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Professionalization and Social Impact of European Political Science
Desirability of policy advice giving

Political scientists should refrain from direct engagement with policy actors

- Fully agree: 5.7%
- Somewhat agree: 15.3%
- Somewhat disagree: 36.3%
- Fully disagree: 42.7%

Political scientists should provide evidence-based knowledge and expertise outside academia, but not be directly...

- Fully agree: 25.9%
- Somewhat agree: 38.6%
- Somewhat disagree: 26.7%
- Fully disagree: 8.8%

Political scientists have a professional obligation to engage in public debate

- Fully agree: 28.6%
- Somewhat agree: 43.1%
- Somewhat disagree: 19.4%
- Fully disagree: 9.0%

Political scientists should become involved in policy making

- Fully agree: 24.2%
- Somewhat agree: 47.4%
- Somewhat disagree: 22.6%
- Fully disagree: 5.9%
I provide data and facts about policies and political phenomena
I analyse and explain the causes and consequences of policy problems
I evaluate existing, policies, institutional arrangements, etc.
I offer consultancy services and advice, and make recommendations on policy alternatives
I make forecasts and/or carry out polls
I make value-judgements and normative arguments

- At least once a week
- At least once a month
- At least once a year
- Less frequently
- Never
Advisory roles types

Figure 16.1: Policy advisory types of European political scientists (N=2,354)

- Pure academic: 47.8%
- Expert: 28.2%
- Opinion maker: 19.6%
- Public intellectual: 4.3%
# Gender bias in advisory roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pure academic</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion maker</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public intellectual</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Advising at levels of government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Subnational</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 6 With which substantive policy areas is your advice concerned? (%)

- Government and public administration: 32.1%
- International affairs, development aid, EU: 28.5%
- Civil Rights, political rights, gender issues: 17.7%
- Immigration, integration, ethnic minorities: 13.6%
- Education: 10.8%
- Social welfare: 10.5%
- Defence: 6.9%
- Environment: 6.1%
- Culture: 4.9%
- Crime, law and order: 4.2%
- Energy: 3.8%
- Technology (including telecommunications): 3.7%
- Labour: 3.7%
- Health: 3.5%
- Macroeconomics, monetary policy, industry policy: 3.2%
- Public works, urban planning: 3.1%