engage students in the data through a sequence of activities and exercise sets. This data exercise module will be appropriate for research methods and substantively focused courses.

Practitioners: Our project will answer the demand for reliable statistics on attitudes towards gender equality and sexism; a demand that is high on the international agenda (see e.g. Ballington 2018). Our evidence is also relevant for organisations such as UN Women which can use the findings of our project to further develop their policies addressing gender inequalities. We will produce a policy report, with defined policy recommendations on gender discrimination which will be disseminated to strategically identified policymakers, practitioners and the media. The Centre for Public Impact, a UK based not-for-profit that works with governments, public servants, and other policy practitioners, has agreed to work with us to promote and distribute the policy brief. The research and impact services at each of our institutions and our press offices will also assist in the launch of this policy report.

We also plan to present the findings of this module (ESS-11) in the European Parliament. Members of the QDT have disseminated research findings at the European Parliament's celebration of International Women's Day.<sup>5</sup> We would work with the European Parliament's Directorate-General for Parliamentary Research to present results from the module at a similar event. We can contribute to similar events at the national level in cooperation with the ESS European Research Infrastructure.

Future funding: During the period of developing and refining the module if awarded, we will also work to secure additional support for networking, analysis and dissemination of the data and results. The QDT and the wider critical network of scholars involved in the current application will consider applications for additional support from the European Commission (H2020) and national funding agencies represent possible sources of funding (e.g. UK Research and Innovation, Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación (Spain), Riksbankens Jubileumsfond and Vetenskapsrådet (Sweden). Support for analysing the data from the module will be requested in a European Research Council Advanced Grant application (deadline 26 August, 2020) by Banducci. We also expect to obtain additional funding for dissemination through national competition calls such as for example, the one currently opened by the Ministry of Equality in Spain that intends to support the organization of conferences and/or workshops engaging researchers studying gender inequalities and interested stakeholders. There is considerable experience within the team at securing research and dissemination funding.

---

<sup>5</sup> Details of this event can be found at <https://epthinktank.eu/2017/03/13/empowering-women-requires-women-in-power/>.

Item Number	Theme	Specifics	Sample Items	Source
Q1-Q4	<b>i.Masculine/ feminine identity</b>	Feminine & Masculine Traits	<p>"How often do the following personality traits apply to your character?" Answer categories range from 1 'never or almost never true' to 7 'always or almost always true.'</p> <p>Feminine traits: sympathetic and sensitive to other's needs.  Masculine traits: strong personality and forceful.</p>	Longitudinal Internet Studies for the Social sciences (the Netherlands, 2012); The Gendered Personality and Politics Survey (US, Mc.Dermott 2016); Bem (US, 1974)
Q5, Q6		Self-categorisation	<p>"To what extent would you say that you have feminine and masculine characteristics, respectively?" Respondents assess their characteristics on two scales, one for masculine and another for feminine characteristics. Each scale ranges from 0 = "I have few of such characteristics," to 10 = "I have many such characteristics."</p> <p>"not at all feminine" and "very feminine" and "not at all masculine" and "very masculine,"</p>	Society, Opinion Media (SOM) survey 2013; (Sweden)Magliozzi et al. 2016 (US), Wängnerud et al. 2019 (US MTurk Sample 2014)
Q7		Salience of Gender Identity	'My gender identity is an important reflection of who I am.' 0 to 5: strongly disagree to strongly agree [Alternative Some people describe themselves by their gender. How about you? How strong would you say your attachment is to your gender identity you chose? Would you say your attachment is: 0 "not strong at all", slightly strong, somewhat strong, 5 "very strong"]	Gustaffson Sendén et al. (2015).
Q8 - Q11	<b>ii.Sexism</b>	Ambivalent Sexism	<p>Below are a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the scale below: 0"Disagree Strongly" - 5"Agree Strongly"</p> <p>Women should be cherished and protected by men. (Benevolent)  Women seek to gain power by getting control over men. (Hostile)  Women exaggerate problems they have at work. (Hostile)  Women, compared with men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility. (Benevolent)</p>	Glick and colleagues (e.g. ) in Netherlands (Tillburg) Germany Argentina Chile Australia US Turkey

Q12, Q13, Q14		Modern Sexism	Below are a series of statements concerning women in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the scale below: 0"Disagree Strongly" - 5"Agree Strongly" When women demand equality these days, they actually seeking special favors. When women complain about discrimination, they cause more problems than they solve. It is rare to see women treated in a sexist manner in the media.	American National Election Study
Q15, Q16, Q17	<b>iii.Experiences and perceptions of discrimination</b>	Individual experiences of discrimination	How often, in the past year, anyone has anyone discriminated against you or treated you unfairly because of...age, gender, ethnicity. 0"Never" 4"Very Often"	Revised ESS4 (2008) EB 65.4 and EB 69.1
Q18, Q19, Q20		Perceptions group discrimination	For each of the following types of discrimination, could you please tell me whether, in your opinion, it is very widespread, fairly widespread, fairly rare or very rare in (OUR COUNTRY)? Discrimination on the basis of... age, gender, ethnicity. 1 Very widespread 2 Fairly widespread 3 Fairly rare 4 Very rare	EB 65.4 and EB 69.1
Q21 - Q25	<b>iv.Salience of Gender Equality</b>		Please tell me to what extent you agree or disagree that gender equality in [country]: 1"Agree Strongly" 5"Disagree Strongly" Increases economic development Improves the quality of democracy Improves environmental sustainability Makes it easier to balance work and family Puts too much burden on businesses to regulate employee behavior	NEW ITEMS (though see Flash Eurobarometer 465 2017)

Q26 - Q30	<b>v. Gender Equality Policies</b>	Support for policies	<p>Do you think that each of the following measures has gone too far or not far enough in your country? Response Scale from “Gone too far (0)” to “Not far enough (10)”</p> <p>Measures that ensure equal pay for men and women  Measures that target gender-based violence  Measures to ensure parity between men and women in politics  Measures that target distribution of household chores and childcare (e.g. paternal leave)  Measures against sexual harassment in the work-place</p>	Special Eurobarometer 465 (2017) for politics2)- IMAGES (for equal pay, gender violence, and parental leave)
--------------	--	-------------------------	---	---

**Table 2. Proposed Items for Module on Gender Attitudes**

## References

- Ackerly, B.A., Friedman, E.J. Gopinath, M., & Zalewski, M. (2019). Resisting global anti-genderism with global feminist research. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 21(2): 165–67.
- Alexander, A.C. (2012). Change in women's descriptive representation and the belief in women's ability to govern: A virtuous cycle. *Politics & Gender*, 8(4), 437-464.
- Alvarez-Galvez, J. & Salvador-Carulla, L. (2013). Perceived discrimination and self-rated health in Europe: Evidence from the European Social Survey (2010). *PLoS One* 8(9). DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0074252
- Ayalon, L. (2014). Perceived age, gender, and racial/ethnic discrimination in Europe: Results from the European social survey. *Educational Gerontology* 40(7): 499-517.
- Ballington, J. (2018). Turning the tide on violence against women in politics: How are we measuring up? *Politics & Gender* 14(4): 695-701.
- Bem, S. (1974). The psychological measurement of androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 42: 155-162.
- Bittner, A. & Goodyear-Grant, E. (2017). Digging deeper into the gender gap: Gender salience as a moderating factor in political attitudes. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 50(2): 559–578.
- Bolzendahl, C. & Coffé, H. (2019). Public support for increasing women and ethnic minority MPs. *Politics & Gender*. Advance online publication.
- Bolzendahl, C. & Myers, D.J. (2004). Feminist attitudes and support for gender equality: Opinion change in women and men, 1974-1988. *Social Forces* 83(2): 759-789.
- Brescoll, V.L., Okimoto, T.G., & Vial, A.C. (2018). You've come a long way...maybe: How moral emotions trigger backlash against women leaders. *Journal of Social Issues*, 74(1): 144–164.
- Brooks, R. (2018). Higher education mobilities: A cross national European comparison. *Geoforum* 93: 87-96
- Burns, N. & Gallagher, K. (2010). Public opinion on gender issues: the politics of equity and roles. *Annual Review of Political Science* 13: 425–443
- Connor, R. A., & Fiske, S. T. (2019). Not minding the gap: How hostile sexism encourages choice explanations for the gender income gap. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 43(1): 22–36.
- Crosby, F. J. (1982). *Relative deprivation and working women*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Donno, D., & Russett, B. (2004). Islam, authoritarianism, and female empowerment: What are the linkages? *World Politics* 56(4): 582-607.
- Esarey, J. & Schwindt-Bayer, L.A. (2019). Estimating causal relationships between women's representation in government and corruption. *Comparative Political Studies* 52(11): 1713-1741.
- Fish, M.S. 2002. Islam and authoritarianism. *World Politics*, 55(1): 4-37.
- Fortin, N.M. (2005). Gender Role Attitudes and the Labour-market Outcomes of Women across OECD Countries, *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 21(3): 416–438.
- Fortin-Rittberger, J., Howell, D., Quinlan, S., & Todosijevic, B. (2016). Supplementing Cross-national surveys with contextual data (pp.670-679). in C. Wolf, D. Joye, T.W. Smith, Y. Fu (Eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Survey Methodology*. Sage.
- Gidengil, E. & Stolle, D. (Forthcoming). Beyond the 'gender gap': The role of gender identity beyond the gender gap. *Journal of Politics*.
- Glick, P. & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 70(3): 491-512.
- Glick, P. & Fiske, S. T. (2001). Ambivalent sexism. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (vol. 33, pp. 115-188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Academic Press.
- Graff, A. (2014). Report from the gender trenches: War against 'genderism' in Poland. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 21(4): 431-435.

- Gustafsson Sendén, M., Bäck, E.A., & Lindqvist, A. (2015). Introducing a gender-neutral pronoun in a natural gender language: The influence of time on attitudes and behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology* 6. DOI: [10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00893](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00893)
- Henry, P.J. & Wetherell, G. (2017). Countries with greater gender equality have more positive attitudes and laws concerning lesbians and gay men. *Sex Roles* 77(7): 523–32.
- Hudson, V.M., Ballif-Spanvill, B., Caprioli, M., & Emmett, C.F. (2012). *Sex and world peace*. Columbia University Press.
- Hyde, J.S., Bigler, R.S., Joel, D., Tate, C.C., & van Anders, S.M. (2019). The future of sex and gender in psychology: Five challenges to the gender binary. *American Psychologist* 74(2): 171.
- Inglehart, R. & Norris, P. (2003). *Rising tide: Gender equality and cultural change around the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jelen, T.G., O'Donnell, J. & Wilcox, C. (1993). A contextual analysis of Catholicism and abortion attitudes in Western Europe. *Sociology of Religion*, 54(4): 375-383.
- Jost, J.T., Stern, C., Rule, N.O., & Sterling, J. (2017). The politics of fear: Is there an ideological asymmetry in existential motivation? *Social Cognition* 35: 324–353. DOI: [10.1521/soco.2017.35.4.324](https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2017.35.4.324)
- Kassinis, G., Panayiotou, A., Dimou, A., & Katsifaraki, G. (2016). Gender and environmental sustainability: A longitudinal analysis. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 23(6): 399-412.
- Kinder, D.R. & Sanders, L.M. (1996). *Divided by color: Racial politics and democratic ideals*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Klasen, S. & Lamanna, F. (2009). The impact of gender inequality in education and employment on economic growth: New evidence for a panel of countries. *Feminist Economics* 15(3): 91-132.
- Krizsán, A. & Roggeband, C. (2018). Towards a Conceptual Framework for Struggles over Democracy in Backsliding States: Gender Equality Policy in Central Eastern Europe. *Politics and Governance* 6(3): 90-100.
- Lewis, J. A. (2018). From modern sexism to gender microaggressions: Understanding contemporary forms of sexism and their influence on women. In C. B. Travis & J. W. White (Eds.) *APA Handbook of the Psychology of Women*, 381 – 397.
- Lizzote, M.K. (2018). Attitudes towards women and the influence of gender on political decision making (pp. 1-28). *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*.
- Magliozzi, D., Saperstein, A., & Westbrook, L. (2016). Scaling up: Representing gender diversity in survey research. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World* 2: 1–11.
- Manne, K. (2017). *Down Girl. The Logic of Misogyny*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McDermott, M.L. (2016). *Masculinity, femininity, and American political behavior*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Möhring, K. & Teney, C. (2019). Equality prescribed? Contextual determinants of citizens' support for gender boardroom quotas across Europe. *Comparative European Politics*. Advance online publication. DOI: [10.1057/s41295-019-00199-w](https://doi.org/10.1057/s41295-019-00199-w)
- Nadal, K.L. & Haynes, K. (2012). The effects of sexism, gender microaggressions, and other forms of discrimination on women's mental health and development. In P. K. Lundberg-Love, K. L. Nadal, & M. A. Paludi (Eds.), *Women's psychology. Women and mental disorders* (p. 87–101). Praeger/ABC-CLIO.
- Nilsson, Å. & Holmberg, S. 2006. Könsidentitet. In *Nya gränser Västsverige*, ed. L. Nilsson. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg: Rapport 37, SOM Institute.
- Norris, P. & Inglehart, R. (2019). *Cultural backlash: Trump, Brexit and authoritarian populism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pascoe, E.A. & Smart Richman, L. (2009). Perceived discrimination and health: a meta-analytic review. *Psychological bulletin* 135(4): 531-554.

- Ratliff, K.A., Redford, L., Conway, J., & Smith, C.T. (2019). Engendering support: Hostile sexism predicts voting for Donald Trump over Hillary Clinton in the 2016 U.S. presidential election. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* 22(4): 578–593.
- Raviglione, M. & Maher, D. (2017). Ending infectious diseases in the era of the sustainable development goals. *Porto Biomedical Journal* 2(5): 140-142.
- Rydland L.T., Arnesen, S., & Østensen, Å.G. (2008). Contextual data for the European social survey. An overview and assessment of extant sources. Report no. 124, Bergen, Norway. Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD).
- Schmitt, M.T., Branscombe, N.R. & Postmes, T. 2003. Women's emotional responses to the pervasiveness of gender discrimination. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 33(3): 297-312.
- Schwartz, S.H. & Rubel-Lifschitz, T. (2009). Cross-national variation in the size of sex differences in values: Effects of gender equality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 97(1): 171–185.
- Spence, J. T. (1984). Masculinity, femininity, and gender-related traits: A conceptual analysis and critique of current research. Pp. 2-97 in B. A. Maher and W. Maher (Eds.), *Progress in Experimental Research*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Spence, J. & Helmreich, R. (1972). The attitudes toward women scale: An objective instrument to measure attitudes toward the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 2, 66.
- Spence, J. T., & Hahn, E. D. (1997). The Attitudes toward women scale and attitude change in college students. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 21(1): 17–34.
- Swim, J.K., Aikin, K.J., Hall, W.S., & Hunter, B.A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 68(2):199-214.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J.C. (1986). The Social identity theory of intergroup behavior (pp.7-24). in: Stephen Worchel, William G. Austin (Eds.). *Psychology and Intergroup Relations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- UN Women 2019. UN Women Annual Report 2019-2018. <https://annualreport.unwomen.org>.
- UNEP 2016. Global Gender and Environment Outlook. UN Environment, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Valarino, I., Duvander, A.Z., Haas, L. and Neyer, G., (2018). Exploring leave policy preferences: A comparison of Austria, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 25(1), pp.118-147.
- Valentino, N.A., & Sears, D.O. (2005). Old times there are not forgotten: Race and partisan realignment in the contemporary South. *American Journal of Political Science*. 49(3): 672-688.
- Valentino, N.A., Wayne, C., & Ocen, M. (2018). Mobilizing sexism: The interaction of emotion and gender attitudes in the 2016 US presidential election. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 82 (S1): 799–821.
- Westbrook, L. & Saperstein, A. (2015). New categories are not enough: Rethinking the measurement of sex and gender in social surveys. *Gender & Society* 29(4): 534–60.
- Walby, S. (2011). *The future of feminism*. London: Polity.
- Wängnerud, L. (2018). Moving beyond categorical measures of gender in corruption research. *QoG Working Paper Series*.
- Wängnerud, L., Solevid, M., & Djerf-Pierre, M. (2019). Moving beyond categorical gender in studies of risk aversion and anxiety. *Politics & Gender* 15(4): 826-850.
- West, C. & Zimmerman, D.H. (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender & Society* 1(2): 125–151.
- Whitley, B.E. (2001). Gender-role variables and attitudes toward homosexuality. *Sex Roles* 45(11): 691–721.
- Wodak, R. (2015). *The politics of fear. What right-wing populist discourses mean*. London: Sage.
- World Bank. (2012). *World Development Report 2012: Gender Equality and Development*. World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/439>.



## Appendix – Contextual Indicators

The ESS has been a leader in offering a broad array of contextual data to supplement its survey data: the survey offers a broad set of contextual variables mapping demography, education, employment, socio economic developments and political system features (Rydland et al. 2007) both at the national and the regional level. The previous waves of the survey already contain a series of indicators pertaining to gender, for instance in terms of educational attainment, health, and indices mapping gender inequality as well as political and economic rights (UNDPL Gender Inequality Index (GII), and CIRI).

To these highly aggregated measures, we feel the following additions would provide more fine grained contextual insights: the adoption of legal measures adopted for the promotion of women in politics, a more detailed set of indicators mapping gender equality in various domains like work, money, knowledge, time, power, health, as well as violence. The inclusion of indicators mapping the situation of women in terms of presence, not only in legislative assemblies (already included by ESS), but also in executives, political parties, public administration, judiciary bodies, economic and financial institutions, NGOs, the media, as well as in research sectors. Last, we propose a series of indicators tracing the policy context of gender equality by looking at social protection policies like maternity/paternity leave, childcare expenditures, presence in the labor force.

We list a series of potential indicators with their sources from publicly available sources of high quality including some of which have already included in the ESS in prior modules.

Gender quotas: Politics <https://www.idea.int/data-tools/data/gender-quotas>

quotas	Legislated candidate quotas
	Reserved seats
	Political party quotas (would have to see how to deal with this empirically, e.g. data structure here is at the party level, and the data will be country-region-individual.

Gender statistics data base <https://eige.europa.eu/gender-statistics/dgs>

	<b>Gender Equality Index</b>
INDEX	Overall
Work	Overall
	Participation in work
	Segregation and quality of work
Money	Overall
	Financial resources
	Economic situation
Knowledge	Overall
	Attainment and participation

	segregation
Time	overall
	Care activities
	Social activities
Power	Overall
	Political
	Economic
	Social
Health	Overall
	Health status
	Healthy behavior
	Access to health
Violence	domain
	Disclosure
	Percentage experience violence
	Percental experience harassment
	prevalence
	Percentage exp. In the last 12 months
	Percentage experience since they are 15
	Percentage expérience psychological violence by partner
	Violence severity
	Percentage of women with health consequences
	Percentage experience from different perpetrators.

	<b>Men women in decision making</b>
politics	Parliaments and assemblies
	Governments and executives
	Parties
	Advisory committees
Public administration	Senior admin at national level
	Heads of monitoring audit bodies
Judiciary	National courts
Business/ finance	Largest listed companies: presidents, board members and employee reps
	Largest listed companies: CEOs executives, and non-exec
	Finance: governors. Deputy/vice governors and members
Social partners and NGOs	National social partner orgs. Presidents, executive heads and members
Environment and climate change	Environment decision making bodies in national government and public admin
Media	Public broadcasters: presidents and members of boards
	Public broadcasters: CEO executives and non-executive
	Media reg. authorities
Education science + research	National academies of science, presidents and members of highest decision bodies.
	Research funding organizations: presidents and members of highest decision bodies.

Family and Children data:

Family and Children	International Network on Leave Policies and Research <a href="https://www.leavenetwork.org/annual-review-reports/cross-country/">https://www.leavenetwork.org/annual-review-reports/cross-country/</a>	Maternity leave, paternity leave, parental leave
Family and Children	<a href="https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/equality/data/database">https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/equality/data/database</a>	Children in formal childcare or education by age group and duration - % over the population of each age group - EU-SILC survey
		Family benefits as a share of total social protection benefits
		Family expenditures in Europe per inhabitant
Labour	ILO Working Conditions Laws Database	labor force participation
Labour	<a href="https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/equality/data/database">https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/equality/data/database</a>	Gender pay gap, gender overall earning gap

## **Susan Banducci**

Country/Institution: Politics, University of Exeter, Clayden Building, Streatham Rise, EX4 4XP, Exeter, United Kingdom

EMAIL [s.a.banducci@exeter.ac.uk](mailto:s.a.banducci@exeter.ac.uk)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1874-5110>

URL for web site: <http://socialsciences.exeter.ac.uk/politics/staff/banducci/>

PhD, Political Science. 1995. University of California, Santa Barbara, CA.

## **Field/Area of specialisation**

I am an internationally recognised expert in elections, media and political inequalities and my research has been supported by over £5mil in funding. I have led and participated in major cross-national and national projects such as the European Election Study and the New Zealand Election Study.

## **Current Position(s)**

Director of Research. 2018-present. Department of Politics. University of Exeter.

Turing Fellow. 2018 – 2020. Alan Turing Institute. United Kingdom.

Deputy Director. 2018 – present. Data Science and Artificial Intelligence Institute. University of Exeter.

Coordinator. Exeter Q-Step Centre. September 2013 - present. College of Social Sciences and International Studies. University of Exeter, UK.

Professor. March 2010 to present. Politics. University of Exeter, UK.

## **Relevant Experience**

I contribute to the development of my discipline and the social science more broadly through numerous professional activities. I am co-editor since 2017 of the *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* which is the official journal of the Political Studies Association. I served as a member of the executive committee of the University Association of Contemporary European Studies [UACES] between 2011-2013 during which time I supported the organisation of the annual conferences. I have been appointed to prestigious research reviews bodies including the ESRC's Grants Administration Panel (2016-2019), the UK Research and Innovation Future Leaders Review Panel College (2019-present), the International Peer Review Panel of the Danish Council for Independent Research, Politics and Law (2015), the Global Social Comparisons Advisory Board (ESRC project) and the Scientific Advisory Board, Social Sciences, University of Vienna (2016 to present).

## **Relevant Recent Selected Publications**

**Banducci, Susan** and Peter Loedel. *Forthcoming* "Gender, Austerity, and Support for EMU across Generations." *Journal of European Integration*.

**Banducci, Susan**, Laurel Elder, Steven Greene, and Daniel Stevens. 2016. "Parenthood and the polarisation of political attitudes in Europe." *European Journal of Political Research* 55(4): 745-766.

**Banducci, Susan**, Cioroianu, Iulia, Coan, Travis, Katz, Gabriel, & Stevens, Daniel. 2018. 'Intermedia Agenda Setting in Personalized Campaigns: How News Media Influence the Importance of Leaders'. *Electoral Studies* 54: 281–88.

**Banducci, Susan**, Heiko Giebler, and Sylvia Kritzing. 2017. "Knowing more from less: How the information environment increases knowledge of party positions." *British Journal of Political Science* 47(3): 571-588.

Lühiste, Maarja, and **Susan Banducci**. 2016. "Invisible women? Comparing candidates' news coverage in Europe." *Politics & Gender* 12(2): 223-253.

**Banducci, Susan** and Dan Stevens. 2015. "Surveys in Context: How Timing in the Electoral Cycle Influences Response Propensity and Satisficing" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 79 (S1): 214-243.

Pollock, Will, Jason Barabas, Jennifer Jerit, Martijn Schoonvelde, **Susan Banducci** & Daniel Stevens (2015). Studying media events in the European social surveys across research designs, countries, time, issues, and outcomes. *European Political Science* 14(4):394–421.

**Banducci, Susan**. 2013. "Women as Political Communicators: Candidates and Campaigns" in Holli Semetko and Maggie Scammell, eds. *Handbook of Political Communication*. Sage: London.

Karp, Jeffrey A. and **Susan A. Banducci**. 2008. "When Politics is Not Just a Man's Game: Women's Representation and Political Engagement." *Electoral Studies* 27(1) 105-115.

### **Major Research Project & Activities**

Co-Investigator. "Social Identity, Belonging and the Role of the Media in Brexit Britain". Dr Katharine Tyler, Cathrine Degnen, Susan Banducci, Dan Stevens, Travis Coan. Economic & Social Research Council. £743,911, £483,805 to Exeter. 2018-2021.

Principal Investigator. "Informed Decision-making and Better Local Governance: Reinforcing local democracy with Voter Advice Applications in the Istanbul local elections of 2019" [with Ali Carkoglu]. GCRF Facilitation Fund. £28,049.82. 2019.

Principal Investigator. "Measuring Information Exposure in Dynamic and Dependent Networks (ExpoNet) [with Travis Coan, Hywel Williams, Lorien Jasny and Gabriel Katz]. NCRM Methodological Innovation Project. Economic & Social Research Council. £635,000. 2016-19.

Co-Investigator. Gender, Campaign Coverage, and Mobilisation Effects (PI Maarja Luhiste with Laura Sudulich). British Academy Small Grant. £10,000. 2015-16.

Co-investigator. "Media in Context and the 2015 General Election: How Traditional and Social Media Shape Elections and Governing". With Dan Stevens (PI), Gabriel Katz and Travis Coan. Economic & Social Research Council. £315,000. 2015-2016.

Principal Investigator/Project Coordinator. Industry and Doctoral Training in Vote Advice Applications VOTEADVICE . Marie Curie European Industrial Doctorate. European Union's Seventh Framework Programme [Section: People]. £609,000. 2013-2017.

Principal Investigator. "Advancing Understanding in News Information, Political Knowledge and Media Systems Research [with Dan Stevens, Exeter, Jennifer Jerit and Jason Barabas, SUNY Stonybrook]. Economic & Social Research Council. £199,422.45. 2013-2014.

Principal Investigator/Project Coordinator. Marie Curie Initial Training Network in Electoral Democracy ELECDem. 2009-2012. European Union's Seventh Framework Programme [Section: People]. Amount awarded €3.2 million for entire network [amount to Exeter approx. €650,000]. 2009 - 2013.

## **Hilde COFFÉ, Professor in Politics**

University of Bath, Department of Politics, Languages and International Studies

Building 1 West North 2.36

Bath BA2 7AY, United Kingdom

Email: [h.r.coffe@bath.ac.uk](mailto:h.r.coffe@bath.ac.uk)

Websites: <https://researchportal.bath.ac.uk/en/persons/hilde-coffe>  
<https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=-1XBR5MAAAAJ&hl=en>

Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0020-0227>

## **Qualifications**

2004 Ph.D. in Social Sciences, Vrije Universiteit Brussel (Belgium)

2000 M.A. in Social Sciences, Vrije Universiteit Brussel (Belgium)

1998 B.A. in Social Sciences, Vrije Universiteit Brussel (Belgium)

## **Academic Positions**

2018 - Professor, University of Bath, Department of Politics, Languages and International Studies.

2016 – 2018 Associate Professor, Victoria University of Wellington, Political Science and International Relations Programme

2014 – 2017 Head of Programme, Victoria University of Wellington, Political Science and International Relations Programme

2012 – 2015 Senior Lecturer, Victoria University of Wellington, Political Science and International Relations Programme

2006 – 2012 Assistant Professor, Utrecht University (the Netherlands), Department of Sociology/ICS,

2004 – 2006 Postdoctoral Researcher, Vrije Universiteit Brussel (Belgium), Department of Political Science

## **Selection of Publications**

Coffé, H. & Lago, I. (2020). "Explaining gender differences in turnout using panel data across elections." *Social Science Quarterly* 101(2): 940-959.

Coffé, H. (2019). "Gender, gendered personality traits and radical right populist voting." *Politics* 39(2): 170-185.

Bolzendahl, C. & Coffé, H. (2019). "Public support for increasing women and ethnic minority MPs." *Politics & Gender*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1017/S1743923X19000217

Coffé, H. (2018). "The impact of policy content and party label on policy agreement and candidate support. An analysis on the issue of the integration of immigrants." *Acta Politica* 53(2): 184-203.

Coffé, H. (2018). "The impact of candidates' vocal expression on policy agreement and candidate support: Differences between populist radical right and other voters." *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1080/17457289.2018.1544905

Coffé, H. & Reiser, M. (2018). "Political candidates' attitudes towards group representation." *Journal of Legislative Studies* 24(3): 272-297.

Coffé, H. (2017). "Citizens' media use and the accuracy of their perceptions of electoral integrity." *International Political Science Review*, 38(3): 281-297.

Coffé, H. & Bolzendahl, C. (2017). "Avoiding the subject? Gender gaps in interpersonal political conflict avoidance and its consequences for political engagement." *British Politics* 12(2): 135-156.

Immerzeel, T., Lubbers M. & Coffé, H. (2016). "Competing with the radical right. Distances between the European radical right and other parties on typical radical right issues." *Party Politics*, 22(6), 823-834.

Coffé, H. & Dillin, S. (2015). "The gender gap in political participation in Muslim-majority countries." *International Political Science Review* 36(5): 526-544.

- Immerzeel, T., Coffé, H. & van der Lippe, T. (2015). "Explaining the gender gap in radical right voting: A cross-national investigation in 12 Western-European countries." *Comparative European Politics* 13(2): 263-286.
- Bolzendahl, C. & Coffé, H. (2013). "Are 'good' citizens 'good' participants? Testing citizenship norms and political participation across 25 nations." *Political Studies* 61(S1): 45-65.
- Coffé, H. (2013). "Women stay local, men go national and global? Gender differences in political interest." *Sex Roles* 69(5): 323-338.
- Van der Horst, M. & Coffé, H. (2012). "How friendship network characteristics influence subjective well-being." *Social Indicators Research*, 107(3), 509-529.
- Voorpostel, M. & Coffé, H. (2012). "Transitions in partnership and parental status, gender, and political and civic participation." *European Sociological Review* 28(1): 28-42.
- Coffé, H. & Bolzendahl, C. (2011). "Gender gaps in political participation across sub-Saharan African nations." *Social Indicators Research* 102(2): 245-264.
- Coffé, H. & Voorpostel, M. (2010). "Young people, parents and radical right voting. The case of the Swiss People's Party." *Electoral Studies*, 29(3), 435-443.
- Coffé, H. & Bolzendahl, C. (2010). "Same game, different rules? Gender differences in political participation." *Sex Roles* 62(5-6): 318-333.

### **Selection of Grants**

- 2019 University of Bath, Institute for Mathematical Innovation, Internal Secondment. 'Careers of Members of Parliament in Mixed Member Proportional Electoral Systems.' £5,000.
- 2019 University of Bath, International Relations Office, International Research Funding Scheme – Developing Networks in Europe, Ghent University and University of Helsinki, Research Project 'Political Candidates' Social Media Campaigns, Intra- and Inter-Party Competition, and Electoral Success.' £4,600.
- 2016 Victoria University of Wellington, University Research Grant. 'First Term MPs in New Zealand and Germany', NZ\$ 22,200.
- 2015 Victoria University of Wellington, University Research Grant. 'MPs' representational roles in New Zealand and Germany', NZ\$ 14,878.
- 2012 Victoria University of Wellington, University Research Grant. 'Time Use among New Zealand Members of Parliament', NZ\$ 10,000.
- 2010 Utrecht University, Focus Area Institutions Grant, Research Project 'Legitimacy of Democratic Decision Making Processes', 16,200€.
- 2008 University of Colorado (Boulder) Innovative Grant Program, Research Project 'Regular People and Politics: What is Political?', US\$ 33,000. (with Jennifer Fitzgerald)
- 2007 Utrecht University and University of California Collaboration Funding Program, Research Project 'Citizenship Norms, Citizenship Behaviour and Gender. Cross-National Patterns and Pathways of Citizenship among Men and Women', 5,200€ and US\$ 7,000. (with Catherine Bolzendahl)
- 2005 Federal Belgian Government, Research Project 'Analysing the Relation between Citizen Participation, Government Policy and Citizen Satisfaction', 425,266€ (co-applicant). (with Kris Deschouwer and Benny Geys)

### **Selection of Survey Data**

- 2019 Finnish Comparative Candidate Survey, Research project 'Intraparty competition during the nomination process.'
- 2015 German Longitudinal Election Survey, Research project 'The influence of knowledge about women's descriptive political representation on attitudes towards gender quota.'
- 2012 Measurement and Experimentation in the Social Sciences (MESS) Grant, funded by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NOW), Research Project 'Gender, Party Characteristics and Radical Right Voting.'

**Marta Fraile Maldonado**

Country/Institution: Spain, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC), the Institute of Public Goods and Policies (IPP)

EMAIL: [marta.fraile@csic.es](mailto:marta.fraile@csic.es)

ORCID: 0000-0002-4123-2874

URL for web site: <https://sites.google.com/site/martafrailmaldonado/>

PhD, Political and Social Sciences. 2000. European University Institute, Italy.

**Field/Area of specialization**

My research interest spans across the fields of public opinion, gender and politics, voting behavior, and other kinds of political participation. I am currently directing a project about the psychological mechanisms explaining gender differences in political involvement. For this project, I have recently obtained public financial support from the Spanish national competition (80.000€- Ref: PID2019-107445GB-I00)

Since 2010 I have published more than 25 articles in top journals from different disciplines (political science, women studies, communication, sociology, and survey methodology), including the *European Journal of Political Research*, *British Journal of Political Science*, *European Union Politics*, *Electoral Studies*, *Politics and Gender*, *International Journal of Press Politics*, *The International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, *Political Research Quarterly*, *Political Psychology*, *West European Politics*, among others.

**Current Position(s)**

Permanent Senior Researcher. Consejo Superior Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC), the Institute of Public Goods and Policies (IPP) 2007-Present.

Since 2017, I hold the Italian National Certification for the role of full Professor in Political Science.

I have held teaching and research positions at Pompeu-Fabra University, Autonomous University of Madrid, Juan March Institute (CEACS), Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna (Pisa), Central European University (Budapest) and European University Institute (Florence)

**Relevant Experience**

I have extensive experience in the design of survey questionnaires, having directed four research projects involving the design and collection of survey data, and collaborated as associated researcher in another four projects (national and international). I hold two national awards for the best Survey Questionnaire Proposal at Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas (CIS) in 2005 and 2012 (Open competition at the national level). I have abundantly used comparative survey data (coming both from ESS but also from other international programs such as CSES) in my publications. One of my recent articles using surveys from different countries has been awarded the 2019 Gordon Smith and Vincent Wright Memorial Prize

I have been appointed to prestigious research reviews bodies such as the board of the Spanish Evaluation Agency (ANECA) as a reporter for political science, media, sociology, and gender studies. I am currently a member of the editorial board of two international journals: *the International Journal of Public Opinion Research* and *the European Journal for Political Research*.



### Relevant (most recent) Selected Publications

2020. Unpacking gender, age and education knowledge inequalities: a systematic comparison. *Social Sciences Quarterly*. Accepted for publication (with Jessica Fortin)
2020. Tracing the gender gap in political interest: a panel analysis. *Political Psychology* 41(1): 89-106 (with Irene Sánchez)
2019. Who learns in information rich contexts? Knowledge gaps and electoral campaigns. *International Journal of Press Politics* 24(3): 315-340 (with MF and GG)
2019. Adult roles and the gender gap in political knowledge: A comparative study. *West European Politics* 42(7): 1368-1389. (with Mónica Ferrín-MF and Gema García-GG) Awarded the 2019 Gordon Smith and Vincent Wright Memorial Prize.
2019. The gender gap in political interest revisited. *International Political Science Review* : [doi/full/10.1177/0192512119860260](https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512119860260) (with MF, GG and Raul Gómez).
2018. Is it Simply Gender? Content, Format, and Time in Political Knowledge Measures *Politics & Gender* 14(2): 162-185 (with MF and GG)
2017. Bridging the enduring gender gap in political interest in Europe: The relevance of promoting gender equality. *European Journal of Political Research* 56(3): 601-617 (with Raul Gómez, RG)
2017. Why does Alejandro know more about politics than Catalina? Explaining the Latin American Gender Gap in Political Knowledge *British Journal of Political Science* 47(1): 91-112 (with RG)
2017. The gender gap in political knowledge: is it all about guessing? An experimental approach *The International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 29(1): 111-132 (with MF and GG)
2015. Young and gapped? Studying civic knowledge of girls and boys in Europe *Political Research Quarterly* 68(1): 63-76 (with MF))
2014. Does deliberation contribute to a decrease of the gender gap in knowledge? *European Union Politics* 15(3): 372-388.
2014. Do women know less about politics than men? The Gender Gap in Political Knowledge in Europe *Social Politics* 21(2): 261-289
2014. Not all news sources are equally informative: A cross-national analysis of political knowledge in Europe *International Journal of Press Politics* 19(3): 275-294 (with Shanto Iyengar).

### Most Recent Research Project

- 2020-2023. Principal Investigator: "Opening the black box of the gendered psyche to explain the gender gap in political engagement"(ref: PID2019-107445GB-I00). 80.000€
- 2017-2019. Co-investigator with Gema Garcia-Albacete: "Is it gender, motivation or something else? Revisiting gender differences in political involvement". (ref: CSO2016-75090-R) 75.000€
- 2013-2016. Principal Investigator: "A study of the persistent gender gap in politics in Spain". (ref: CSO2012-32009). 55.000€
- 2012-2013. Principal Investigator. "How much do people know about socioeconomic and political reality in Spain? An analysis of the gender differences" Special survey. Financed by the Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas (CIS). 70.000€
- 2008-2011. Principal Investigator. "Causes and consequences of citizens' political knowledge: Spain in comparative perspective" (ref: CSO2008-03819/SOCI). 50.000€
- 2008-2010. Responsible of the Spanish partnership: "EuroPolis: A deliberative polity-making project". Call Identifier FP7-SSH-2007-1. Ref: GA2255314, CSIC. Coordinator: Pierangelo Isernia.

## Jessica Fortin-Rittberger

Country/Institution: Rudolfskai 42, 5020 Salzburg, University of Salzburg, Austria

EMAIL: [jessica.fortin-rittberger@sbg.ac.at](mailto:jessica.fortin-rittberger@sbg.ac.at)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0628-7113>

URL for web site: <https://www.uni-salzburg.at/index.php?id=201165>

PhD, Political Science. 2008. McGill University, Canada.

### Field/Area of specialisation

Main areas of research interest include political institutions and their measurement with particular focus on electoral rules, women's political representation, political knowledge, gendered differences in attitudes, as well as democratisation. Her work has appeared in *Comparative Political Studies*, *European Journal of Political Research*, *Electoral Studies*, *European Union Politics*, and the *Journal of European Public Policy*, among others.

### Current Position(s)

Full Professor. Comparative Politics, University of Salzburg, October 2013-Present.

### Relevant Experience

Jessica Fortin-Rittberger has extensive experience in comparative survey research as a former member of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES) Secretariat (2009-2013), in putting together a cross national survey comprising 50 countries and collecting contextual data for the project. She has published research using cross-national survey data (in *Political Research Quarterly*, *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, *Social Science Quarterly*), and also about the management of contextual data.

I have been appointed to prestigious research reviews bodies such as the board of the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) as a reporter for the social sciences, the Scientific Advisory Board of GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, and AUSSDA - The Austrian Social Science Data Archive. As of September 2020, I will be the co-lead editor of the *European Journal of Politics and Gender*.

### Relevant Selected Publications

- 2020. Marta Fraile & Jessica Fortin-Rittberger. "Unpacking Gender, Age and Education Knowledge Inequalities: A Systematic Comparison." ***Social Science Quarterly***. (Forthcoming).
- 2020. Jessica Fortin-Rittberger. "Political Knowledge: Assessing the Stability of Gender Gaps Cross-nationally." ***International Journal of Public Opinion Research***. Vol. 32(1): 46-65.
- 2019. Sarah C. Dingler, Corinna Kroeber, & Jessica Fortin-Rittberger. "Do Parliaments Underrepresent Women's Policy Preferences? Exploring Gender Equality in Policy Congruence in 21 European Democracies" ***Journal of European Public Policy***. Volume 26 (2): 302-321.
- 2019. Corinna Kroeber, Vanessa Marent, Jessica Fortin-Rittberger, & Christina Eder. "Still a glass ceiling? Tracing the limits to women's representation in elected office." ***Comparative European Politics***. Volume 17 (1): 112-131.
- 2019. Jessica Fortin-Rittberger, Christina Eder, Corinna Kroeber & Vanessa Marent. "How Party Systems Shape Local-National Gender Gaps." ***Government and Opposition***. Volume 54 (1): 52-74.

2017. Jessica Fortin-Rittberger, Philipp Harfst & Sarah C. Dingler. "The Costs of Electoral Fraud. Establishing the Link between Degrees of Electoral Integrity, Winning an Election, and Satisfaction with Democracy." ***Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties***. Volume 27(3): 350-368.
2016. Jessica Fortin-Rittberger. "Cross-national Gender-gaps in Political Knowledge: How Much is Due to Context?" ***Political Research Quarterly***. Volume 69(3):391-402.
2016. Jessica Fortin-Rittberger, David Howell, Stephen Quinlan and Bojan Todosijevic. "Supplementing cross-national surveys with contextual data" in Christof Wolf, Dominique Joye, Tom W Smith, Yang-chih Fu (Eds.) ***The SAGE Handbook of Survey Methodology***, Sage Publishers.
2016. Christina Eder, Jessica Fortin-Rittberger & Corinna Kroeber. "The Higher the Fewer? Patterns of Female Representation across Levels of Government in Germany." ***Parliamentary Affairs***. Volume 69 (2): 366-386.
2015. Jessica Fortin-Rittberger & Berthold Rittberger. "Nominating Women for EP Elections: Exploring the Role of Political Parties' Recruitment Procedures." ***European Journal of Political Research***. Volume 54 (4): 767-783.

### **Recent projects**

- 2015-2018. The Consequences of Electoral System Change in Modern Democracies (With Philipp Harfst) jointly funded by the *Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung* (FWF Austria 116 000 EUR) and the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (DFG Germany 115 000 EUR).
- 2014-2015. The Electoral Success of Women at Different levels of Government (With Christina Eder) Funded by the *Fritz Thyssen Foundation*. (18 000 EUR).

**Amy C. Alexander**

Country/Institution: Political Science, 40530 Göteborg, University of Gothenburg, Sweden

EMAIL: amy.alexander@gu.se

URL for web site: <http://pol.gu.se/english/personnel/faculty/alexander--amy>

PhD, Political Science. 2011. [University of California](#), Irvine, CA.

**Field/Area of specialization**

I am an internationally recognized expert in topics covering women and politics, democratic values and quality of government. In that capacity, my research has been supported by several grants and fellowships. I have led and participated in major cross-national projects involving the World Value Surveys and the Quality of Government Institute at the University of Gothenburg.

**Current Position(s)**

Associate Professor. 2017-present. Department of Politics. University of Gothenburg.

Member of the Quality of Government Institute's Collegium. 2019 – present. Department of Politics. University of Gothenburg.

**Relevant Experience**

I contribute to the development of my discipline and social science more broadly through numerous professional activities. I review for top journals in spanning the disciplines of Political Science, Sociology, Gender Studies and Economics. I am a member of the Quality of Government Institute's Collegium since 2018. Between 2014-2019 I was a research Fellow of the European Union Seventh Framework Research Project PERDEM (Performance of Democracy, grant agreement number 339571). Between 2014-2016 I was the Secretary for the Women and Politics Research Group of the American Political Science Association. Finally, between 2012 and 2014 I held the Maria Goeppert Mayer Chair of Politics and Gender at the Institute of Political Science, Georg-August-University Goettingen, Germany.

**Relevant Selected Publications**

Glas, S., & Alexander, A. (2020). Explaining Support for Muslim Feminism in the Arab Middle East and North Africa. *Gender & Society*, 0891243220915494.

Alexander, A. C., Bågenholm, A., & Charron, N. (2019). Are women more likely to throw the rascals out? The mobilizing effect of social service spending on female voters. *Public Choice*, 1-27.

Naurin, D., Naurin, E., & Alexander, A. (2019). Gender Stereotyping and Chivalry in International Negotiations: A Survey Experiment in the Council of the European Union. *International Organization*, 73(2), 469-488.

Alexander, A. C. and Jalalzai, F. (2018). Symbolic empowerment and female heads of states and government: a global, multilevel analysis. *Politics, Groups, and Identities*, 1-20.

Alexander, A. C., & Parhizkari, S. (2018). A multilevel study of gender egalitarian values across Muslim-majority provinces: the role of women and urban spaces. *International Review of Sociology*, 28(3), 474-491.

Alexander, A.C. and Welzel, C.. (2017). "The Myth of Deconsolidation: Rising Liberalism and Populist Reaction." *The Journal of Democracy*. Online Exchange on Democratic Consolidation. <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/online-exchange-%E2%80%9Cdemocratic-deconsolidation%E2%80%9D>

Alexander, A.C., Inglehart, R. and Welzel, C. (2015). "Emancipating Sexuality: Breakthroughs into a Bulwark of Tradition." *Social Indicators Research* (open access): 1-27.

Alexander, A.C. and Welzel, C. (2015). "Eroding Patriarchy: The Co-Evolution of Women's Rights and Emancipative Values." *International Review of Sociology* 25: 144-165.

Alexander, A.C. (2012). "Change in Women's Descriptive Representation and the Belief in Women's Ability to Govern: A Virtuous Cycle." *Politics and Gender* 8: 437-464.

### **Major Research Projects and Activities**

Research Fellow of the European Union Seventh Framework Research Project PERDEM (Performance of Democracy, grant agreement number 339571), 2014-2019.

Co-Investigator, Niedersächsisches Ministerium für Wissenschaft und Kultur Grant for the Theme, Geschlecht – Macht – Wissen: Genderforschung in Niedersachsen.

Project title: The Gender-Governance Link: Gender Equality and Public Goods Provision. Co-PI with Prof. Dr. Stephan Klasen, Georg-August University Göttingen and Prof. Dr. Christian Welzel, Leuphana University, Lüneburg. Total requested funding awarded € 353,762, December 2014. Project Duration 2015-2018.

Co-Investigator, Thyssen Foundation Conference Grant. Conference title: Measuring Women's Political Empowerment Across the Globe: Strategies, Challenges and Future Research. Lead Applicant with Co-applicants Farida Jalalzai and Catherine Bolzendahl. Total requested funding awarded € 20,000, January, 2015.