

Overview quotes “Selling science” (supplementary material to <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-01-2021-0028>)

Methodological approach of the panelists’ interviews is described in <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2848-x>

Quote #	Quotes relevant to various aspects of evaluation process	Argument
	Quotes that relate to overselling (n=3)	
7	“I think what the difference in the writing is how you push forward or sell your ideas and your preliminary data. And I think, as I said, the females write more sound and realistic, and down to earth. And that really pays off in the interviews . Because to show off a selling attitude in the interview is what a lot of the males do, and there you realize that this is just appearance and there is no substance whereas it's all substance in the females: you can see what I say.”	→ <i>Overselling caught, gender difference</i>
20	“And in paper you know most applicants are sometimes over-coached so you know... then usually it’s more the question like did he or she write it? Is it really him- or herself? So you have all these bureaus and then you can already see this is not written by a person; this is written by an agency. And then also everybody starts to throw in all the high end technology buzzwords. ... In that sense people are over-coached. It’s unclear whether the person can deliver, whether he or she has any experience in this, how you should evaluate all this.”	→ <i>Overcoaching - overselling - caught</i>
25	“I think it's really that we might lose talented female scientists due to judging just on the writing. So we actually had to reconsider and not just go by the scores but really look into getting more females to the interviews, because they really perform much better than they do in the writing actually.”	→ <i>Overselling – writing versus interview, gender difference</i>
6	“So for heaven’s sake, don’t be humble, but absolutely don’t go over the top, yeah. That’s as important. And [...], um, ahh – that there’s a gender difference in the tendency to be too humble.”	→ <i>Overselling - self-promotion - narrow band</i>

	Quotes on evaluating written material (n=4)	
1	“I think men on average are more likely to write in a very confident way so that [...], when you’re reading it, you’re somehow convinced that they will be able to do this...Proposals are written in such a way .. And maybe in the ERC we expected the proposals to be ambitious. And to write an ambitious proposal, you have to have a lot of confidence. And in general – very general – my experience is that the women have less confidence, so they will probably write proposals that are not as ambitious, on average as the men.”	→ <i>Selling science</i>
3	“And I think this is part of the problem: how you write the science. I don't think that female scientists turn down their own data; they don't exaggerate it as much. And a lot of the males write it fancy.”	→ <i>(Over)selling science</i>
19	“I think that in terms of language, females are typically more proficient.”	→ <i>Selling science: gender difference</i>
9	“If I read a grant that's badly written I have a very "I hate it" response. That [good writing] has become incredibly important in [...]. I just get angry at a badly written grant and then I give it a bad score. So when I read it the second time I'm looking for evidence why it is bad. If I liked it the first time I read it, it is probably because it was nicely written and there were ideas I liked. Then I give it a good score. And I'm looking for evidence of why I liked it.”	→ <i>Inclusion and exclusion arguments</i>
	Quotes on evaluating enactment (n=6)	
2	“In general women were not always presenting in an optimal way. They were shy and presenting as if they would be giving a lecture in school. In the way of "I know and I am talking fast to say everything" but not convincing people of this being the best idea and that they will do it because they can do it. And some boys presented themselves as the best in Europe and the leading persons.”	→ <i>Selling science</i>

4	“When you ask the question and this particular person was perfectly answering and you saw that he or she knows a lot about it and was just presenting in a not optimal way you are tolerant and say that it's a question of time and she will be able to oversell.”	→ <i>(Over)selling science</i>
26	“Then when they present ... the females really know what they are talking about. You ask them hard questions and they can respond and they think. And you can also see the level of commitment. I mean that's what really shines through from the really good applicants.”	→ <i>Selling science: gender difference</i>
15	“I'm very skeptical about [professional support]. It can help you to avoid silly mistakes, but is not going to generate the concept, the idea, the creative mind. Science is about the guys who make the difference. So it's really the personality of the candidate which actually decides whether he or she will make it or not. Institution support can help, can spare you time, but is not how you make it in the ERC.”	→ <i>Selling science: support for presentations, masculine norm</i>
28	“Well, it very much depends also on culture, because I still remember vividly that we had an Asian woman who was very aggressive in presenting very tough, and saying, “I’m going outside of my comfort zone,” whatever, and in the end she did not make it, whereas, there was this very shy lady, but she had a very straight talk; she knew what she was talking about, and she didn’t raise her voice, but she just made it.”	→ <i>Selling science Intersectional perspective</i>
24	“Some of the proposals thought that they were the best, they are better than the others... Sometimes it’s almost annoying, the fact that you’re always presenting yourself as the best, and you also have to make an abstraction of that. You could be influenced by that, because somebody was very confident about herself, and maybe could impress you because you would believe the argument, or it could annoy you because you say “she’s crazy, or he’s crazy, he’s completely in love with him or herself”.	→ <i>Overselling</i>

	Quotes on group dynamics (n=3)	
8	“I want you to go home tonight, take a look at that list, and see if there’s anybody you want to make an argument for that we pushed below the line; that looks – that he or she shouldn’t have been there, but is there by historical artefact, because it happened late in the day; it happened early in the panel process; it happened late in the panel process.”	→ <i>Calibration (panel chair)</i>
11	“Among the competitive ones we start – we go through, and look for positions; you know, which are the ones that everybody is absolutely sure that we want to grant?”	→ <i>Inclusion and exclusion arguments</i>
11+8	“There’s a board that goes up, and so we write that name up there. And then we move on to the next proposal, and then we just keep doing that process, as we – as we go along. At the end of each session, we take a look at that board, and say, ‘Okay, now let’s think about what we’ve done if we’ve...,’ because it’s a moving target – right? – [...], and not everybody is read every proposal.” “At the very end of it, now, when we have everybody up on the board, we’ll have a group of people that are pretty much below the line, and we’ve all agreed are not going to be competitive, and people above the line, and before we do anything else, we take a look at everybody who is below the line, and I ask everybody on the panel, because they’re going home that last night before the final day, and said, I want you to go home tonight, take a look at that list, and see if there’s anybody you want to make an argument for that we pushed below the line that looks – that he or she shouldn’t have been there, but is there by historical artefact, because it happened late in the day; it happened early in the panel process; it happened late in the panel process. All the usual human sociology that goes into that, and then once we get everybody there, then we subdivide that upper group that these are the competitive proposals; these are the non-competitive proposals, and then among the competitive ones we start – we go through, and look for positions; you know, which are the ones that everybody is absolutely sure that we want to [grant]?”	<i>[this is the full quote that comprises 8 and 11]</i>

21	“Actually it wasn't true on the whole committee. I just felt that there were people on the committee for whom the 'Nature' paper was enough. And you couldn't argue with them and there was nothing on paper to argue with them. You couldn't say "Look, we should be considering how good the proposal is. The proposal is terrible. I don't care if they had a 'Nature' paper". There was nothing on paper that allowed you to argue with that person.”	→ <i>Need for clear criteria in call text</i>
30	“But then we have to take into account on the pre-proposal stage the discussion that happened in the room, and so we try to get beyond scores very fast – because my argument is if we’re going to do this on scores, we can just become a spreadsheet, and we don’t need this meeting. And so, what we do is we – once we’ve – once we had the discussion, we just stay away from the scores. And um – and that’s not quite true; you know, we do come back, and people say, ‘You know, there’s still a lot of variance there,’ and so you’ve got a little bit of that, but we try not to become pseudo-quantitative about it; um, you know, based upon that”	→ <i>Calibration / chair</i>