

Who creates the ‘common market’? the Gendered Practices of Knowledge Production in a ‘European Studies’ journal

Abstract

Publishing has a variety of functions for academics. The most significant of these is linked to esteem and career success. Beyond this however, publishing in academic journals also play a significant knowledge production role; consequently, who is represented in journal publishing is also about who knows and is contributing to productive knowledge in the different fields. In this article, we draw on the gender distribution in publishing from the journal’s inception in 1962 until 2021, for reviewing (2015-2020) and for submissions ratios since 2017 in JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies. While we identify a gender gap in publishing and a persistent one in submissions, we also highlight the ways in which this gap has impacted knowledge production and reinforced disciplinary boundaries. Over time, we also find notable changes in review participation with more women being invited to review with women are more likely to accept invitations to review. Because these findings are consistent with the general trends in Political Science and International Relations journals, we conclude this assessment with a reflection on what has paid off to decrease existing gaps and some of the ongoing challenges.

JCMS; gender gap; European integration; gendered knowledge production; knowledge hierarchies

Introduction

Recent interrogations in the humanities and social sciences have rightly called attention to the ways in which the academy’s main measures of esteem and success contribute to structural inequalities. Holger and Gross (2009: 107) note the impact of scholarship published in journals on careers by arguing that “advancement, and reputation in the university setting have traditionally depended on a scholar’s work as judged by his or her colleagues”∞∞. Consistently, however, women are shown to bear the brunt of these inequalities – from grant capture (see for example Bornmann, Mutz, & Daniel, 2007) to promotions (Pyke, 2011; Hanretty, 2021), teaching evaluations (Mengel et al, 2019; Boring et al. 2016) and in publishing. Many studies conducted in the last five years have reinforced, in particular, the myriad of ways women continue to be excluded in scholarly publishing within political science/international relations (see for instance Malianak, et al., 2013; symposium in PS: Political Science & Politics Vol 51 No. 4, 2018; Breuning et. al. 2007; Teele and Thelen, 2017; Closa et al., 2020; Grossman, 2020; Stockemer et. al., 2020).

Journals, the main means of publishing and disseminating a key productive activity, research, thus manifests the same inequalities we find in other areas of the academy. Not only do journals continue to play a role in marginalizing minoritized groups, including women, and people of colour, within the academy, but this marginalization also has broader impacts on the scope of knowledge production. Journal business is gendered, meaning that the

“sociocultural and economic concept [of gender with the] institutionalised system of social practices ... translates into different experiences and uneven advantages for men and women at the individual, organisational, and societal levels [constituting a that] system manifests as the persistent gender pay gap, endemic sexual harassment, 2 and the proverbial glass ceiling limiting women's representation and advancement in social and economic life” including academic publishing. (Lundine et al, 2018:)

This article explores the gendered impacts of knowledge production via a reflection on the content of and participation in the oldest outlet for studies on Europe. The article draws on six decades of publishing JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies to review the interdisciplinary development of the European Studies and its gendered implication.

Thus far, much has been written about who submits, who is rejected and who reviews (e.g. Breuning, et. al., 2018; Nedal and Nexon, 2018; Wold and Wenneras, 2010); ultimately however, it is the outcomes of these different processes that matter – who gets to publish at all. Why? Because this also tells us about *what* gets published since this contributes to knowledge making or what is known and worth knowing about European studies. So, our interest here is as much a reflection on the gender of who gets to publish in our journal over the last six decades, and the gendered hierarchical relationships that determine knowledge production. In other words, who gets to produce knowledge about the European Common Market? The article will proceed as follows: first, we present a short history of the journal that takes into account the evolution of European studies thematically and across a range of editorial tenureships. Second, the article presents the data gathered so far around gender as an addition to recent works on this theme. We add on to these works to argue that the gender patterns in participation have implications for knowledge production, replicating the hierarchical relations in the academy and with implications for diversity, equality and inclusion (DEI). Third, we reflect on our own practices and interventions to promote greater attention to DEI and conclude by highlighting ongoing challenges to fully realizing our ambitions for change.

Gender, representation and gendered knowledge production

As the journal heads into its seventh decade, there is no better to take stock of its history and its role in transforming and shaping studies in European politics broadly defined. JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies was founded in 1962 by Uwe Kitzinger to focus on the integration process within Europe and the functioning on its many institutions. Though open to interdisciplinary research and insights from the onset, its subjects and the expertise of the founding editor centered political science, international relations and international political economy. The ‘international’ focus created space for the interrogation of integration in other contexts while also highlighting a foreign policy dimension of the common market very early on. Balogh’s article in the first issue of the journal is evidence as it dealt with the relationship of the common market with Africa (Balogh, 1962). Over the years, JCMS has on the one hand broadened its disciplinary foci, publishing more in economics (where it is also ranked), law, sociology and anthropology among others. Indeed, the

heterogeneity of disciplines that feature has gone a long way to break disciplinary boundaries in the work that is published as European studies. On the other, the journal has also contributed to reinforcing paradigms and paths certain paths within those original disciplines. This sometimes gives the appearance of moving away from the original intent – a journal of common market studies wherever it may exist. It is worth noting however that since the 2010s, there has been an explicit (re)embrace of the ‘common market’ origins of the journal, with an additional emphasis on comparative regionalism (Lombaerde, 2011; Mattheis and Fioramonti, 2016). This emphasis allows for comparisons between the European Union (EU) and other common markets; but one that also draws out how practices in other regional contexts have implications for the EU.

In its almost 60 years, JCMS has had a significant impact on what we know about the politics of Europe though it is not solely a journal about the political science of Europe. Indeed, what and how we know about subjects is a central domain of journals and those who curate that knowledge. Consequently, in exploring how academic publishing is gendered, gendered knowledge making ought to be of concern and the role of editors in this process is especially important. Stewart and Valian (2018) show clearly that diversity in editorial boards has an impact of what counts as important, while Fox et al (2019: 13637) note that

poor representation of women among the scientific gatekeepers is likely to reduce the diversity of ideas, perspectives, and values that make it to print: increased representation of women might change which types of manuscripts are accepted for publication, which areas are identified as worthy of invited reviews .

At JCMS, no women took on main editorship of the journal until 2010 – 48 years after its founding. That is to say for almost five decades, men called the shots about who published and what counted as knowledge. It is of course possible for men to promote equality and seek to break down existing hierarchies in academic publishing. Yet, the limited research on the implications of masculinized editorial boards suggests that the underrepresentation of women in this space also has the knock-on effect of underrepresenting women work in journals (Metz and Harzing, 2009; Fox et al., 2019; Lerchenmüller et. al. 2021)

For example, in the first four decades of JCMS, work that was explicitly feminist was mainly absent from the journal¹ and when present has been advanced mainly by women. This example suggests that women and work produced by women has been excluded from the knowledge production even as anecdotal observation would suggest an increase in women’s entry into the field.

In six decades however, JCMS has been associated with leading important debates and breaking new theoretical ground for approaches that are now considered integral to the political studies of the European Union. For example, Andrew Moravisk’s *Preferences and Power in the European Community: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach* (1993) and Ian Manners’ article, *Normative Power Europe: a*

¹ Outside of book reviews, the term ‘feminist’ features first in issues published the 1980s (twice); and then again in 2010; then since 2014 there has been more systemic engagement with feminist scholarship coinciding with the tenureship of women editors and in the context of Special Issues

Contradiction in Terms? (2002) are two of the most cited articles in EU studies where the two authors introduce the approaches of Liberal Intergovernmentalism and Normative Power Europe respectively. Indeed, the top-five most cited articles are by men.

Importantly, and in seeking to understand gender performance within the journal, we provide evidence for why in our intervention as editors, it not enough to simply desire an increase in descriptive representation; rather it is important too that we pay attention to the broader implications of absences and indeed what is silenced. A core assumption then, in the process of data collation is that editors past and present play an important role in gendered knowledge production and this is much less acknowledged than the observations around equity.

So, what is the data telling us...really?

For this article, we have sought to gather longitudinal data on who participates in JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies via authorship and reviewing. While the current editorial team was interested in broader categories of inequalities, and the ways in which they contribute to the systemic under-representation of minoritised groups within this academy we have only been able to gather data based on gender men/women. Data collection and analysis was carried out with a view to reflecting upon the who gets to participate in a well-regarded and longstanding academic journal. This has implications not only for DEI efforts but also the gendered nature of knowledge production in the field. Data for the research was gathered by means of administrative access to *ScholarOne* our manuscript management system database and *Wiley Online Library* archive which allows us to access authors from JCMS' inception. The use of *Wiley Online Library* was essentially to data gathering since self-declaration of gender was only instituted by the journal in 2018.

The *Wiley Online Library* archive includes all volumes of the articles published in the core journal, the Annual Review supplement, and the book reviews. From the archive basic author information like author first names helped to determine gender particularly from 1962-2008 (those outside the *ScholarOne* system). Where there is ambiguity about names, this was cross checked against institutional websites paying attention to pronouns used in author's biographies. Where we were unable to ascertain gender based on these cross checks, these were coded as 'Not found'. The 'not found' categorization follows from the current *Scholar One* categories, which include those who prefer not to identify within the binaries as male/ female or men/women. It is important to note that this approach though conforming to how the journal currently collects data and how the Higher Education Statistical Agency (HESA) UK currently displays gender data is not ideal. It is a useful shorthand for collecting data about the gender of journal participants. Yet, approaching inquiries about gendered knowledge production in this way can reinforce the gender binary contributing to the erasure of gender non-conforming scholars' participation in academic publishing (see point made by Heath-Kelly, 2021). While the proportion of those coded as 'not found' had no significance on the percentage representation it is nevertheless necessary to note that the data can be read as somewhat partial insofar as it does not capture those who are outside those binaries. for our purposes we focused on corresponding authors only, in those articles that had more than one author. Collating the data in this way excluded those who since July 2017 identified as non-binary.

Below in *Figure 1*, we represent the pattern of contributors as corresponding authors in JCMS between 1962 and 2020.

Figure 1. [here](#)

From the 1960s to the mid-1990s, we found that women's participation in the journal in terms of authorship was significantly lower in comparison to men. This period was rife with all male issues. Some of these issues included articles from key figures in European integration like Jean Monnet (Volume 1 Issue 3). From 2000 onwards, and especially after 2004, women increasingly contributed to the journal as corresponding authors. This period that saw an increase in women authorship has coincided with the appointment of women on the editorial core team of the journal (2010 – present). It is worth noting, however, that in the same period men's contributions have also increased as corresponding author creating a seemingly increased gender gap that has mainly favoured men. Yet, since 2017, we have found that women are represented as authors at the same rates as they of submit work to the journal (approximately 38%)². The patterns in JCMS appear to follow the same patterns as many political science and international relations journals in that there is no parity. Men are overrepresented as knowledge producers in JCMS publishing on a variety of themes. These themes and who gets to publish on them underscore the masculinised nature of political science as a discipline (Celis et al, 2013).

Beyond the gender gaps that existed in terms of participation through publishing/authorship, there are other ways in which inequalities are reproduced in the publishing process. Some of the literature on gender gaps in journals has shown that the review process can reproduce inequalities in journal publishing. There is however no consensus. For instance, Fox et al (2016) argue that “lack of diversity on editorial boards might generate disparities in editorial and peer review that contribute to gender gaps”. Lloyd's earlier study has shown that female reviewers accepted more female authored manuscripts while male reviewers tended to review female authored manuscripts less favourably (Lloyd, 1990; Fox and Paine, 2019).

Figure 2. [here](#)

Data on reviewers who participated in the JCMS was sourced from the *ScholarOne* database. This data however only goes as far back as 2008, and until 2018 excluded reviewers assigned to review original symposium articles which were reviewed outside of ScholarOne. In *Figure 2*, the pattern of participation of male and female reviewers is represented in a bar chart. Similar to the pattern of contributors, while female participation in the review process increased markedly in some years, it is

² This number is again based on gender of corresponding authors as inputted on the *ScholarOne* database. While overall data on submission only starts in 2008, gender attributes have only been recorded over the Hastrup-Whitman editorship. Further breakdown of analysis shows that of all the articles submitted between 1st July 2017 and 20th August 2021, 55%. And of that 55% were group submissions, 43% of which included at least one woman as co-author

still the case that more women review for the journal. This data is focuses on those who reviewed rather than those who were invited to review.

ScholarOne however also gives us the opportunity to evaluate who is invited to review not just who accepts since 2008. *Figure 3* illustrates that since 2010, more women have been invited to review in the journal coinciding with the first appointment of a joint team of women as editors. The gap between inviting men and women however only started to close around 2017 to coincide with an explicit journal mandate for more diversity, equality and inclusion in journal activities. There are different categories of those who choose not to participate in the review process along three categories: ‘declined’, ‘unavailable’ or ‘uninvited’. This data, represented in *Table 1* below allows us an in-depth picture of the pattern of participation in the review process.

By calling attention to particular modes of non-participation, this data may perhaps help to illuminate the extent to which structural barriers contribute to keeping women out. For example, one of the most interesting distinction we found here is between the ratios of ‘declined’ and ‘unavailable’. The average ratio of those who declined to review is 4:1 (men: women) whereas the average ratio for unavailable is 2:1 (men: women). Thus, male scholars are four times more likely to simply *decline* an offer to review, the category of unavailable, which may suggest competing priorities that do not allow for women’s participation. It is important to note that this is not an exert science since it is possible that reviewers do not distinguish between the two categories. What is interesting is that since 2017 (the Haastrup-Whitman led editorial term), the gaps in the decline/uninvited rate between men and women has decreased. This is partly due to the increase invitation of more women. Another explanation however may be that the broadening of subject matter has allowed for the greater participation of women.

Figure 3. [here](#)

Table 1. [here](#)

Additionally, men are more likely to be uninvited by editors usually due conflicts of interests. This reinforces the fact that scholarly networks are dominated by men. In the context of this journal, until about five years ago, men dominated the reviewer pool, though an increase in women being asked to review

Reflecting on the Gendered Implications of Publishing Participation

We value the work on journals that has supported what we’ve known anecdotally that all things considered, women still face a measure of exclusion from the academy. Although we have gone looking for this data half-way towards the end of our five-year term as editors, we were unsurprised

by the broader findings from JCMS. We have collated data specifically related to gender although we acknowledge that this is only one measure of the social inequalities that are reflected in academic publishing (REF).

Collating data in this way however has limits on what we can know. Such data cannot capture the underlying ideologies that foster inequality. Feminist scholars for example drawing on intersectional analysis not only explore the gender gaps in publishing but how multiple axis of oppression like racism, ageism and ableism can often coalesce with the sexism to reproduce and uphold these inequalities (Guerrina et al., 2018; Medie and Kang, 2018). As a statement of fact then this approach and the focus on gender representation is not expansive enough to encompass the broader functioning of inequalities via publication. At this stage, the sole focus on representation often only tells us what we know already; or at best and as we show, chart changes in representation.

When we (Haastrup-Whitman) were appointed to the roles of Editors in Chief of JCMS, we took our responsibility seriously to our community, especially the co-owner of the journal and European studies professional association – the University Association of Contemporary European Studies (UACES). While our ambitions for a more inclusive field preceded our appointment, UACES shared our vision to challenge barrier to access and hierarchies in knowledge production. We considered in our application for example, who belongs and who can belong in the field in terms of gender, geographical representation, race and ethnicity, subject theme as well as career stage. We modelled our aspiration by changing the editorial model of JCMS that has typically been one or two editors to a gender equal team of 6 geographically dispersed editors (North America, Australasia and Africa) with expertise in international relations, political science, political economy and law with Haastrup-Whitman as leads.

We have further sought to enact other interventions to engender the holistic substantive representation and inclusion that we envisioned. For instance, attending Meet the Editors panels and taking time to speak to early career researchers has meant that on a purely anecdotal level, we are increasingly seeing more submissions from late-stage PhD students. Further, we made the commitment to ban all male issues and ensure that at least 30% of contributors to any one issue are women. By participating in Meet the Editor panels, we send the message through that JCMS remains interdisciplinary and heterodox. This has allowed for new themes including those that bring in knowledge from the margins (see hooks), like works that theorize race, gender through feminist and queer lenses and thus able capture another dimension, often hidden of EU studies (see for example Schotel and Mügge, 2021; Døhlie Saltnes and Thiel, 2021)

Although we happily accepted our editorial role, the position of knowledge gatekeeper by virtue of being an editor was not worn so easily. As a means to address the unease while attending to commitments to greater inclusion, we changed our Special Issue policy. Proposals must consider a gender balanced list of contributors as well and both men and women would be represented on the guest editorial team. Moreover, we ask that the editorial teams and contributors are scholars at

different career stages. The same went for our shorter symposiums. This has gone a long way in increasing gender representation while also signaling our broader commitment to those who wish to engage the journal. For example, anecdotally more early career scholars consider JCMS a venue for their research where previously they may have discounted on the basis that it was “too prestigious” to consider their scholarship seriously. In a sense, we have found that to institutionalize practices that are intended to mitigate ongoing inequalities we need to bring others along as form of accountability. Further such practices with their implications for knowledge making have implications beyond the limited orbit of journal publishing.

Conclusion

Gender was and is the lowest hanging fruit when it comes to broadening representation in the journal publishing process. Asking contributors for their gender on registration with the journal management system appears more socially acceptable than collating other types of identity data. Paying attention to gender allows us to develop strategies for challenging hegemonic knowledge practices, and consequently who can make knowledge about ‘European Studies’. While much our findings so far, though limited, reflect similar trends in political science and international relations journals (see Bettecken et al; Martinsen et al; and Verney and Bosco), we have gone further to claim that who gets represented within journals is not only a metric for equity, but also has implications for knowledge production about our subject areas (see also Medie and Kang, 2016; Demeter, 2020) .

We have further shown the ways in which we have sought to intervene so that gender (and other axis of inequality) has been mitigated over the latest editorial tenure of the Journal. Change is however slow as evidence by the fact that we do not have parity. Additionally, in the bid to understand parity with respect to gender we call attention to the ways in which data around gender is currently collated, which can have the unintended consequence of erasing gender non-conforming scholars. There is thus much to do in this regard.

Yet, there are events beyond our editorial control that further slowdown change. For example, while the impact of COVID has been uneven in terms of its impact on women’s submission, across the board³, our experiences shows that the timeline of reviews and their eventual submission is increased. When we consider the gendered impact of COVID (Wright et al, 2021) , as editors we have experienced firsthand impacts such as delays to reviews and delays to author returns. These sort of impacts including lower submission rates during the pandemic by women, can be linked to who undertakes the bulk of caring responsibilities (Kenny, 2021). While the current crisis underscores the limitations of what we can do in our gatekeeping roles, importantly, it also illuminates how journal publishing sits within broader systems of inequalities that undermine gender equality, including in political science and international relations. At the same time, being limited

³ In JCMS, there was no marked difference in submission rates at the height of the pandemic in late spring to early summer 2020 though other journals have reported a decrease in submissions across the board including from women. We are aware however that a steady at that peak does not capture the experiences beyond that particular period, which we know anecdotally has been particularly detrimental to women, and people of colour.

within these systems of broader inequality is not to say we are powerless. Editors, in our choice of who sits on editorial boards, what we consider to be scholarship in our area and therefore what we consider publishing can have an important role in transforming unequal systems within higher education broadly.

References

Balogh, T. (1962), Africa and the Common Market. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 1: 79-112.

Boring, Anne, Ottoboni, Kellie, and Stark, Philip (2016) *Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness*, ScienceOpen Research.

Bornmann, L., Mutz, R., & Daniel, H.-D. (2007). Gender differences in grant peer review: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Informetrics*, 1(3): 226–238.

Breuning, M., and K. Sanders. 2007. Gender and Journal Authorship in Eight Prestigious Political Science Journals. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40(2): 347–351.

Breuning, M., Gross, B., Feinberg, A., Martinez, M., Sharma, R., & Ishiyama, J. (2018). Clearing the Pipeline? Gender and the Review Process at the American Political Science Review. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 51(3): 629-634

Celis, K, Kantola, J, Waylen, G and Weldon, S.L (2013) Introduction: Gender and Politics: A Gendered World, a Gendered Discipline. In Georgina Waylen, Karen Celis, Johanna Kantola, and S. Laurel Weldon eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Gender and Politics* (Oxford University Press)

Closa, C., Moury, C., Novakova, Z. *et al.* (2020) Mind the (submission) gap: EPSR gender data and female authors publishing perceptions. *European Political Science* 19 (3): 428–442

Demeter, M (2020). *Academic Knowledge Production and the Global South: Questioning Inequality and Underrepresentation*. Palgrave Macmillan

Fioramonti, L., and Mattheis, F. (2016) Is Africa Really Following Europe? An Integrated Framework for Comparative Regionalism. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 54 (3): 674– 690

Fox, CW and Paine, CET. (2019) Gender differences in peer review outcomes and manuscript impact at six journals of ecology and evolution. *Ecology and Evolution* 9 (6): 3599– 3619

Fox, CW, Duffy, MA, Fairbairn, DJ, Meyer, JA. (2019) Gender diversity of editorial boards and gender differences in the peer review process at six journals of ecology and evolution. *Ecology and Evolution* 9 (4): 13636– 13649.

Fox, C.W., Burns, C.S. and Meyer, J.A. (2016), Editor and reviewer gender influence the peer review process but not peer review outcomes at an ecology journal. *Functional Ecology*, 30 (1): 140-153

Grossman, E. A. (2020) gender bias in the European Journal of Political Research?. *European Political Science* 19 (3): 416–427

Hanretty, C (2021) Career trajectories in UK departments of politics and international relations: A report for the British International Studies Association and the Political Studies Association: [PSA BISA Career Trajectories Report.pdf](#)

Heath-Kelly, C. (2021). Rejoinder: Women in the Profession? Assuming Gender in the Analysis of the Composition of UK Politics Departments. *Political Studies Review*, 19(1): 37–38.

Kenny, M. (2021) Work When You Can: Reflections on Gender, Covid-19, and Academia
Available at: <https://www.gender.ed.ac.uk/work-when-you-can-reflections-on-gender-covid-19-and-academia/>

Lerchenmüller C, Schmallenbach L, Jena AB, et al (2021). Longitudinal analyses of gender differences in first authorship publications related to COVID-19 *BMJ Open*;11:e045176.

Lloyd, M. E. (1990). Gender factors in reviewer recommendations for manuscript publication. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Analysis*, 23(4): 539–543.

Lombaerde, P (2011), The Good, the Bad and the Ugly in Comparative Regionalism: A Comment on Sbragia. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 49 (3): 675-681.

Lundine, Jamie et al. (2018) The gendered system of academic publishing *The Lancet*, 391(10132): 1754 - 1756

Maliniak, D., Powers, R., and Walter, B. (2013). The Gender Citation Gap in International Relations. *International Organization*, 67(4): 889-922

Medie, P.A. and Kang, A.J. (2018) Power, knowledge and the politics of gender in the Global South, *European Journal of Politics and Gender*, 1(1-2): 37-54

Mengel, Friederike, Sauermann, Jan, and Zölitz, Ulf. 2019. Gender Bias in Teaching Evaluations. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 17 (2): 535–66

Metz, I., & Harzing, A.-W. (2009). Gender Diversity in Editorial Boards of Management Journals. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8(4): 540–557

Murau, S., and Spandler, K. (2016) EU, US and ASEAN Actorness in G20 Financial Policy-Making: Bridging the EU Studies–New Regionalism Divide. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 54 (4), 928– 943

Nedal, D., Nexon, D. (2018). Gender in the International Studies Quarterly Review Process. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 51(4), 859-865

Østby, G., Strand, H., Nordås, R., & Gleditsch, N. P. (2013). Gender gap or gender bias in peace research? Publication patterns and citation rates for *Journal of Peace Research*, 1983–2008. *International Studies Perspectives*, 14(4), 493–506

Pyke, K. (2011). Service and gender inequity among faculty. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 44(1), 85–87

Stewart, A. J., & Valian, V. (2018). *An inclusive academy: Achieving diversity and excellence*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Teele, D., and K. Thelen. (2017). Gender in the Journals: Publication Patterns in Political Science. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50(4): 870–880

West, J. D., Jacquet, J., King, M. M., Correll, S. J., & Bergstrom, C. T. (2013). The role of gender in scholarly authorship. *PloS one*, 8(7), e66212. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0066212>

Wold, A., and C. Wenneras. (2010). Nepotism and sexism in peer-review. In *Women, science, and technology*, ed. M. Wyer, M. Barbercheck, D. Cookmeyer, H. Ozturk, and M. Wayne, 64–70. Abingdon: Routledge.

Wright, K, Haastrup, T and Guerrina, G. (2021) Equalities in Freefall? Ontological Insecurity and the long-term Impact of COVID-19 in the Academy. *Gender Work & Organization*. 28(S1),163–167