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Diversity: Differences in the values, attitudes, cultural perspective, beliefs, ethnic background, sexual orientation, gender identity, age, skills, knowledge, and life experiences of each individual in any group of people.

Equity: Equity is described as fairness, sameness, and valuing diversity and inclusion.

Gender Balance: Human resources and equal participation of women and men in all areas of work, projects or programmes. In this specific research project, we considered gender-balanced events, panels with at least 40% women are present as speakers.

Gender Bias: Prejudiced actions or thoughts based on the gender-based perception that women are not equal to men in rights and dignity.

Gender Binarism: The classification of gender into two distinct, opposite forms of masculine and feminine, whether by social system or cultural belief. In this binary model, sex, gender, and sexuality may be assumed by default to align, with aspects of one’s gender inherently linked to one’s genetic or gamete-based sex, or with one’s sex assigned at birth.

Gender Blindness: Failure to recognise that the roles and responsibilities of women/girls and men/boys are ascribed to, or imposed upon, them in specific social, cultural, economic and political contexts.

Gender Equality: Equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities of women and men and girls and boys.

**Gender Equity:** Provision of fairness and justice in the distribution of benefits and responsibilities between women and men. Though often used interchangeably, equality and equity are two very distinct concepts. While international human rights treaties refer to ‘equality’, in other sectors the term ‘equity’ is often used. The term ‘gender equity’ has sometimes been used in a way that perpetuates stereotypes about women's role in society, suggesting that women should be treated ‘fairly’ in accordance with the roles that they carry out. This understanding risks perpetuating unequal gender relations and solidifying gender stereotypes that are detrimental to women. Therefore the term should be used with caution to ensure it is not masking a reluctance to speak more openly about discrimination and inequality. 

**Gender Gap:** Gap in any area between women and men in terms of their levels of participation, access, rights, remuneration or benefits.

**Gender Identity:** Gender identity is the personal sense of one's own gender. Gender identity can correlate with a person's assigned gender at birth or can differ from it. Gender expression typically reflects a person's gender identity, but this is not always the case.

**Gender Mainstreaming:** Gender mainstreaming is the (re)organisation, improvement, development and evaluation of policy processes, so that a gender equality perspective is incorporated into all policies at all levels and all stages, by the actors normally involved in policymaking. Mainstreaming a gender perspective is the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in all areas and at all levels. It is a way to make women's as well as men's concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equally, and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender equality.

**Gender Parity:** Gender parity is a statistical measure that provides a numerical value of woman-to-man or girl-to-boy ratio.

**Gender-Sensitive:** Policies and programmes that take into account the particularities pertaining to the lives of both women and men, while aiming to eliminate inequalities and promote gender equality, including an equal distribution of resources, therefore addressing and taking into account the gender dimension.

**Gender Stereotypes:** Preconceived ideas whereby females and males are arbitrarily assigned characteristics and roles determined and limited by their sex.

**Glass-ceiling:** A glass ceiling is a metaphor used to represent an invisible barrier that prevents a given demographic (typically applied to women) from rising beyond a certain level in a hierarchy.

**Home-based work:** Work carried out by a person in her or his home or in other premises of her or his choice, other than the workplace of the employer, for remuneration, which results in a product or a service as specified by the employer, irrespective of who provides the equipment, materials or other inputs used.

**Inclusion:** Inclusion is about how well the contributions, presence and perspectives of different groups of people are valued and integrated into an environment. An environment where many different genders, races, nationalities, and sexual orientations and identities are present but only the perspectives of certain groups are valued or carry any authority or influence, may be diverse, but not necessarily inclusive.
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**Institutional capacity for gender mainstreaming:** Potential of an institution to deliver upon its gender mainstreaming commitments and the ability to identify and solve implementation-related problems.

**Intersectionality:** Analytical tool for studying, understanding and responding to the ways in which sex and gender intersect with other personal characteristics/identities, i.e. racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age, sexual orientation, gender identity or other characteristics, and how these intersections contribute to unique experiences of discrimination. It starts from the premise that people live multiple, layered identities derived from social relations, history and the operation of structures of power. Intersectional analysis aims to reveal multiple identities, exposing the different types of intersectional and multiple discrimination and disadvantage that occur as a consequence of the combination of identities and the intersection of sex and gender with other grounds.³

**Invisible barriers:** Attitudes and the underlying traditional assumptions, norms and values that prevent women's empowerment/full participation in society.

**Manel:** A panel where only men are present as speakers.

**Misgendering:** refer to someone, using a word, especially a pronoun or form of address, that does not correctly reflect the gender with which they identify. More in general, making assumptions on someone's gender based on their gender expression.

**Non-Binary:** Non-binary or genderqueer is an umbrella term for gender identities that are neither male nor female — identities that are outside the gender binary. Non-binary identities can fall under the transgender umbrella, since many non-binary people identify with a gender that is different from their assigned gender.

**Organisational culture:** Commonly accepted values and behaviours within an organisation, such as the hours that are worked, the jokes that are considered appropriate and the manner in which colleagues are addressed.

**Pinkwashing:** when a company or institutions adopt (or pretend to adopt) a positive attitude towards women or LGBT+ identities in order to promote their brand or product.⁹

**Sex:** refers to the biological differences between males and females, such as the genitalia and genetic differences. People that do not fit into the binary approach male-female are intersex.

**Sex-disaggregated statistics:** Data collected and tabulated separately for women and men allowing the measurement of differences between women and men in terms of various social and economic dimensions and are one of the requirements to obtaining gender statistics.¹¹

**Sexual Orientation:** Each person's capacity for profound emotional, affectional and/or sexual attraction to, and intimate and sexual relations with, individuals of a different gender, the same gender or more than one gender.

**Transgender:** Person who has a gender identity different to the gender assigned at birth and who wishes to portray gender identity in a different way to the gender assigned at birth.

---


Research plays a central role in shaping and influencing policy by providing evidence-based insights into realities and contributing to problem-solving. However, gender imbalance in research is an ongoing systemic issue where the lack of women’s representation means that currently produced work skews to a dominantly male-perspective, meaning that half the population is poorly represented in research.

As part of The Brussels Binder’s efforts to make policy-making and shaping more gender inclusive and equitable, we have carried out several research projects focusing on women’s representation in think tank events and publications. This report analyses on the latter by reviewing gender balance and authorship in research outputs (reports, blogs, commentaries, etc.) from 33 think tanks based in Europe during the full year of 2020. As this project was mainly volunteer-led, the scope of the research was limited to three policy areas.

The key trend throughout the findings of this study was that women account for one-third of total research authors which carried through when disaggregating the data for different categories. It was also discovered that from the 65.5% of co-authored research outputs with one woman or more, delving deeper into the data showed that gender imbalance prevailed.

By using secondary sources, this research further examined structural factors that are preventing women from participating in research, including talent pipeline issues. It was found that women are overrepresented in administrative and organisational roles in think tanks while men still made up the majority of executive level leadership12. When examining specific policy areas which are known to be male-dominated fields, it was also found that gender stereotypes could be inhibiting women’s access and progression into research.

2020 was also a year where research became more important with a demand for analysis and proposals in response to the Covid-19 pandemic. Although women’s productivity in research faced challenges prior to the pandemic, the reinforcement of gender roles had exacerbated existing gender inequalities to the point where there was an evident decline in women’s research production13.

Several detailed recommendations are included in this report for both think tanks and individual researchers. Those for think tanks focus not only on addressing structural issues that prevent women from accessing and progressing in research careers, but also how think tanks can make their research content more innovative and outcome-oriented by adopting tools such as gender analytics. Lastly, recommendations for researchers involve making conscious and habitual changes to make their research more inclusive.


The lack of representation of women across political and policy spheres has been an ongoing phenomenon for quite some time, and at The Brussels Binder, efforts have mainly focused on promoting women’s voices in policy debates.

However, as policy discussions are often based on research, it is equally important that gender representation is also accounted for at this stage in policy development. Research is also an important function for most think tanks and the lack of women’s presence in these roles means that the produced research is currently skewed towards a male-perspective. Therefore, the gender imbalance in who gets to produce research should be a matter of concern for those interested in effective policy outcomes.

Although the underrepresentation of women in research is not a new phenomena, the Covid-19 pandemic has heightened the importance of the issue by raising awareness on the need for gender-responsive policies in dealing with the crisis. For example, the EU found that out of 115 Covid-19 task forces across 87 countries, just 3.5% had gender parity. Actions have recently been taken by the EU with its Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2021-2027) in an attempt to address gender imbalance in research projects. The new provisions set out a legal basis for gender equality by making it a cross-cutting priority and also outlines how it can be achieved. It is important to highlight that key funds for the Horizon2020 and Horizon Europe programmes are within this framework which tends to be a popular source of funding for many think tanks.

Like elsewhere, the pursuit for gender equality often requires holistic and cross-sectoral approaches, but it also needs benchmarks to determine whether structural measures are having a positive impact. In an attempt to do the latter, The Brussels Binder has examined research papers published by 33 major think tanks based in Europe to assess the gender balance of their authors. The scope of this paper covers the full year of 2020 (January to December), and although there are two months deemed “pre-pandemic” included in the data collected (January and February), several insights will pertain to trends experienced during the crisis.

This study not only assesses the gender gap in think tank publications by discussing structural barriers but it also provides a series of recommendations for think tanks and individual researchers on how to help mitigate gender disparities and become more inclusive as an institution. By revealing the trends in publications and overall research production, this report does not seek to name and shame individual organisations. Instead, the mission is to show data, and encourage reflection and systemic change within the European think tank community with an evidence-based, solution-focused and positive approach. This collective exercise should offer a better understanding of the scope and root causes of the problem, as well as contributing to making research more representative of society’s nuances.

---


2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Think Tank Selection

In order to select a number of think tanks to analyze, we decided to use the Global Go To Think Tank Index Report from the University of Pennsylvania, Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program.

Our methodology consisted of picking one think tank per EU member state, including the United Kingdom selecting the highest/top ranking ones in the list. The decision to include the UK is justified by the fact that believed it was important to include the UK based on its historical importance within the think tank community and for its ties with the EU. An additional reason to include the UK is that some independent think tanks might be supported financially by EU funding, and therefore, maintaining a relationship with the EU that will not expire with Brexit. The UK's think tank selected for the research was the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), however, we couldn't receive feedback regarding some lacking data and therefore we decided to delete it from the study. See more details at footnote n. 20.

2.1.1. National vs European Think Tanks

During our selection process, we realized that although some think tanks have their legal registration in an EU member state, their research focus is European rather than local or regional. For this reason, we created a separate category named ‘European Think Tanks’, where we listed a number of institutions that endorse the BB, have a European vision stated in their mission, but were also listed in the Global Go To Think Tank Index Report. We believed it was important to include the 'European' think tanks — that endorse an initiative such as The Brussels Binder — also to see whether those institutions are consistent with the idea of creating a more diverse and inclusive environment in the policy arena. We included 21 National think tanks and 12 European think tanks. In some cases, even though the institutes were ranked in the Index, their work was not relevant for the purpose of this research.

We reviewed and analysed information that was available on the websites of think tanks and then verified it with the respective think tanks. Those that did not have publications listed on their website, were considered “inactive” during the researched period. We also did not include think tanks that were offering more philosophical reflections rather than evidence-based analysis. Additionally, we also excluded think tanks that focused on one specific topic as well as those with a partisan connection.

19 Think tanks who verified the data collected: Bruegel, Carnegie Europe, CEPS, Centre for European Reform (CER), Clingendael, Netherlands Institute of International Relations, Center for Social and Economic Research (CASE), ECIPE, Egmont Institute, European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM), European Policy Center (EPC), EUROPEUM Institute for European Policy, Ecologic Institute, Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS), ICDS, Finnish Institute of International Affairs, Friends of Europe, German Marshall Fund of the United States, Brussels Office, Istituto Affari Internazionali, International Centre for Defence and Security, Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI), Lisbon Council, Slovak Foreign Policy Association (SFP).

20 Think tanks that were considered inactive during the research period: Centre for Liberal Strategies (CLS) (Bulgaria), European Institute (Bulgaria), Institute for Market Economics (IME) (Bulgaria), Institute of Public Affairs (Bulgaria), Institute for Security and International Studies (ISIS) (Bulgaria), PRAXIS Center for Policy Studies (Estonia), Center for Security and Defense Studies Foundation (CSDS) (Hungary), Latvian Institute of International Affairs (Latvia), Providus (Latvia), Centre for Geopolitical Studies (Lithuania), Eastern Europe Studies Center (EESC) (Lithuania), Lithuanian Free Market Institute (LFMI) (Lithuania), Institute for Public Policy (IPP) (Romania), International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) (we found publications for this think tank but names of the authors were not featured and not they were not responsive to emails).

21 Think tanks that were excluded because they focus on a specific topic: Transparency International (TI) (Germany) (advocacy organisation) and Ludwig von Mises Institute (Romania).

22 Think tanks that were excluded because they are partisan: Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung (KAS) (Germany) and Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) (Germany).
2.1.2. PUBLICATION CATEGORIES

Under the scope of this research, we have selected all think tank publications published in 2020. Think tank research has been categorized under two main output types: ‘Publications’ and ‘Other’. The ‘Publications’ category includes policy papers, policy recommendations, research reports/research briefs, policy briefs, monographs, working papers, business cycle surveys, analytical reports, books, and journals. Meanwhile, blog posts, Op-eds are opinion pieces, comments and commentaries are classified as ‘Other’.

In our analysis, research outputs are further divided into three categories:

• ‘EU/Foreign Policy and Security’ includes all publications on EU member state relations, foreign policy (EU & non-EU), Diplomatic relationships between states (EU & non-EU), Covid-19’s impact on security, and papers that explore disinformation as a threat to security. This category also includes publications that touch upon defense-related topics such as NATO interventions, terrorism, military interventions, peace agreements and border control policies.

• ‘Economics & Trade’ includes all publications with a broad ‘economics’ theme — such as papers on international trade agreements, macro and fiscal perspectives, fiscal and monetary policy, economic indicators of a country (GDP, debt, etc.), the economic impact of climate change, and Covid-19’s impact on the economy. However, we exclude publications about internal politics and governance in a country (such as elections and internal social policy).

• ‘Digital & Innovation’ includes research output on digital topics such as cybersecurity, technology innovation to combat climate change, digital rights, changes to digital policies, and digitalisation due to Covid-19.

2.2. Limitations

Although we are aware of the multiplicity of gender identities, we used a binary approach and we only considered two genders: man and woman. To determine someone’s gender, we made assumptions by looking at their gender expression, e.g. online picture, name, title, or pronouns used in biographical descriptions. We acknowledge potential discrepancies which could have arisen from assessment of gender of any author included in our research due to lack of related public data. When encountering a non-binary person, we did not include them in the statistics.

While developing the methodology of our research, we realised that although we wanted to collect data on other diversities, e.g. racial/ethnic background, we encountered the inability to do so without making assumptions on someone’s ethnic identity. We also recognise that diversity is represented by many different aspects we didn’t capture, as we only focused on gender with a binary approach.

Another limitation in our methodology is the unequal sample sizes between National think tanks and European think tanks. As stated earlier, our analysis includes 21 National think tanks and 12 European think tanks. We see this as a limitation in making comparisons between the two groups, however our analysis is descriptive and is not intended to capture statistically significant differences between the two groups. In essence, there are more National think tanks than European think tanks in general, so our sample is reflective of the current state of affairs in Europe. For this reason, we consider the sample balanced enough to validate our conclusions, though not enough to make statistically significant inferences.

In terms of policy areas, the categories we selected can often blur as many think tanks’ publications overlap policy areas and in each publication different topics might be covered. Therefore, the publications were categorised based on the qualitative assessment by the research team itself or the self-definition done by the think tanks themselves, not based on any quantitative methodology. We should also mention that this research project was mainly a volunteer effort and was produced under a constricted timeframe. Therefore, several decisions had to be taken to limit the scope of the research.
3.1. General Findings

12 European think tanks and 21 national think tanks were analysed to get a first snapshot of how present women are within think tank publications by reviewing the gender representation of think tank research outputs during the full year (January to December) of 2020. We focused on three policy areas that are typically known to be underrepresented by women but are also policy areas that tend to have a prominent position in most think tank programmes.

A total of 2347 research outputs were found with publications representing 61.6% of the total, while the rest falls in the "other" category. Also from this total, 35.3% were co-authored pieces while 64.4% were solo-authored. Further to this, 4309 authors were found with men constituting 66.4% of them compared to just 33.5% who were women. From the co-authored "publications" and "other", 65.5% of them were co-authored with one woman or more. However, from the 1512 solo-authored research outputs, women constituted only 30.5%.

Authors from national think tanks represent almost three-quarters of the total sum and they also produced more research outputs than European think tanks during 2020. Notably, during 2020, national think tanks also produced nearly 10% more solo-authored research outputs than European think tanks who had more co-authored research outputs.

In regards to gender representation for both co-authored and solo-authored research outputs, similar findings can be found in both national and European think tanks which correspond with the overall averages. Out of the total number of co-authored pieces, around 65% featured one woman or more. Meanwhile, out of the total number of solo-authored pieces, men are overrepresented by 68-69.1%. The trend with women representing about 30% of solo-authored pieces continues even when disaggregating the data for “publications” and “other” across the board for both national and European think tanks.

When reviewing the three policy areas, we found that most outputs were published on topics related to EU/Foreign Policy and Security (EU/FP/S), then on topics related to Economics and Trade (E&T) and the smallest amount on Digital & Innovation (D&I)-related topics. Out of the three policy areas, D&I featured the most women authors with 36% representation in think tank research outputs with EU/FP/S following behind with 35.3% and Economics and Trade (E&T) with only 30.2% of women authors.

Gender of the authors of all research outputs analysed in 2020

Authors by women: 33.53%, Authors by men: 66.47%
Gender balance of total research outputs analysed in 2020
National vs European think thanks

Solo Women (out of solo pieces)  Co-authored with women (out of co-authored pieces)
Solo Men (out of solo pieces)  Co-authored with only men (out of co-authored pieces)

Publications and "Other" from National Think Tanks (1518)
- Solo: 1024 (67.46%)
- Co-authored: 493 (32.48%)

Publications and "Other" from European Think Tanks (829)
- Solo: 488 (58.87%)
- Co-authored: 337 (40.65%)
3.2. Women in Research: Pipeline Issues?

By analysing the data collected, we can say that the absence of women authors, notably that **only 30.5% of solo-authored research outputs are by women**, is evidently linked to the proportion of women in think tanks. In a recent report\(^{23}\) by the German Marshall Fund of the United States, it was highlighted that women’s representation in European think tanks is unequal. The report outlines that there is **more gender-balanced representation in non-senior roles but an underrepresentation in leadership positions**. For example, 45% of all employees in 25 major European think tanks are women; however, there is not a single woman in the role of president while three-quarters of directors are men. Furthermore, the report also showed that **women are overrepresented in administrative roles as well as constituted 74% of “organisational” roles** such as communications, IT, finance, human resources and funding.

The overrepresentation of men in solo-authored research outputs, **with almost 70%, may be related to factors of seniority**. Research indicates that there is a more equal gender distribution for entry and mid-level positions where women constitute 48% of experts. Nevertheless, when reviewing more senior research positions, men constituted 64%. A 2020 Elsevier report\(^{24}\) highlights that **women are not involved in collaborative networks at the same level as their male colleagues**. Meanwhile, the data collected in this study highlights that around 65% of collaborative publications (from national and European think tanks) featured at least one woman.

**Gender balance of total think tank research outputs for Economics & Trade in 2020**

By analysing their sample of authors of academic publications, grant recipients and patent applicants across 15 countries, the European Union, and the United Kingdom, Elsevier shows that there is a **slower growth of articles published by women, and higher numbers of women leaving research and understudied areas of research**. In their analysis, they also identify that on average, men have more co-authors than women, with a tendency to collaborate with those of the same gender.

Delving deeper into the policy areas analysed in 2020, our findings outline that **30.2% of think tank research outputs in Economics and Trade (E&T) are authored by women**. Additionally, only 28.7% of the total solo-authored pieces in E&T were by women and a similar proportion can be found in both national and European think tanks. A study by Bruegel highlights that only **35.1% of PhD students at the economic departments of top 20 European universities were women**, far below the 47% average across all fields\(^{25}\). Similar findings can also be found in Elsevier’s 2020 report as it indicates that the gender ratio among active authors in Economics during 2014–2018 from the EU28 was **50 women per 100 men**.

The Brussels based economic think tank Bruegel claims that it is **“equally important to check the portion of all other academic staff who are not full professors – assistant-professors, associate-professors, senior/junior lecturers, readers and researchers – as well as the portion of female PhD graduates”**.

---


They state that this way it gives a greater context on how gender is represented in the entire career path towards full professorship in economics. As a direct consequence of the lack of representation, women’s expertise is not getting the necessary exposure that helps their ideas spread and their careers advance within policy institutions.

By assessing the gender dynamics of research production in both academia and think tanks, it can give a sense of whether similar institutional trends are experienced across all research sectors. The findings produced by this research and from other sources suggest that this is the case and it raises questions on what structural barriers are causing gender imbalances in who gets to produce research and in what fields.

One such issue could be gender stereotypes as Bruegel’s research maintains that the lack of role models could be one of the factors for the low percentage of women willing to start an academic career in economics. Meanwhile, On Think Tanks, a global platform dedicated to promoting better informed policy, notes that talent pipeline issues within think tanks are reinforced by the fact that women tend to avoid sectors/fields where they feel they won’t be supported which could be the case for male-dominated sectors/fields such as economics. Therefore, addressing gender imbalances in research needs to extend beyond getting women into research positions by also tackling biases that exist within institutions.


3.3. Gender Balance in Publications

In our analysis of a total of 2347 research outputs in 2020, we found that 64.4% of the pieces were solo-authored, while 35.3% were co-authored by more than one writer. It is worth highlighting again that out of the 1512 solo pieces that we collected, only 30.5% (462 pieces) were authored solely by women.

Among the co-authored publications, on an average, 65-70% of publications were co-authored with women authors, and this number seems to be consistent across all the three policy areas that were analysed. Notably, co-authored research outputs featuring EU/FP/S related topics featured the highest women’s representation — about 74% of total co-authored publications were co-authored with women.

With a preliminary perusal, this number seems to be high; however, delving deeper into the co-authored pieces reveals some discrepancies. While publications that were co-authored seem to majorly feature at least one woman author, we believe it is also essential to understand ‘how many women’ were featured, raising the question of “how gender-balanced is gender balance”?

Women’s representation in co-authored research outputs in 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-authored publications</td>
<td>36.70%</td>
<td>63.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-authored ‘other’ papers</td>
<td>28.30%</td>
<td>71.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 836 co-authored pieces that we analysed featured a total of 1808 men, but only 973 women authors, revealing a discernible gender gap. Furthermore, only 30% of all co-authored research outputs featured at least 50% women authors. In research outputs by national think tanks, this was even lower — only 27.7% of their published pieces featured at least 50% women authors.

Overall, the co-authored ‘publications’ featured only 36% women authors. In research outputs classified as ‘other’ published by national think tanks, this number is as low as 10%. The next diagrams provide a summary of women’s representation in co-authored pieces:

This pattern can be observed across all the three policy areas analysed. In addressing inequities in publications, it is clear that specific interventions are needed to encourage ‘equal representation’ even in co-authored pieces, instead of just ‘including women’ for token representation.

### 3.4. Publications During a Pandemic

Reflecting further on the fact that women’s representation in think tank research outputs is only 30.5% during a year when research and analysis has been of paramount importance due to the Covid-19 pandemic, it raises many questions as to why this is the case. One such question is how much of a role has the pandemic played in limiting women’s ability to research, write and publish.

Although women have long been underrepresented in research with added gender disparities in citations, awarded grants, and collaborations, it has been widely noted that the Covid-19 pandemic has exacerbated this gender gap\(^28\). Analysis by Philippe Vincent-Lamarre, Cassidy R. Sugimoto, Vincent Larivière on women economists

---

demonstrated a 12% drop in production of preprints and registered reports in March 2020 and a 20% reduction in April, while another showed that they were less likely to work on COVID-related topics. It is also important to note that women’s authorship was increasing in January and February 2020 before lockdown measures came into force but subsequently dropped to previous rates.

Much of the loss in women’s productivity during the pandemic has been attributed to reinforcing gender roles during lockdowns. The unequal distribution of household and caregiving tasks meant that little time was left for women to produce publications in addition to their professions. Contrary to popular belief that teleworking can easily be combined with household and caregiving roles, the limited or non-presence of women in the office environment, makes it difficult to differentiate who is “working” and who is “caring for their children”.

Eurofound discovered that during the pandemic, 17% of women with children under 18 years old were more likely to report that they were finding it hard to concentrate on their job because of family compared to just 9% of men. When reflecting on the figures of the proportion of households in EU member states that have at least one child (Ireland 39%, Cyprus, Poland, Slovakia and Romania above 35%, while the medium average stayed at 20% for the rest of the European countries), it is no surprise that the closure of schools and daycare centres had compounded the challenges faced while working from home, especially when a minimum level of home-schooling was required.

It is important to note that gender roles have long had an impact on women’s participation in research which is supported by On Think Tanks who concluded that even prior to the Covid-19 pandemic, “caregiving responsibilities were a central factor in shaping women’s experience in think tanks”. They noted that this was especially the case for mid-career researchers who would opt for sectors with better employee benefits. Therefore, the Covid-19 pandemic has only exacerbated existing inequalities, proving that care infrastructure is a key component in advancing gender equality in think tanks and professional life as a whole.

---


34 European Commission (2018). Working from Home in the EU. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-eurostat-news/-/DDN-20180920-1&text=In%20the%20EU%20C%20more%20well%20true%20in%20all%20Member%20States.&text=In%202017%20C%20slightly%20higher%25

35 On Think Tanks (2016). Women in Think Tanks. Available at: https://issuu.com/onthinktanks/docs/ott_newoutput_july_womeninthinktank

This report analyses gender balance in think tanks and aims to provide an analysis of women authorship of publications and other research outputs. The report focused on the findings from the analysis of 2347 research outputs produced in 2020 by 12 European think tanks and 21 national think tanks. The respective think tanks were contacted for data verification.

The findings of the report show that the gender gap in research is still high and women’s representation accounts for around 30% in the three policy areas analysed in this report. This number of 30% is also representative for women solo-authors and the number of women who co-author publications.

The report focuses on three key areas: 1) structural and pipeline issues; 2) the overall analysis of gender balance in publications; and 3) the impact of Covid-19 on women’s authorship of research outputs. There has also been analysis on the policy areas of EU Affairs, Foreign Policy and Security, Economics and Trade, and Digital and Innovation.

4.1. Structural Barriers

Even though women account for almost half of staff in think tanks, they are underrepresented in leadership positions and over-represented in the administrative roles. Additionally, if represented almost equally on entry and mid-level in research, women in senior research positions account for only one third of researchers. Moreover, women report that their work is impacted by household duties and childcare responsibilities even prior to the pandemic. Therefore, this report identifies that there are still structural issues that prevent women from fully participating in research and having their voice present and represented in policy research.

4.2. Limited Representation

According to the findings, women account for one-third of all the research authors. In the case of co-authored pieces, around 70% of research outputs have women as co-authors, however the number of women co-authors accounts for only 30%. Therefore, it could be argued that in the case of co-authorship, think tanks make an effort to invite women as co-authors; however, they are far from ensuring equal representation of women and men.

4.3. Covid-19’s Impact on Women Authorship

The report shows that the pandemic had its toll on women’s authorship, which increased in the first two months of 2020 and then dropped when lockdown measures were introduced. Women reported an increased amount of housework and childcare, which was exacerbated by the closing of care facilities and schools. Therefore, it disproportionately affected women compared to men.
5. RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. What Think Tanks Can Do

Tackling gender inequalities in research requires a cross-cutting, holistic and structural approach. Think tanks play a central role in advancing gender equality not only within their own organisations but across their sector and field of expertise. However, it is important that think tanks evolve from just aiming for gender balance among researchers to embedding a gender lens in the production of their research.

5.1.1. ADDRESSING GENDER IMBALANCE SYSTEMICALLY

Address Institutional Biases

Like most other organisations and institutions, think tanks are not exempt from having systemic biases that give advantages to certain groups over others. However, to tackle this problem, it first needs to be recognised and the best way to do that is visualise it. By forming an internal DE&I task force to carry out a demographic survey that not only focuses on how many women are in the organisation, but also tracks their roles and responsibilities. The task force can help highlight institutional and individual responsibility of gender and diversity objectives. It is also possible to source expert consultants to support this process or to acquire specialised training to develop awareness of biases as well as gender competencies throughout staff.

Targets Matter

“What gets measured, gets managed” is also relevant in the pursuit of equality. Monitoring gender and diversity should be applied throughout think tank activities from recruitment to the composition of panel events. A tracker mechanism can also be applied to gender and authorship of publications. Successful monitoring and evaluation systems use targets, are centralised and consistent. Gender and diversity data should also be publicly available to not just motivate self-improvement but to encourage others within the think tank community to do the same.

---

37 Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
39 “Gender competence is the ability of people to recognise gender perspectives in their work and policy fields and concentrate on them towards the goal of gender equality. Gender competence is a prerequisite for successful Gender Mainstreaming.”
40 Quote by management guru Peter Drucker.
Recruitment & Career Advancement
A gender equality action plan needs to take into account the recruitment process from the initial hiring of a new candidate, to retention and to job promotions. Hidden gender biases can inhibit women from accessing or progressing within certain sectors, particularly in how the “criteria” for the ideal candidate is formulated. As part of a gender-sensitive recruitment, criteria for positions should be transparent, weighted, and fixed throughout the entire process. Sourcing women candidates also requires that positions not only be widely advertised but to be targeted too (e.g. send job listing to women networks). Furthermore, to overcome biases, think tanks can also implement periodic and comprehensive tracking of:
- Gender composition of interview panels;
- Gender of job candidates (long-list, short-list, interviewee, new hires)
- Rates of progression and promotion by gender.

Lastly, think tanks can also offer training, mentorship and periodic talent talks as a core part of supporting women in their career development41.

Get to the Root of Pipeline Issues
Underrepresentation of women in some academic disciplines can be lessened by cooperating and learning from universities, which have been using the strategies of attracting junior talent to their institutions through various initiatives. Some educational institutions use targeted scouting of students in high schools and universities to encourage and promote fields that might be socially considered as traditionally male-oriented. This includes a communication strategy that works against gender stereotypes and encourages young women to apply and go beyond social constraints that might keep them back. The approach has successfully been implemented in Portugal, where the disparity in STEM subjects has been battled with early education interventions, as well as special scholarships to attract young talent amongst women42.

Implement Gender-Sensitive Policies
Gender-sensitive organisations respond to the needs and interests of both women and men within their structures, operations, and work, which can help remove barriers. It is crucial that we stop viewing gender inequality as “women’s issues” and as an isolated matter that is unconnected to different parts of an organisation; therefore, all organisational policies should be gender-sensitive43. Such policies include codes of conduct where gender-sensitive language is promoted and sanctions for gender-discriminatory behaviour and speech. It is recommended that gender equality mechanisms should review such codes along with broader procedural rules on a regular basis to identify discriminatory provisions44. Lastly, mechanisms for issuing grievances and disciplinary matters (e.g. sexual harassment) should be communicated thoroughly to all staff members.

43 On Think Tanks (2016). Women in Think Tanks. Available at: https://issuu.com/onthinktanks/docs/ott_newoutput_july_womeninthinktank
44 OECD. Toolkit for Mainstreaming and Implementing Gender Equality. Available at: https://www.oecd.org/governance/toolkit/parliament/representation-at-all-levels/human-resource-policies/
Work-Life Balance

A healthy work environment requires work-life balance to prevent stress and reduce the risk of burnout. One way think tanks can promote this is by implementing flexible working hours and the ability to work remotely either full-time or in a hybrid system. This practice should not be exclusively for women though as evident over the course of the Covid-19 pandemic, it can reinforce gender equalities. Therefore, it should become the norm and not lead to stigmatisation around productivity. Flexible and remote working systems should become regulated by labour laws; however, think tanks can already implement their own organisational policies where they can monitor trends of usage. Additionally, think tanks can also provide family support services or networks which would not only enhance work-life balance but could free-up space for researchers.

5.1.2. PRACTICE GENDER-INCLUSIVE RESEARCH

Top Down Strategy

While many DE&I initiatives often begin at a grassroots level among employees, organisational impact will remain limited until senior leadership becomes fully engaged. Systemic change within think tanks needs intentional, cross-cutting and coordinated efforts starting from the top. It is only with leadership buy-in that strategic change in how research is practiced can become sustainable. You can address leadership uncertainty by making the “business” case of how gender-inclusive research will bring positive outcomes for your think tank (e.g. funding opportunities that require gender equality in research) and enhance its reputation.

Diversify Research Partners

All too often, research partners within think tank projects tend to be from similar establishments (universities, governmental departments, private sector, etc.) which can contribute to a sense of disenfranchisement from ordinary citizens in how policy is shaped. Ensuring that policy recommendations are reflective of the diversity of societies, engaging with grassroots and civil society organisations (CSOs) during the research phase, using citizen consultations and focus groups, with grassroots and CSOs who have more hands-on experience of social realities can bring a wealth of insights to research as well as enhance its credibility. As think tanks tend to be institutions for knowledge production, partnering up with the civil society sector would also help bridge data gaps that exist in social causes (e.g. the gender data gap in employment). By harnessing meaningful collaboration and using the unique features and expertise of think tanks and grassroots/CSOs, the opportunities to make social impact are tenfold.

Standardise Gender Analytics

There is no such thing as gender-neutral outcomes, especially in policy. Therefore, to act in a gender-blind way does a disservice to half the population. One way to address this is to use gender analytics in think tank research to analyse policies by using a gendered perspective to understand a given context. This will not only allow think tanks to describe the current state of gender in their research focus, but to also explore the causes and effects of gender disparities that may exist. By mainstreaming gender analytics in research programmes, think tanks can ensure their work is representative. Gender analytics should be implemented at all stages of the research process starting from defining the hypotheses right through to disseminating the results.

45 Bagley, B (2020). The Key D&I Success Factor: Getting Your Leaders on Board, Pulsely. Available at: https://assets-global.website-files.com/5ecd00fbbff1d943cb35a59e/5f16da1e8e6d4d17edd3a49f9_200720_pulsely_white-papers_the-key-di-success.pdf
Be Intersectional with Data
An intersectional approach to data collection acknowledges systemic discrimination due to sexual orientation, gender, race, economic status, immigration status, national origin, and (dis)ability, among other aspects of one’s identity and these aspects intersect to compound discrimination. By disaggregating data to be more reflective of intersecting identities, it can reveal patterns that can often be masked by larger aggregated data.50 By adopting an intersectional approach, it brings the research closer to the lived experiences of marginalised groups and enable better and more effective policy solutions51.

Best practices in intersectional data often go beyond gender by factoring in other attributes such as the ones listed above. If possible, avoid making assumptions based on gender expression by sourcing gender pronouns. If the research does have a gender component, then subgroup the sample to reflect the full diversity of women. Lastly, ensure any interpretation of data is without bias by having a peer review done by someone from a different background than the researchers.

Make Research Outcome-Oriented
By having an outcome-oriented approach to research that is mainstreamed and embedded at a strategic level, think tanks can more clearly focus on the intentions and goals of their research and how it impacts policy. This way, they can ensure that the work they’re doing is actually meeting the needs of women and diverse populations but it will also help with efficiency in communicating information, internal decision-making as well as resource management52.

Be More Qualitative
Data is the foundation for research and quantifiable data allows us to observe and measure phenomena in an impartial and accurate manner over a period of time. Many think tanks rely on quantitative data for their research and while it is crucial to have it, it can sometimes be devoid of human connection. By incorporating qualitative data into their work, think tanks can make their research not only more participatory but it can bring a deeper understanding of social realities. By using qualitative data in gender analytics, it allows researchers to explore and examine gender disparities as well as solicit solutions from those with first-hand experience53.

Give Women the Lead
Men still dominate in the prestigious first and last author positions in research publications. To promote women’s visibility in research, think tanks should ensure that leadership roles for projects and publications are distributed in an equitable and gender-balanced manner.

Be More Open on Authorship
Advancing gender equality is also about breaking gender stereotypes and inspiring the next generation of women that all spaces and fields of expertise are accessible to them. Being more open on who is producing and publishing research can contribute to this by publishing the full names (and gender pronouns) of researchers to promote inclusion.

5.2. What Researchers Can Do

Individual researchers also play a part in promoting change by not only developing their own self-awareness but by making small habitual changes in how they practice gender inclusivity in research and publications.

**TACKLE UNCONSCIOUS BIAS**

Everyone has unconscious biases (even those of us who work in equality!) as they’re deep seeded and instinctive assumptions that are absorbed through interactions in society. These can occur from making snap judgements based on someone’s appearance, speech, religious belief and so forth. For example, an unconscious bias is automatically associating professions such as nursing with women. Unconscious bias can be harmful when practiced repeatedly over a period of time, which is particularly important for researchers whose purpose is to produce knowledge. Not only can these biases influence research content itself but they can contribute to a toxic workplace culture that is detrimental for underrepresented groups such as women. Tackling unconscious bias can start as an individual commitment to attend training to learn how to unpack unconscious biases which in turn can influence work cultures.

**RECOGNISE MALE PRIVILEGE**

Men are still overrepresented in many working arenas, and the think tank industry is no exception. We know that this result is not proof of men researcher overperforming, but rather a presence of structural barriers (limited access to education in certain fields, unconscious biases, lack of parental-friendly work environments, scarce presence of women in leadership roles and so on). In order to have more women published, there is also the need for male colleagues to recognise their privilege in the lack of barriers they face compared to women in their careers. Just as we did for this report, it would be a worthwhile exercise to internally map the gender composition of research staff and authorship to see if there are disparities.


55 CHEER, University of Sussex (2021). Unconscious bias and implicit bias. Available at: http://www.sussex.ac.uk/education/cheer/researchprojects/risetoolkit/bias

PRACTICE REPRESENTATIVE & INCLUSIVE RESEARCH

You do not need to be a woman to practice gender analytics in research. By embedding gender analysis in research (see the point above), it enhances the quality of knowledge produced by making it more reflective of society’s nuances and in turn improves policy suggestions. Practicing representative and inclusive research is also about giving space to women to be involved. Male researchers can do the following:

- Propose co-authorship with a woman;
- Ensure that the research team is gender balanced;
- Be aware to also consult prior work done by women colleagues and that it is reflected in footnotes/bibliography;
- Aim for gender balance in citations;
- If unable to present your research, recommend women colleagues to promote their visibility.

PROMOTE INTERGENERATIONAL COLLABORATION

Successful careers in research are strongly driven by publications\(^{57}\). Therefore, senior, and more specifically, male researchers, can leverage their influence to include and support younger women researchers to contribute to research and publishing. They can do this by knowledge sharing and building up their networks by including them in research meetings and presentations. Mentoring and sponsoring the career of a young woman researcher can go a long way in advancing gender equality in your field of expertise.

BE AN ADVOCATE

Gender inclusion starts with everyday decision-making; therefore, men are invited to be advocates to promote gender-sensitive approaches in research. This can begin within their own organisations by assisting in a co-creational DE&I strategy to ensure there is balance in gender representation in think tank activities. Furthermore, they can also advocate for changes to update research journal guidelines to be more inclusive when training early researchers. Such actions showcase role model behaviours which can have a positive impact by inspiring other male colleagues to step up and take action.

---

\(^57\) Husemann, M. Rogers, R. Meyer, S. Habel, J.C. (2017). “Publicationism” and scientists' satisfaction depend on gender, career stage and the wider academic system, Palgrave Communications. Available at: https://www.nature.com/articles/palcomms201732#citeas
## ANNEX I

### LIST OF THINK TANKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austrian Institute of Economic Research (WIFO)</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egmont Institute*</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Study of Democracy (CSD)</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Economics (EIZ)</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPEUM Institute for European Policy*</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS)</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Centre for Defence and Security (ICDS)</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Institute of International Affairs (FIIA)</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Institute of International Relations (IFRI)</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecologic Institute</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign Policy (ELIAMEP)</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of International and European Affairs (IIIEA)</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian Institute of International Affairs (LIIA)</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe Studies Centre (EESC)</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clingendael, Netherlands Institute of International Relations</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Social and Economic Research (CASE)</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Foreign Policy Association (SFPA)</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Economic Research (IER)</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elcano Royal Institute*</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS)</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istituto Affari Internazionali* (IAI)</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMF Brussels*</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruegel*</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Europe* (FoE)</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Centre for International Political Economy* (ECIPE)</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for European Policy Studies* (CEPS)</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for European Reform (CER)*</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Europe*</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Policy Center* (EPC)</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Centre for Development Policy Management* (ECDPM)</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham House*</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Think tanks who officially endorse The Brussels Binder.*
### TABLE 1: GENDER BALANCE OF TOTAL RESEARCH OUTPUTS ANALYSED IN 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Authors</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4309</td>
<td>2864</td>
<td>1445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66,47%</td>
<td>33,53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2: GENDER BALANCE OF TOTAL SOLO-AUTHORED RESEARCH OUTPUTS BY NATIONAL THINK TANKS ANALYSED IN 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Publications and “Other” (P+O) from National Think Tanks</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>P+O</th>
<th>Total Publ</th>
<th>Total Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2772</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66,70%</td>
<td>33,30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Co-authored</th>
<th>Tot co-authored with women (out of co-authored pieces)</th>
<th>Total Solo</th>
<th>Solo Men (out of solo pieces)</th>
<th>Solo Women (out of solo pieces)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32,48%</td>
<td>64,71%</td>
<td>67,46%</td>
<td>69,14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3: GENDER BALANCE OF TOTAL SOLO-AUTHORED RESEARCH OUTPUTS BY EUROPEAN THINK TANKS ANALYSED IN 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Publications and “Other” (P+O) from European Think Tanks</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>P+O</th>
<th>Total Publ</th>
<th>Total Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1537</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66,04%</td>
<td>33,96%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Co-authored</th>
<th>Total co-authored with women (out of co-authored pieces)</th>
<th>Total Solo</th>
<th>Solo Men (out of solo pieces)</th>
<th>Solo Women (out of solo pieces)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40,65%</td>
<td>58,87%</td>
<td>68,03%</td>
<td>31,76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4: GENDER BALANCE OF TOTAL THINK TANK RESEARCH OUTPUTS FOR ECONOMICS & TRADE IN 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total E&amp;T Authors</th>
<th>E&amp;T Men</th>
<th>E&amp;T Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1611</td>
<td>1123</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69,71%</td>
<td>30,29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 5: GENDER BALANCE OF TOTAL SOLO-AUTHORED THINK TANK RESEARCH OUTPUTS IN 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Co-authored</th>
<th>Co-authored with women (out of co-authored pieces)</th>
<th>Total Solo</th>
<th>Tot Solo Men (out of solo pieces)</th>
<th>Tot Solo Women (out of solo pieces)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>1512</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.36%</td>
<td>65.54%</td>
<td>64.42%</td>
<td>68.78%</td>
<td>30.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 6: GENDER BALANCE OF TOTAL SOLO-AUTHORED THINK TANK RESEARCH OUTPUTS FOR ECONOMICS & TRADE IN 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total E&amp;T Co-authored</th>
<th>E&amp;T co-authored with women (out of co-authored pieces)</th>
<th>Total E&amp;T Solo</th>
<th>Total E&amp;T Solo Men (out of solo pieces)</th>
<th>Total E&amp;T Solo Women (out of solo pieces)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>61.39%</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>70.95%</td>
<td>28.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 7: WOMEN’S REPRESENTATION IN CO-AUTHORED RESEARCH OUTPUTS IN 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Type</th>
<th>Men authors</th>
<th>Women authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-authored publications</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-authored ‘other’ papers</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 8: CO-AUTHORED RESEARCH OUTPUTS FEATURING AT LEAST 50% WOMEN IN 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-authored Pieces Featuring at least 50% Women</th>
<th>National Think Tanks</th>
<th>European Think Tanks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-authored publications</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-authored ‘other’ papers</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOURCES BY THE BRUSSELS BINDER:

**Database**
BBBeyond Online Repository of Women & Diversity Expert Databases

**Blog**
"Think Tanks...Put a Gender Lens on!" (2021)

**Event (YouTube)**
Mind the Gap: Women in Research (in partnership with Carnegie Europe)

**Research Report**

**Toolkits**
https://toolbox.brusselsbinder.org/

---

**ANNEX III**

**RESOURCES AND FURTHER READING**
OTHER RESOURCES AND READINGS:

- Bruegel - The Sound of Economics: “Where are the women in economics?”
- Chatham House, CFFP, and Basic: Gender, Think-Tanks and International Affairs: A Toolkit (2021)
- EIGE: Gender Mainstreaming: Gender Statistics and Indicators (2019)
- Elsevier: Gender in Portugal Research Arena: A Case Study in European Leadership (2021)
- Elsevier: Gender in the Global Research Landscape (2017)
- Elsevier: Mapping Gender in the German Research Arena (2015)
- Gender and the Economy: “How Leaders’ Beliefs about Inequality Affect Organizational Diversity” (2019)
- Gender and the Economy: Gender Analytics Online: Gender Equity Through Inclusive Design (2021)
- Gender and the Economy: “Intersectionality and the Implications for Workplace Gender Equity” (2019)
- Gender and the Economy: “Why Changing Gendered Behaviour does not Equate to Gender Equality” (2018)
- German Marshall Fund of the United States: Absent Influencers? Women in European Think Tanks (2020)
- On Think Tanks: Women in Think Tanks (2016)
- On Think Tanks: Towards a Gender Equal Think Tank (2019)
- PLOS ONE: The gender gap in commenting: Women are less likely than men to comment on (men’s) published research (2020)
- PLOS ONE: Men and Women Differ in their Perception of Gender Bias in Research Institutions (2019)
- Rotman Magazine: Gender Analytics: How Gender-Based Insights Create Value (2021)
- Think Tank Initiative: Why Intersectionality Matters for Think Tanks: Reflections from PAC
- Think Tank Initiative: Think Tanks and Gender Equality