



GENDER DIVERSITY IMPACT –  
Improving research and innovation  
through gender diversity

WWW.GEDII.EU

Project Deliverable

## D4.3 Survey Analysis and Performance Indicator Research Report

24<sup>th</sup> March 2018 – **version 1.0 FINAL**



The work contained in this document is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (CC BY). [View License Deed.](#)

## Project Consortium



Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, Spain

Project Coordination

Dr. Jörg Müller  
Dr. Milagros Sáinz  
Dr. Rosa Borge  
Dr. Julià Minguillón  
Dr. Julio Meneses  
Dr. Sergi Fàbregues

Hochschule Furtwangen, Germany



Prof. Dr. Ulrike Busolt  
Sandra Klatt  
Wiebke Kronsbein



Örebro University, Sweden

Dr. Ulf Sandström  
Dr. Anne-Charlott Callerstig  
Prof. Dr. Liisa Husu



Verband der Elektrotechnik Elektronik  
Informationstechnik e.V., Germany

Dr. Walter Börmann  
Nicole Biengen  
Andreas Landwehr  
Annika Gereke



Oxford Brooks, UK

Dr. Anne Laure Humbert  
Dr. Elisabeth Guenther



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 665851.

## Table of Content

Executive Summary.....	5
Introduction.....	7
Overview of the report.....	8
Chapter 1 - Methodology.....	9
Design of the Questionnaire(s).....	9
Gaining Access to the Field.....	11
Recruiting R&D Teams.....	16
Online Data Collection.....	20
Data Pre-Processing Steps.....	21
Chapter 2 - Performance Indicators.....	23
Bibliometric Identification & Analysis of Team Performance.....	23
Patent Based Indicators.....	30
Chapter 3 - Relating Gender Diversity to Research Performance.....	33
The impact of gender diversity on research performance.....	33
Methodology.....	37
Results.....	40
Conclusion.....	48
References.....	50
Annex I – Team Contact Questionnaire.....	57
Annex II – Team Member Questionnaire.....	60
Annex III – Overview of Recruitment Efforts 1 <sup>st</sup> Wave.....	70
Annex IV – Example Bibliometric Performance Profile.....	75
Annex V – Descriptive Statistics of Survey Results.....	79
Responses per Country x Gender (v_7R).....	80
Team Member Questionnaire.....	83
Team Contact Questionnaire.....	157

## Acknowledgments

The results of this report would have been impossible without the collaboration of R&D teams across Europe that were willing to participate in our survey. We are very thankful to all team leaders as well as team members for their trust, time and support of this project.

In this report, a large part of the results of the GEDII project are combined. As such it is the outcome of a collective, prolonged effort that merges diverse scientific expertise and skills. The questionnaires were designed collaboratively by Ulrike Busolt, Sandra Klatt, Wiebke Kronsbein (HFU), Anne Laure Humbert, Elisabeth Guenther (Brooks/CRA), Ulf Sandström, Anne-Charlott Callerstig (ORU) and Julio Meneses, Milagros Sáinz, and Jörg Müller (UOC). An advanced draft received valuable comments from the members of the Advisory Board. Web of Science data mining of bibliometric data was carried out by Ulf Sandström. PATSTAT data mining of inventors and patents was organized and supervised by Sandra Klatt, Wiebke Kronsbein and Ulrike Busolt. The online version of the questionnaire was implemented by Wiebke Kronsbein and Jörg Müller. Address verification and team recruitment was carried out by each partner in their respective countries with VDE supporting German recruitment while CRA covered the UK and Lithuania. UOC carried out 2<sup>nd</sup> wave recruitment across 11 additional countries. Regarding the analysis: Ulf Sandström retrieved and generated bibliometric performance indicators for each research group; Sandra Klatt and Wiebke Kronsbein provided patent based performance indicators as well as the descriptive statistics part of the present report. Anne Laure Humbert and Elisabeth Guenther carried out the statistical modeling between team variables and performance data. The overall coordination of WP4 was carried out by Jörg Müller.

## Executive Summary

- The present deliverable reports the findings of the cross-country survey regarding gender diversity in R&D teams across Europe and its link to performance indicators carried as part of Work Package 4 of the GEDII project. The empirical evidence is based upon 1,357 complete questionnaire submissions across 159 teams in the following 17 countries: Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the UK.
- The original recruitment of R&D teams targeted the transport and biomedical engineering sectors in public and private organizations. However, responding teams cover a variety of disciplinary backgrounds, including the social sciences and economics. Most teams were recruited from Spain (approximately 500 individual responses) and Sweden (approximately 300 responses) followed by Germany, the UK, the Netherlands approximating about 100 individual responses each. The fieldwork was conducted between March 2017 and January 2018. Despite concerted efforts, response from the private sector was negligible. The vast majority of R&D teams participating in this survey therefore belong to public Research Performing Organizations.
- R&D teams reaching a sufficiently high response rate threshold were included in the analysis of the diversity-performance link. First bibliometric and patent performance indicators were compiled. A team was understood as a group of people working together and bound by the same organizational context (e.g. through formal labor contract or being a doctoral student). Web of Science publications as well as patents were collected for the groups participating. Bibliometric indicators such as the Field Adjusted Performance (FAP) and Percentile Model (PM) were calculated in order to compare performance of research groups across scientific fields. Patent indicators counted the number of patents per team.
- Gendered processes within teams were captured through the Gender Diversity Index (GDI), a composite indicator developed in Work Package 3 of this project (see Humbert & Guenther 2018). The GDI measures the representation and attrition of women and men within teams along seven dimensions of diversity, such as education, age, marital status, care responsibilities, team tenure, seniority and contract type. The GDI provides a score bound between 0 and 1, where 1 signals a more inclusive team.

### Key Results

- Our preliminary analysis shows that more inclusive teams – that is, teams with a score close to 1 on the Gender Diversity Index – tend to perform better and generate more research output. When controlling for gender stereotypes, gender balance and the representation of women within teams, a score of 1 on the GDI is associated with an increase of 0.91 FAP. Less inclusive teams need on average an additional 0.91

senior researchers in order to perform as well as more inclusive teams.

- There is no statistically significant effect on the quality rank of the published research (Percentile Model). Initial modelling also does not indicate a significant mediation effect of team processes such as team climate, power disparity, perception of leadership style or diversity climate.
- Considering the bibliometric profiles across R&D teams we observe a certain variety of above and below average performing groups. The same holds true regarding the Gender Diversity Index where we observe teams spanning the entire range of GDI scores from 0 to 1.

### **Limitations**

- The survey did not target a representative sample of European R&D groups. Field access was organized through Web of Science and PATSTAT address retrieval, i.e. it reached primarily those groups that have an active track record of publications in the respective transport and biomedical engineering fields.
- Second, the survey targeted active team members pertaining to the group at the time of the survey; it thus provides a snapshot of the team at a specific moment in time. However, performance data measures scientific output with a certain delay as publishing results takes time. A better fit between the team survey and the scientific output of the team that answered to the survey will become available over the next two to three years.
- Third, generating a bibliometric performance profile for individual R&D groups is a complex process. Performance profiles have been validated with team leaders but feedback still needs to be incorporated into the bibliometric data. However, given the received feedback from teams so far, we expect little changes to the overall results.

## Introduction

Among the core objectives of the GEDII project, and in particular WP4, is the attempt to examine the relationship between gender diversity and research performance. Towards this goal, we designed and implemented a survey across 16 countries in Europe, generating first-hand evidence on a large, cross-European scale. The survey was complemented by a qualitative case study approach developed during WP2, which concentrated on the development of new methods and tools using 'sociometric badges' (see Deliverable 2.4, Müller 2018) for studying gendered team interaction.

The following report provides a comprehensive summary of the development of the questionnaire, field access and data collection procedure as well as the first results of our analysis. Although the survey targeted largely research and development (R&D) teams in the public *and* private sector, the response rate from the private sector teams was extremely poor. Overall, a total of 159 teams participated: 86 teams reached a within-team response rate of 70% or more; 121 teams were at or above a 50% response rate. Across all teams, 1,357 individuals completed questionnaires.

The overall design of WP4 is unique in that it combines responses from a questionnaire distributed among team members with performance measures derived from bibliometric analysis. Contrary to many existing studies, the research performance of each team was captured by retrieving their corresponding publications from the Web of Science. Using bibliometric methods, standardized performance indicators were thus generated that allowed to compare groups across different scientific fields. Although there are several important limitations to this approach, some of which related to the time-lag with which publications of the current group become available, we believe that it provides an insightful approach in that it combines information only available through a team-survey with a detailed bibliometric profile.

WP4 and its results are closely related to WP3 in which the Gender Diversity Index was developed (see Humbert & Guenther 2018). The Gender Diversity Index (GDI) is a composite indicator that provides a summary measure of gendered processes at the team level (representation and attrition). The Index relies on indicators of demographic diversity that encompass age, marital status, care responsibilities and education. It furthermore incorporates functional diversity such as team tenure, seniority and contract-type. For example, the GDI assesses women's and men's participation in senior positions as well as attrition rates from junior to senior positions within the team. It provides an instrument to assess the influence of gender on research performance in a more sophisticated way than simply 'counting heads', i.e. linking performance with the proportion of women and men on the team. As described in detail in Deliverable 3.2, the construction of the GDI, specifically the weighting of its individual components, draws on the data collected through the survey.

## Overview of the report

The remainder of this report is structured as follows: Chapter one describes the methods for designing the questionnaire, gaining field access and compilation of the bibliometric and patent performance data.

Chapter two then presents in more detail the methods used for generating bibliometric as well as patent based performance indicators. It focuses especially on the construction of performance indicators that can be used across scientific fields, for which detailed explanations are required.

Chapter three presents the statistical modelling between gender diversity within teams and the performance data. It also examines contextual data such as team climate, leadership or communication patterns within the team.

Several Annexes are provided that contain the questionnaires used, a detailed overview of the recruitment efforts and results, an example bibliometric performance profile as well as an overview of the descriptive statistics for each variable in the questionnaire.



# Chapter 1 - Methodology

Jörg Müller, Sandra Klatt

The following section describes the methodology followed for the design of the questionnaire as well as for gaining access to the field and recruiting of teams. As will become clear, the need to reach a sufficiently high response rate from research teams required a quite elaborated recruitment strategy and flexibility to adapt field access procedure as well as the overall duration of the field phase. Overall, the methodology mirrors the challenges faced by the GEDII Consortium in compiling an innovative dataset that combines detailed team variables with solid bibliometric performance data.

## Design of the Questionnaire(s)

The questionnaire design was informed by the Conceptual Framework (D1.1, see Müller et al. 2016) as well as the requirements of the Gender Diversity Index (D3.2, see Humbert & Guenther 2017). The first versions of the questionnaire were developed among the members of the Consortium; an advanced draft was presented to the Advisory Board of the project; the resulting feedback was incorporated into subsequent versions.

The survey integrates two questionnaires: a team member and a team contact questionnaire. The *team member questionnaire* was filled out by each member of the group individually and covers issues such as socio-demographic variables, current role and tenure in the team, professional situation and career, or care responsibilities among other items.<sup>1</sup> The team member questionnaire combines these more standard socio-demographic variables with established and validated measurement scales that have been widely used in the team science literature (see next section). However, information about the team itself was covered by a second questionnaire, the so-called *team contact questionnaire*.<sup>2</sup> It was filled out by one person per team – ideally, but not necessarily, the team leader – since it focused on issues that concern the research group as a whole, and whose details might not be known to all members. Items include, for example, the founding year of the team, the type of organization, number of employees, shared office/lab space, the existence of a gender equality plan or the working methodologies used by the group. The team-level information as well as all responses from the team members were then combined into a single dataset.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 The contact questionnaire is available in Annex I – Team Contact Questionnaire on page 57.

2 The member questionnaire is available in Annex II – Team Member Questionnaire on page 60.

3 Responses were combined by using a unique team code that allows to assign individual responses as well as answer to the team contact to one and the same group

## Measures

*Gender Stereotypes (Q29)* - Gender stereotypes are part of 'doing' gender (Martin, 2003) within teams and therefore co-produce gendered processes as well as team processes. The analysis relies on a scale developed by Kearney, Razinskas, Weiss and Hoegl (Kearney, Razinskas, Weiss, & Hoegl, n.d.). This scale asks participants to state whether they disagree or agree with the following four items: "Women and men have their respective strengths in different areas", "Women and men generally have different ways of contributing to a team task", "Women and men generally have different communication styles" and "Many of the widespread ideas about how women and men differ are accurate". These items show reliability and internal consistency (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.79).

*Diversity Climate (Q13)* - Diversity climate is captured through the sexist climate scale devised by Settles et al. (2006). This scale is introduced with the question "How would you characterise the working climate at your wider working environment?" and consists of the following four items: "Senior employees respect junior male and female employees equally", "In meetings, people pay just as much attention when women speak as when men speak", "Allegations of gender based and sexual harassment are taken seriously by management" and "In this organisation, I would feel comfortable to raise issues about the treatment of women or men". Respondents can rate each item on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The four items show internal consistency (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.79).

*Team Influence (power disparity) (Q10)* - Power disparity is measured through a short scale, first used by Curşeu and Sari (2015). The scale consists of four items (Cronbach's alpha = 0.85): "To which extent do you think that you can influence your team members?"; "I have preferential position in my team and I can easily influence the other team members"; "I have the resources and power to influence the actions of the other team members"; and "I have more power within my team compared to the other team members".

*Team Climate (Q11)* - A short version of the team climate inventory with 14 items (Boada-Grau, de Diego-Vallejo, de Llanos-Serra, & Vigil-Colet, 2011; Kivimaki & Elovainio, 1999; Strating & Nieboer, 2009) was used. The original (large) scale was developed by Anderson & West (1998). The inventory includes items such as "I am clear about what my team's objectives are", "We have a 'we are in it together' attitude", "There are real attempts to share information throughout the team", "We are prepared to question the basis of what the team is doing" or "We are always searching for fresh, new ways of looking at problems". The team climate scale comprises four factors: "Vision", "Participation Safety", "Task Orientation", and "Support for Innovation". One of the item measuring 'Participative Safety' ("People feel understood and accepted by each other") was not included, instead one additional item for 'vision' was added ("I'm clear about what my team's objectives are"). The 14 items show high internal consistency with Cronbach's alpha at 0.92.

*Leadership Style (Q12)* - The perception of team leadership is assessed using the scale developed by Berger et al. (2012). The eight items capture the members' perception of their team leader. This scale was introduced with the prompt "Please assess your team leaders' leadership style" and includes items such as "She/he develops ways of motivating us",

“She/he promotes the use of intelligence to overcome obstacles” or “She/he actively fosters trust, involvement and cooperation among team members”. The scale shows high internal consistency with a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.93. The original leadership scale was complemented by three additional items: “She/he has realistic expectations on the outcome of my work”, “She/he has realistic expectations on the time schedule I need for my work”, “She/he actively fosters trust, involvement and cooperation among team members”.

*Team Communication (Q9)* – The formal and informal communication and frequency of communication among team members was measured using an adapted scale from Pinto & Pinto (Pinto & Pinto, 1990) The scales measures frequency as “Never”, “Once per month or less”, “Once per week or less”, “A few times per week”, “Once per day or more” regarding formal meetings, formal memos, appointments, telephone/skype calls or informal discussions.

## Gaining Access to the Field

Field access has been based upon data mining the Web of Science database (authors of publications) on the one hand, and the PATSTAT database (inventors) on the other. Important selection criteria guided and limited the data mining exercise from the outset in terms of subject areas as well as country choice<sup>4</sup>.

### *Strategic Subject- and Country Choices*

*Subject areas.* The initial proposal included two thematic areas – Biomedical Engineering and Transport research – as the target of the survey. Biomedical engineering is of high societal relevance since new medical applications, better diagnostics and more effective treatment applications hugely impact people's lives. Better performing teams would not only make a real difference for many citizens, but also contribute to increase European competitiveness. Second, biomedical engineering is result-oriented and is a field where traditional performance indicators, such as publications and patents, are well established. Furthermore, since it combines research with final product application, we can observe ‘performance’ along the pipeline from basic research up to product deployment. Third, biomedical engineering combines classical medical research with engineering applications; interdisciplinary teams are common and combine very divergent subject areas ranging from medicine, biology, engineering, optics, electronics and others. The fact that teams have to draw upon very diverse subject areas eases the observation of factors that facilitate knowledge integration. In other words, tasks are sufficiently complex as to be able to observe the benefits of diversity. The disciplinary mix also eases finding sufficiently gender diverse teams. Fourth, whereas medicine is relatively gender balanced, engineering is usually dominated by men. This provides us with a rich context of changing gender role expectations

---

4 However, the selection criteria in terms of country choices were expanded during the field phase in order to include more countries, hence access more teams and increase the overall response rate to our survey.

and responsibilities and gender diverse teams.

Transport research has been selected as a second field because it tackles issues of strategic importance for society such as environmental friendly and resource efficient mobility. It pertains to Horizon 2020's Societal Challenges; better research decisions and outcomes are vital for Europe's internal market and citizen's quality of life. The transport sector includes air, rail, road, urban and water transport. Whereas a large part of employment in this sector is concerned with the management of infrastructures and vehicles, important research questions concern intelligent transport systems, innovative vehicle technologies and transport management. Hence, in contrast to medical engineering, transport research is often very process oriented: examples include intelligent transport systems, or improving safety and efficiency of infrastructures and vehicles. Given its closeness to the everyday realities of citizens, transport research can be quite amenable to social innovations. This will allow us to extend the traditional performance indicators of medical engineering with 'alternative' and emerging ones. Third, transport research draws upon different subject areas such as mechanics, electronics, computer science (routing problems), and engineering. Women are under-represented in the transport labour force as it is another highly men-oriented field. However, recent societal needs regarding efficient energy use, sustainability and ecological transport have made it more attractive to women. This mix of gendered professional fields provides a rich context for exploring the benefits of gender diversity in teams.

*Country choices.* An initial set of five countries was selected to implement the GEDII survey in, which consisted of Sweden, the UK, Germany, Spain and Lithuania. This initial set of countries was expanded during a second wave of survey roll-out to increase the number of responding R&D teams. The additional selected countries included: Norway, Finland, Belgium, Denmark, Netherlands, Poland, Czech Republic, Portugal, Austria, Switzerland and Italy.

Both the initial and expanded selection of countries enables to contrast high and moderate innovation countries with different welfare and gender regimes. In relation to gender, both science and policy contexts differ within European Member States in terms of (1) research agendas, (2) infrastructures, instruments and methods of implementing gender equality policies, (3) the extent to which the issue has been integrated into policy discussions and policy-making, (4) the level of coordination by different institutions, and (5) the overall emphasis and attention given to gender in science. Our choice of countries is representative of five different *welfare regimes* of the EU Member States as Table 1 demonstrates (Esping-Andersen, 1990; Ferrera, 1996; Korpi, 2000). Welfare regimes capture common trends in the division of work between women and men and how they may be counter-balanced or enhanced by broader structural, political and ideological country-specific factors. The employment structure and its gender-specific occupational patterns shape opportunities and constraints in the labour market. There are considerable national differences in the extent of women's employment attachment over the life course, full-time and part-time work, gender occupational segregation and gender pay gap, at least partially related to welfare regimes (Blossfeld, 2001; Esping-Andersen, 1999, 2002; European Commission, 2008).

At the same time, welfare regimes interface with different country clusters regarding their innovation capacity (European Commission, 2017). This is important for establishing comparisons of gender equality policies in relation to the innovation capacity across the EU member states. There are four clusters of countries: innovation leaders, strong innovators, moderate innovators, and modest innovators. Our choice of countries has representatives from the first three clusters, with a certain bias towards innovation leaders and strong innovators, as we expect to recruit more teams in countries that have a strong R&D sector.

Welfare regime country cluster	Survey Countries	EU Innovation Scoreboard Cluster	Survey Wave
Nordic	Sweden	Innovation Leader	1 <sup>st</sup>
Anglo-Saxon	UK	Innovation Leader	1 <sup>st</sup>
Continental	Germany	Innovation Leader	1 <sup>st</sup>
Southern	Spain	Moderate Innovators	1 <sup>st</sup>
Eastern	Lithuania	Moderate Innovators	1 <sup>st</sup>
Nordic	Norway	Strong Innovator	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Nordic	Finland	Innovation Leader	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Continental	Belgium	Strong Innovator	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Nordic	Denmark	Innovation Leader	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Continental	Netherlands	Innovation Leader	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Eastern	Poland	Moderate Innovator	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Eastern	Czech Republic	Moderate Innovator	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Southern	Portugal	Moderate Innovator	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Continental	Austria	Strong Innovator	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Continental	Switzerland	Innovation Leader	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Southern	Italy	Moderate Innovator	2 <sup>nd</sup>

Table 1: Survey country choice by welfare regime and innovation capacity 2

### Data Mining Procedures - Web of Science Authors

Author names and email addresses were downloaded from the Web of Science (WoS) database, carrying out the following steps:

1. All publications (articles only) following the criteria listed below were downloaded from WoS:
  - a) Country matches for Lithuania, UK, Spain, Germany and Sweden (second wave countries: Netherlands, Belgium, Poland, Czech Republic, Austria, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Finland, Portugal, Italy).
  - b) Subject Field contains “Transport” or “Transportation Science & Technology” or

### “Engineering Biomedical”

c) Years: 2011 - 2016

2. The authors of this initial list of publications needed disambiguation, based on author last name and first initial (see Sandström & Sandström 2009). This is necessary in order to determine the number of publications for each author. Only authors that have a minimum of three publications over the given time period are retained; this identifies established authors within our area of interest vs. occasional authors.
3. Expansion of search to all publications for authors and co-authors. Filtering for relevant subject fields: Excluding “High Energy Physics”, “Astronomy”, as these tend to be fields with many authors per paper.
4. Disambiguation of authors of resulting file in order to assign unique author ID for each author.
5. In a further step, an author-to-email matching is performed. Where emails in the WoS files are available, each author id/name is associated with their corresponding email.

This initial data mining exercise produced an Excel file containing a list of authors with their corresponding emails and institutional affiliations for each of the chosen countries. The initial selection was limited in terms of including only groups that have publications that are listed in the Web of Science database.

### *Data Mining Procedures II – PATSTAT Inventors*

For patents, the PATSTAT database (EPO PATSTAT data base Spring Edition 2016) was analysed with regard to patent applications in the technology fields of “Medical Technology” and “Transport”.

The data for the time frame from 2009-2012 was used to begin with. The available database PATSTAT Spring edition 2016 contains complete patent data only up to the year 2012. To find prospective teams and companies respectively in the data base, a patent (with two or more inventors) of a specific country (e.g. Spain) and technology field (e.g. Medical Technology) was used as a starting point. The inventors (A, B, ...) of this patent were identified. Then, all patents of inventor A, B, ... were searched for and again their co-inventors. This loop was repeated for all newfound patents and co-inventors, until no new data (patents, inventors) could be mined. The patent search was conducted in the whole database, not limited to the same applicant – company/university - or technology field). Out of this mined data set, all inventors with the same company or university as applicant have been gathered in clusters. Since the priority was to find patenting research teams, a minimum of four inventors was defined, analogous to the minimum team size of the survey.

In a next step, the identified clusters were analyzed on the basis of technology field. Clusters were allocated to the specific technology fields of Medical Technology and Transport, if the inventors had 50% or more patents in Medical Technology and Transport. The retrieved data tables show inventors who have done patent applications together (as a cluster, so not

everyone has invented with everybody in the cluster) under the umbrella of a specific company (or university) and within a certain technology field - Medical Technology or Transport. The starting point of finding teams (with the help of the PATSTAT data) can therefore be either the company or an inventor. However, as the inventor can only be reached through a private postal address (available contact data in PATSTAT), it was agreed to proceed with the company contacts.

As a result, companies with patent applications in the relevant technology areas (Medical Technology and Transport) were identified for the five countries Lithuania, United Kingdom, Spain, Germany and Sweden.

### *Address Verification / Compilation*

Both the WoS author list as well as the PATSTAT list of inventors were manually verified. Address compilation and verification was conducted by all project partners for the countries Germany, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom and Lithuania. The corresponding R&D team of listed authors were identified through web-based searches for the public sector which has most information accessible online. Where possible, the address verification in the public sector identified the team leader as our primary contact for the recruitment process. In some cases, this manual online check produced additional contact addresses of research groups that work within the same organization (or department) but have published less or are less visible in the Web of Science. Where it was easily possible to associate the team with the respective subject areas, the team contact was included in our address file. For the private industry, team member address verification could not be done via web-based searches since private companies typically do not publish their staff /teams online. As an alternative approach, the companies resulting from the PATSTAT data mining were contacted directly. In some cases, specific associations such as the WISE Campaign (UK), women's groups in diverse professional associations facilitated the contact to the private industry. In Germany, project partner VDE and its network contacts have been crucial for contacting companies. Another approach was to contact specific departments in companies that could have an interest in the research, i.e. HR, Diversity and/or Gender Equality departments or officers.

The address verification carried out for the initial countries managed to verify the available addresses as well as amplify our initial listing of contacts for carrying out the next step, the recruitment of R&D teams for the survey.

### *Changes of Field Access Procedure between 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Wave*

The procedures described in the preceding section concerns mainly the field access for the first wave of survey roll-out restricted to the initial five countries Spain, UK, Sweden, Germany and Lithuania. Since recruitment of research teams proved extremely challenging the Consortium took the decision to expand the pool of targeted countries and hence pool of possible teams to 11 more countries.

However, due to time and resource constraints two decisions were taken: first, the

recruitment for the second wave concentrated on research teams from the public sector. The very low response rate from the private sector during the first wave suggested that efforts should be concentrated on the public research sector for the additional countries, where a positive response was more likely. This implied data mining authors' addresses through the Web of Science database. Second, no manual address verification was carried out; Authors compiled from publications were contacted directly via their email without knowing their exact role within the team.

## Recruiting R&D Teams

After having compiled authors' emails and company address, team recruitment was carried out by each Consortium partner in their respective countries. The recruitment of teams included a clear definition of what we understand by a team. As set out in the Conceptual Framework (D1.1, Müller et al., 2016), an emphasis on the organizational setting of team membership is central. The organizational context captures 'invisible' contributions of group members not listed as author of publications and also takes into account the effect of organizational gender equality and diversity policies on team work. Thus, a team is defined as a group of persons working towards a shared goal where each team member has a formal organizational role/relationship (e.g. in the form of an official contract with the organization). Although it is true that scientific collaboration does not stop at the boundary of the organization but spans institutions, countries or scientific fields, an organizational definition of membership is more adequate for the purpose of the survey – as it can inquire about the organizational setting. This provides rich insights especially in combination with bibliometric co-authorship analysis, the other form to define scientific collaboration. The survey data therefore provides an interesting starting point to discuss differences and commonalities between these two important definitions of team membership. Overall, recruitment of teams was carried out based upon the following criteria aiming for a minimum of 100 teams:

- Minimum size of teams is four members.
- Teams can have a mixed gender composition, but teams with only women or men are also included.
- Minimum of 20 teams per (initial) country ( $5 \times 20 = 100$ ).
- An additional condition for participation was to make the names of team members available. Otherwise, it would not have been possible to compile the bibliometric performance data of the team.

## *Recruitment of Teams in Public Organizations*

Recruitment for teams in public organizations has been conducted by:

- Sending out an initial recruitment email to all addresses obtained from the WoS data



mining exercise. In case this invitation to participate in the survey was answered, a second follow-up email was sent out with explanations of the next steps.

- Sending out an initial recruitment email to personal contacts (to HR or other management staff, or team members).

Once a potential team contact was identified, the actual recruitment started:

- a. Contacting the team-contact either by email or by phone. For that purpose, a guideline with introductory text regarding the purpose of project, survey and benefits, incentives for participating was provided to participants in the form of the bibliometric profile of the research group.
- b. Clarifying the participation procedures with the team-contact person: distribute paper version or visiting the group in person if feasible, anonymous online survey or personalized online survey.
- c. Team codes were generated by each consortium partner for their respective countries to register each team that agreed to participate.

### *Recruitment of Teams in Private Organizations*

To access private organizations, the following steps were carried out:

- Finding direct contacts to companies listed in the PATSTAT or Web of Science field access files. This could be through personal contacts or through associated associations such as the WISE Campaign (UK), women's groups in diverse professional associations, etc. VDE was crucial in this step for Germany.
- Where email addresses were available (e.g. authors listed in the Web of Science file affiliated at a private company), the person was directly contacted with an invitation to participate in the study with her/his current team.
- Blind approach: contacting the company through official channels such as a web-contact form, phone etc. Departments that could have an interest in the GEDII project were considered as potential entry points: HR, Diversity or Gender Equality Staff, Strategic Development Managers.

Once a potential team contact was identified, the next steps for recruiting the team are the same as described for public organizations (see above).

### *Overall Timing and Response Rates*

The field access preparations started in December 2016/January 2017 by each project partner for their country (Lithuania was done by CRA). The survey was launched online in March 2017.

The recruiting of teams was carried out in two waves. The first wave targeted UK, Sweden, Germany, Spain and Lithuania. Given the very moderate response rate especially from countries with a larger research and innovation sector such as the UK and Germany, the Consortium decided to initiate a second wave of recruitment of research teams from September 2017 onwards. Several factors were taken into consideration and conditioned the execution of a second wave of team recruitment:

- The project had not spent the entire foreseen budget for survey follow-ups during the first wave.
- Field access could be expanded relatively easily to other countries through data mining WoS author addresses.
- The decision to concentrate on the public sector played a further important role: given the very sparse response rate from the private industry during the first wave across all countries, it made sense to concentrate spending the rest of the available resources on the public research sector where participation was likely to be higher while also requiring much less effort.
- The use of the online survey in combination with R scripts allowed for the incorporation of new results into the analysis without any substantial additional effort, making it viable to incorporate new results as they came in, even much beyond the originally planned end of the survey in August 2017.

The main time frame for the first wave of survey roll-out was from April to September 2017. The second wave was started in September 2017. The survey was closed on 31 January 2018.

*Figure 1: Timeline survey*

01/17	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	1/18
Field access and recruitment preparation												
			Cross-country survey									
			First wave									
								Second wave				

The following tables give an overview of the overall contacts (via verified team leaders as contact, mass emails and others like HR, Diversity Departments, networks etc.) and successful responses. Spain has the highest success rate (11%), while Germany and the UK have very low success rates with less than 1%. A detailed documentation of the recruitment efforts for the primary five countries during the first wave of recruitment is available in Annex III on page 70.

	Contacts	Responses	Rate
Germany	1,960	13	0.66%
Lithuania	674	8	1.19%
Spain	669	74	11.06%
Sweden	1,618	31	1.92%
UK	4,924	8	0.16%
Sum	9,845	134	1.36%

*Table 3: Summary contacts and responses 1st wave of recruitment*

Countries	Selected leaders			Mass authors			Others		
	Contacts	Resp.	Rate	Contacts	Resp.	Rate	Contacts	Resp.	Rate
Germany	92	4	4.35%	1,827	4	0.22%	41	5	12.20%
Lithuania	39	7	17.95%	635	1	0.16%	0	0	0.00%
Spain	619	50	8.08%	0	0	0.00%	50	24	48.00%
Sweden	118	1	0.85%	1,500	30	2.00%	0	0	0.00%
UK	139	1	0.72%	4,771	3	0.06%	14	4	28.57%
	1,007	63	6.26%	8,733	38	0.44%	105	33	31.43%

*Table 4: Contacts and responses 1st wave of recruitment – by means of approach*

The second wave of recruitment started in September 2017 and was carried out by UOC and ORU. The second wave was mainly conducted via mass emails (5,747 contacts) with WoS data (authors). In some cases, selected leaders were approached. The overall success rate is 0.66% (40 teams). As can be seen, response rates fluctuate considerably between countries. Generally speaking, the response rate to the first invitation email was very low (usually below 1% for mass emailing). However, in case researchers did respond to the invitation to participate, a relatively high response rate among the team members was the norm, typically about 60 to 70%. This probably has to do with the fact that the decision to participate in our survey was backed-up by the team leader, encouraging group members to participate.

	Contacts	First Resp.	Rate 1st Resp.	Success responses	Rate
Austria	124	2	1.61%	0	0.00%
Belgium	642	4	0.62%	2	0.31%
Czech Rep.	354	2	0.56%	1	0.28%
Denmark	422	3	0.71%	2	0.47%
Finland	285	2	0.70%	1	0.35%
Italy	751	18	2.40%	11	1.46%
Netherlands	1,895	14	0.74%	11	0.58%
Norway	453	3	0.66%	2	0.44%
Poland	502	2	0.40%	2	0.40%
Portugal	300	7	2.33%	3	1.00%
Switzerland	299	6	1.34%	5	1.67%
Total	6,027	63	1.05%	40	0.66%

Table 5: Summary responses of 2nd wave of recruitment

## Online Data Collection

Data collection was implemented using the Unipark platform, which is the academic program of Questback. The survey software is an industry standard solution for online feedback and survey research. Comprehensive respondent management simplifies fieldwork in terms of participant recruitment and management during the field phase. Survey status information enables targeted reminders to be sent via an integrated mail server. The Questback server park, located in Germany, is well protected within a BSI-certified data center that meets the stringent security requirements of the ISO 27001 standard for IT risk management.

### *“Anonymous” and “Personalized” Questionnaire versions*

The Unipark platforms offers two questionnaire formats – anonymous and personalized. Despite the somehow misleading names of “personalized” vs. “anonymous”, it has to be emphasized that all data was collected anonymously. The difference between the two versions is that the personalized one assigns codes to potential respondents via a URL link. This allows tracking if a certain person has already replied to the questionnaire or not – and hence targeting primarily the wave of reminders to those that have not. It needs to be emphasized that the result matrix of the survey naturally does not contain the personalized code of the respondents; it is not possible to assign data rows to individuals. The anonymous version on the other hand does not provide this response tracking feature.

In order to provide the maximum flexibility to potential respondents, our questionnaire was available in both versions. Team contacts/leaders were informed about the possibility to use

either versions. The vast majority of respondents answered the questionnaire through the personalized version. If the anonymous question was preferred, the link to the team contact questionnaire was send directly to the team leader after the first contact was established. In addition to the online questionnaire, paper copies were also available and ready to be sent out if desired by certain teams. Except for isolated cases in Germany, 99% of responses were given directly online. Since variable names and hence result matrix are identical, all questionnaires could be merged during the pre-processing step (see next section).

Finally, a fourth questionnaire was setup up based upon a close collaboration with a research institute in Spain. The original GEDII questionnaire was extended with additional variables on working conditions before being passed to the employees of the institute, including the research groups. The additional items/data was removed before being merged into the global result set.

### *Team IDs and Response Tracking*

A key issue concerned the generation of a group code in order to identify respondents that belong to the same team. Once an agreement with the team contact was reached to participate, a Team ID was generated and distributed either through the Unipark platform (for the personalized questionnaire version) or via a group specific submission URL (for the anonymous version via the team contact).

Weekly updates on survey response tracking were provided by UOC in order to monitor response rates across countries and compare against the overall target of 100 teams.

## Data Pre-Processing Steps

All data pre-processing and analysis has been carried out using the R statistical package<sup>5</sup>. Apart from enabling the Consortium to incorporate incoming survey results on a continuous basis, it assures maximum transparency and reproducibility regarding our results. Scripts used for data pre-processing will be published within the Open Access scheme of the GEDII project (see next section for details). .

The main pre-processing steps carried out were:

- Merging the three different team members survey result sets into one: the personalized survey, the anonymous survey, and the single research institute survey.
- Removal of meta-data information regarding participant response behavior and technical platforms
- Revision and anonymization of open text responses
- Recoding “Other” text fields for highest education, disciplinary background, current role, etc.

---

5 See “The R Project for Statistical Computing” <https://www.r-project.org/>

- Error correction for certain Team ID codes
- Merging team contact, team member and bibliometric/patent performance measures into a single dataset.

### ***Disclosure Control and Open Access***

Although the GEDII project is participating in the Open Access Pilot of the Horizon 2020 project and planning to make as much of its data accessible to the public as possible, the raw survey dataset has been excluded from the OA policy due to privacy concerns.

The GEDII project has consulted with an external disclose control expert to explore the possibilities of publishing the dataset without violating any privacy concerns of the participants. In general, two possibilities exist: first, to reduce the number of variables in order to prevent identification of participants. By simply combining several socio-demographic variables such as age, sex, team role, highest qualification and others the identity of participants can be reconstructed quite easily, especially since team members pertain each to a relatively small group-based sample. It is entirely plausible for someone to search first her/his entry, and through the group code retrieve all other team members and then identify individual responses by a simple combination and exclusion criteria of age, sex, role. In order to avoid this type of disclosures, basic socio-demographic variables would have to be removed which would limit the utility of the dataset substantially.

Second, statistical noise can be introduced into different variables that do not affect the overall distribution of values but inserts uncertainty as to which a given numeric value reflects the actual response of a team member. Although this leaves the result dataset complete as no variables need to be removed, it does not address our basic concern that participants could potentially be confronted with their survey responses – as if they were 100% certain. It cannot be guaranteed that the introduction of statistical noise into the dataset will be recognized by others who might use it in unethical ways.

Give these two options and the unsatisfactory possibilities to protect the privacy of team members responses, the Consortium decided not to publish the raw survey data file. The data will be used for GEDII internal reports, analysis and publications, that is, only on an aggregated level. The project will publish all scripts that have been used to pre-process, analyze and achieve the overall results of WP4. This will happen on the GEDII repository and website as stipulated in the D1.3 Data Management Plan.

## Chapter 2 - Performance Indicators

Ulf Sandström, Sandra Klatt

### Bibliometric Identification & Analysis of Team Performance

One condition for participation in the GEDII survey was to make available the current list of team members to the Consortium. For public universities or research organizations, this was relatively unproblematic since most groups have the list of team members published on their website. For private industry, however, this was a concern and probably contributed to their very low overall participate rate.

Based on team member names, we have identified publications in one of the bibliographic databases, namely the Web of Science (WoS) provided by Clarivate Analytics that consist of international scientific publications. The procedure for this and the analytics used is described in the following section.

#### *Bibliometric Identification*

One of the practical problems is that of constructing the basic bibliography of the units under assessment. This is not a trivial question as papers from one institution might be headed under several different names (de Bruin & Moed, 1990) and due to the problem of homonyms for individuals there is need of careful identification of each researcher. The identification of papers included in this exercise has been done on the basis of names given from the survey recipients nominated by the team leader. This was all the information given even if many groups have websites and give at least examples of their publication activity.

Searches were done in the online version of Web of Science. Each download was created using all variants of names, full names and last name plus first initial for the team. In the case of typical Spanish names, like Anna Lucia Garcia Torres, we in principal used the first name Anna and the first last name Garcia. In many cases, the recall with that strategy was quite large, seldom more than 25,000 articles. In those cases, subject categories were used to delimit the result: large subject categories with many articles and many authors like "Astronomy and Astrophysics", "Physics, Particles and Fields", "Physics, Nuclear" and others alike were deleted and thereby the recall could be taken down to less than 10,000 articles.

With that result started the more detailed identification. Using a parser for the download files a document with all authors separated and with all possible information, organizations addresses etc. connected to the name made it possible to sort out the article shares that were considered as belonging to members of the teams involved in the GEDII survey. The fact that WoS included full name and organizational names is one precondition for the identification. Also, using mainly Internet sources; e.g. searches for name and organization or publications and/or CVs made the identification possible.

After presenting the first results there was a round of validation where the underlying data was scrutinized by unit leaders and/or each researcher.

### *Coverage of scientific and technical publications*

Explorations made by Carpenter & Narin (1981), and by Moed (2005), have shown that the WoS database is representative of scientific publishing activities for most major countries and fields: "In the total collection of cited references in 2002 ISI source journals items published during 1980-2002, it was found that about 9 out of 10 cited journal references were to ISI source journals" (Moed 2005:134). It should be emphasized that the database mainly covers international journals, and that citations analysis is viable only in the context of international research communities. National journals and national monographs/anthologies cannot be accessed by international colleagues. Consequently, publications in these journals are of less interest in a citation exercise of this type. As long as we are calculating relative citation figures based on fields and sub-fields in the WoS database the inclusion of national or low cited journals will only have the effect of lowering the citation scores, and is, therefore not an alternative.

In some studies, it has been suggested that there are two distinct populations of highly cited scholars in social science subfields — one consisting of authors cited in the journal literature, another of authors cited in the monograph literature (Butler, 2008). As the Web of Science has a limited coverage of monographic citing material, the latter population will hardly be recognized in the database (Borgmann & Furner, 2002). But, in the overall sense, Web of Science works well and covers most of the relevant information in a large majority of the natural sciences and medical fields, and quite well in applied research fields and behavioral sciences (CWTS, 2007:13). However, there are exceptions to that rule. Considerable parts of the social sciences and large parts of the humanities are either not covered very well in the Web of Science or have citations patterns that do not apply for studies based on advanced bibliometrics (Butler, 2008; Hicks, 1999; Hicks, 2004).

### *Matching of references to articles*

The WoS database consists of articles and their references. Citation indexing is the result of a linking between references and source (journals covered in the database). This linking is done with an algorithm, which is conservative and the consequence is non-matching between reference and article. Several of the non-matching problems relate to publications written by 'consortia' (large groups of authors), to variations and errors in author names authors, errors in initial page numbers, discrepancies due to journals with dual volume-numbering systems or combined volumes, to journals applying different article numbering systems or multiple versions due to e-publishing. Approximations indicate that about seven per cent of citations are lost due to this conservative strategy. The current analysis is based on an alternative algorithm that addresses a larger number of the missing links.

### *Self-citations*

Self-citations can be defined in several ways; usually with a focus on co-occurrence of authors or institutions in the citing and cited publications. In this report the recommendation to eliminate citations where the first-author coincides between citing and cited document is applied (Aksnes, 2003a). If an author's name can be found at other positions, as last author



or middle author, it will not count as a self-citation. This more limited method is applied for one reason: if the whole list of authors is used, the risk for eliminating the wrong citations will be large. On the down-side we will probably have a senior-bias with this method; this will probably not affect units of assessments, but caution is needed in analysis on the individual level (Adams, 2007: 23; Aksnes, 2003b; Glänzel et al., 2004; Thijs & Glänzel, 2005).

### *Time window for citations*

An important factor that has to be accounted for is the time effects of citations. Citations accumulate over time, and citation data has to cover comparable time periods (and within the same subfield or area of science, see below). However, in addition to that, the time patterns of citation are far from uniform and any valid evaluative indicator must use a fixed window or a time frame that is equal for all papers. The reason for this is that citations have to be appropriately normalized. Most of our investigations use a decreasing time-window from the year of publication until December 2016. However, some of our indicators are used for time-series and in these cases a fixed two-year citation window is applied. Publications from the year 2010 receive citations until 2012; publications from 2011 receive citations until 2013 and so on.

### *Fractional counts and whole counts – the Frac P indicator*

In most fields of research, scientific work is done in a collaborative manner. Collaborations make it necessary to differentiate between whole counts and fractional counts of papers and citations. Fractional counts give a figure of weight for the contribution of the group to the quantitative indicators of all their papers. By dividing the number of authors from the unit under consideration with the number of all authors on a paper, we introduce a fractional counting procedure. Fractional counting is a way of controlling for the effect of collaboration when measuring output and impact. In consequence, from Frac P-figures we can see to what extent the group receives many citations on collaborative papers only, or if all papers from the group are cited in the same manner.

### *Fields and sub-fields*

In bibliometric studies the definition of fields is generally based on the classification of scientific journals into more than 250 sub-fields, developed by Thomson Reuters. Although this classification is not perfect, it provides a clear and consistent definition of fields suitable for automated procedures. However, this proposition has been challenged by several scholars (e.g. Leydesdorff, 2008; Bornmann et al. 2008). Two limitations have been pointed out: (1) multidisciplinary journals (e.g. Nature; Science); and (2) highly specialized fields of research.

Clarivate Analytics classification of journals includes one sub-field category named “Multidisciplinary Sciences” for journals like PNAS, Nature and Science. More than 50 journals are classified as multidisciplinary since they publish research reports in many different fields. Fortunately, each of the papers published in this sub-field are subject specific, and, therefore, it is possible to assign a subject category to these on the article level

– what Glänzel et al. (1999) calls “item by item reclassification”. That strategy has been used in this report.

### *Normalized indicators*

During the latest decades, standardized bibliometric procedures have been developed to assess research performance. Relative indicators or rebased citation counts, as an index of research impact, is widely-used by the scientometrics research community. Research teams in the United States and in Hungary popularized the central concepts of normalization during the 1980s. The method applied here builds on a statistic calculation at the paper level and on a year to year basis. Publications from 2008 are given a nine-year citation window (up to 2016). Because of these (small) differences, we name the indicator NCS (Normalized Citation Score), but, it should be underlined that it is basically the same type of indicator as the one today used by bibliometric groups e.g. in Leiden and Leuven.

### *Citation normalization*

In this report normalization of citations is performed in reference to two different normalization groups: WoS sub-fields and journals. When normalizing, we also take publication year and publication type into account. A normalization group might then look as follows: papers of the type “review” within the sub-field “Metallurgy & Metallurgical Engineering” published in 2002.

The most commonly used normalization type was developed by Schubert, Glänzel and Braun during the 1980s (1988). Simultaneously the Leiden group (Moed et al. 1988) developed a variant methodology with the “crown indicator”. These normalized indicators are typically named CPP/JCS or CPP/FCS depending on whether the normalization is carried out in relation to journals or sub-fields.

In our calculations of “Field normalized citation score (NCSf)” and “Journal normalized citation score (NCSj)” we use the following formulas. First, the field normalized citation score (NCSf):

$$\frac{1}{P} \sum_{i=1}^P \frac{c_i}{[\mu_f]_i}$$

where  $c$  is the number of cites to paper  $i$  and  $[\mu_f]_i$  is the average number of citations received by papers in the normalization group of paper  $i$ . Our calculation treats all papers equally, while other formulas often give higher weight to papers in normalization groups with higher reference values, cf. Lundberg (2006), s. III:3; cf. Visser et al, (2007).

When calculating the “Normalized journal citation score (NCSj)” we use the following formula:

$$\frac{1}{P} \sum_{i=1}^P \frac{[\mu_j]_i}{[\mu_f]_i}$$

where  $[\mu_j]_i$  is the average number of citations received by papers in the journal of paper  $i$  and  $[\mu_r]_i$  is the average number of citations received by papers in the sub-field of paper  $i$ .

### Top percentiles

The above normalized indicators give a good account of performance. Nonetheless, we might need simple figures that indicate the excellence of the group in just one number; e.g. the *Top 10%* is an indicator of that type. As an indicator, it expresses the number of publications within the top 10% of the worldwide citation distribution of the fields concerned for the research group. This approach provides a better statistical measure than those based on mean values. It is suggested that this indicator should be used together with other indicators and in this case as “*a powerful tool in monitoring trends in the position of research institutions and groups within the top of their field internationally*” (CWTS, 2007: 25). If the research group has a high proportion of articles in the Top 10% they will probably have a large impact on their research field.

### FAP - Field Adjusted Production (Waring)

It is well known that medical researchers tend to produce more, often shorter papers where methodology and prior knowledge is codified in citations and engineering scientists produce less frequently and have fewer cross-references (Narin and Hamilton, 1996; Glänzel, 1996). These field differences affect both citation rates and mean number of papers per author, and the differences are to some extent explained by shifting coverage of fields in the ISI database.

In order to compute a field adjusted factor we have to meet certain obstacles: publication databases give information on the authors that are active during a given period, but not all the potential authors. As the non-contributors (non-publishing authors) are unknown it is difficult to create an average publication rate per author taking all potential authors into account. There is a proposed mathematical solution to this problem: bibliometric data are characteristically “Waring distributions” (Schubert and Glänzel, 1984). With information on the distribution of author publication frequencies, an estimate of the average publication rate per researchers (contributors and non-contributors) in a given field, country or such can be computed (Telcs, Glänzel and Schubert, 1985).

The approach is based in mathematical statistics and a theoretical discussion can be found in papers by Braun, Glänzel, Schubert and Telcs during the second half of the 1980s. Inspired by Irwin (1963) they showed that bibliometric material had the properties of “Waring distributions”. A straight line should be obtained by plotting the truncated sample mean of these distributions (Telcs, Glänzel and Schubert, 1985). By extrapolating this series towards zero, the numbers of non-contributors are included. The intercept of this line is the average productivity of all potential authors during a given period of time (Braun, Glänzel and Schubert, 1990). In our model this value is used as a reference value and is computed per field for Nordic data. Several successful empirical tests using the Field Adjusted Production (FAP) model have been implemented (see Koski et al. 2016 for further clarification).

The Field Adjusted Production is calculated as follows:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{P_i}{r_i}$$

where  $P_i$  is the number of papers in field  $i$  and  $r_i$  is the (estimated) average number of papers per researcher in field  $i$ . The estimation of the reference values is performed for each field by first calculating the  $s$ -truncated sample mean of each field as follows:

$$\frac{\sum_{i=s}^{\infty} i n_i}{\sum_{i=s}^{\infty} n_i}$$

where  $n_i$  is the number of authors having exactly  $i$  papers. The truncated sample means are plotted versus  $s$  and the intercept of the fitted line, using weighted least squares linear regression, is used as an estimate for number of papers per author for the entire population. The regression is weighted using weights proposed by Telcs et al. (1985).

When applying this model, authors with an address at Nordic universities were used as reference data. All Nordic universities (Sweden, Finland, Denmark and Norway) were used in the operation which yielded almost 400,000 unique authors over a four-year period, (2008–2011). Homonyms and similar problems were taken care of by automatic procedures in combination with manual procedures. all Nordic universities (Sweden, Finland, Denmark and Norway) and the operation yielded almost 400 000 unique authors for a four-year period, e.g. 2008–2011.

The about 250 WoS-categories create too small samples when Nordic authors are used for creation of productivity data. There are several alternative ways of producing macro classes (e.g. SPRU classes or the Thomson ESI field categories). In this case, all journals were clustered using inter-citations as proximity values (Boyack and Klavans, 2006), and the least frequent relation were decisive in order to distinguish, as far as possible, between basic and applied sciences. It has been shown by Rinia, van Leeuwen, Bruins, van Vuren and van Raan (2002) that applied sciences tend to cite back to more basic sciences, not the other way around. The clustering procedure was based on the SLM (smart local moving) algorithm (Waltman &, van Eck 2013) and created five macro classes (fields).

### Percentile Model

Relative citation indicators – based on averages were introduced already in the 1980s, but since then not much has happened except for different ways to calculate the indicator (Lundberg, 2006). The use of size-independent indicators continued to be the normal procedure up until quite recently. Indicators where the number of publications is of no importance for the bibliometric value has one negative feature as it overlooks constant good performances and visibility of researchers. A researcher who produced highly cited articles during the period of 2008-2010 will be none the worse as a consequence of publishing a number of non-cited articles in 2011 and 2012. But, in our view, the amount of articles and

the level reached in the first period will not diminish. When assessing a group of researchers and performances we should therefore add performances to each other's instead of creating an average of all articles where there is a highly skewed distribution in the background.

The basis for percentiles is that each article is ranked, based on its citations, within their respective fields of science, defined by the subject classes (about 250) listed in Web of Science, and is divided into percentile groups (the 1 per cent, 5 per cent, 10 per cent maximum rated, and so on). Measurements based on percentiles have the advantage that they are not affected by biases in the distribution of citations (Rousseau, 2005). In some disciplines, there are a few publications with a very large number of citations pulling up the average (Seglen, 1992, 1998), so that 70 per cent of articles in the field are below average citation-wise.

The percentile indicator is translated to a point score for each article based on probability, depending on whether an article belongs to the most cited per cent or belongs to another percentile group. Those in the top one per cent are awarded 100 points; the top five per cent get 20 points, and so on (see Table 6). An article that belongs to the 50 per cent least cited gets one point, implying that a researcher can never lose points by publishing an article during the period under study.

Percentile (per cent)	Points
0.01	100
0.05	20
0.10	10
0.25	4
0.50	2
1.00	1

*Table 6: Points given per percentile group*

The number of points that each article thus obtains is adjusted by the FAP-method for field adjustment of production (Sandström & Sandström 2009). This is done in order to compensate for differences in scientific production behaviour between research areas. All journals in the Web of Science have been categorized into five areas (Applied Sciences, Natural Sciences, Health Sciences, Economic & Social Sciences, and Arts & Humanities). Using the Waring method then makes it possible to create a FAP-factor (Koski et al. 2016) which can be multiplied with the citation points. The measure we use is thus a composite measure of a single value expressing productivity (number of papers) and level of citations (quality). The advantage, compared to other similar measures, such as the h-index, is that this measure is designed to be used over and between all areas of science as is the case when we want to compare performance at the university level and across different faculty areas.

The researchers identified according to the methodology described above, receives a score based on article fractions and their citations based points. As this has been used for the whole Swedish research community we have a ranking of all 48.000 Swedish researchers

during the four-year period. This gives a basis for benchmarking in order to specify where a specific group of researchers is located in the Swedish distribution over percentiles of performance. For further information on this, Sandström & Wold (2015).

### *Percentile Level*

Based on the identification of unique and disambiguated a file of Swedish researchers 2008-2012 was created by Sandström. Based on the Percentile Model these researchers have been ranked in percentiles and percentile groups. This can be used as a benchmark for performance evaluation: To which group of performances are our team and our number of fractionalized articles and normalized citations equivalent?

For this procedure the total of the group performance is divided by the number of senior researchers per team. Seniority can be defined as being a publishing author over at least five years during the period 2008-2016.

An anonymous example is attached in Annex IV on page 75.

### *Patent Based Indicators*

A further interest next to the bibliometric indicators was the data mining of patent activities of the teams. Due to the quality of the input data (information about the team members) and the characteristics and logic of the PATSTAT database, it was only possible to count applications per team. Since we only have person names (first names and last names) as data to match with the PATSTAT database, it is to be assumed that by matching the names alone, a certain number of matches can be found, however it is high uncertainty factor about the correctness, because there is no cross-check possibility if the matched person in PATSTAT is really the team member. In case two different persons have the same name, there is no information in the database itself to disambiguate these inventors. On the other hand, there is a certain error rate with 'person\_id' and the allocated inventor information. As it happens, e.g. different spellings in the inventors' address, change of address or typing errors lead to different 'person\_id's for the same person.

In order to get valid results when data mining person names, we decided to cross check the application's count. In other words, only applications were counted per team, which have at least two or more team members as inventor as a match. Of course, due to this condition (two team members) patents are not counted which have only one team member as inventor on the application. Another problem presents the time gap when working with the PATSTAT database. The application data is only complete up to the year 2012. Since survey responses pertain to teams in 2017, recently submitted Patents are not covered. This large time-gap between the original submission of a patent before 2012 and the current survey also implies that team composition might have changed considerably. Hence, the patent performance indicator as used in the current report tells us little about the actual performance of the current team. However, as the current patenting activities of the team surveyed becomes available in the future versions of PATSTAT, an additional analysis would

clearly address this issue. In the following section the data mining procedure is described in more detail.

### *Step 1: Finding team members in PATSTAT*

Based on names (first name and last name) from teams that have answered the survey, a list of team member names with group IDs was the basis of the inquiry. For the person names on that list, it was searched for matching person entries in PATSTAT. These would be used in a next step to find applications related to the persons from the initial list. To look up the person names from the list in PATSTAT, a subset of the table `tls906_person` was created, enriched by `EEE-PPAT` data<sup>6</sup>. So, persons from `tls906_person` were included in the new table `gedii_inventors_201711`, if all the following conditions were fulfilled:

- a matching entry existed in `eee_ppat_2016a`
- `pers_appln.invt_seq_nr > 0` which means the person is an inventor, not an applicant

The script `create-table_gedii-inventors_2017-11.sql` was used to create the new table<sup>7</sup>.

### *Step 2: Looking Up Inventors*

To look up the person names from the initial list, the list was manually converted into a CSV file, and then parsed by a PHP script. The script extracted the first and last names from the list, combined them in the form last name - first name, and searched for this combined name string in the column `doc_std_name` in table `gedii_inventors_201711`. If there was more than one match in `gedii_inventors_201711` for a name, all matches were used subsequently.

A new column `person_id` was added to the result list, as an extension of the original list. If matching persons were found in PATSTAT, their person IDs were written to the new column. This yielded 211 persons names with matches in PATSTAT and 1,067 person names without a match.

### *Step 3: Looking up group applications and finding applications related to inventors*

For inventors with at least one matching person entry from PATSTAT, for each `psn_id` all related applications were searched, where:

- `earliest_filing_year` was between 2001 and 2012
- `invt_seq_nr` was greater 0 (making the person an “inventor” instead of an “applicant” for that application)

The result of this step was a list of applications for each person id, reflecting the applications for the person entries found in PATSTAT. The column `NumberOfApplications` was added to the result sheet, which denotes the total number of applications found for a specific person ID. The application IDs were not saved permanently, but directly handed over to the next

---

6 For details about `EEE-PPAT` (`ECOOM-EUROSTAT-EPO PATSTAT Person Augmented Table`) data see <https://www.ecoom.be/nl/EEE-PPAT>

7 The scripts used for the PATSTAT data processing will be made available in the data repository of GEDII.

processing step inside the script.

#### *Finding of Applications Shared Within Groups*

For all members of a specific group, the found applications were filtered by the script for applications related to at least two group members.

Note that all person IDs found for a specific name in the group were considered standing for one group member only, so if an application showed up more than once for a single group member because of its various person IDs, it would still only count as one for the group.

The column appln\_id was added to the result sheet: it contains only IDs of applications, which were shared within the group (meaning that at least two group members would be related to that application). As a result, twelve teams have been found with the following patent counts:

Group	Country	Sector	Public/Private	Patents per Group
1	Spain	Medical Technology	Public	2
2	Spain	Medical Technology	Public	17
3	Spain	Medical Technology	Public	7
4	Spain	Transport	Public	7
5	Spain	Transport	Private	1
6	Netherlands	Transport	Public	5
7	Sweden	Medical Technology	Private	27
8	Sweden	Medical Technology	Private	71
9	Sweden	Medical Technology	Public	5
10	Sweden	Medical Technology	Public	1
11	Italy	Transport	Public	1
12	Italy	Transport	Public	19

*Table 7: Results PATSTAT data mining*


It can be assumed that the low number of teams is due the fact that mostly public institutions have participated in the survey, but it is primary the private sector who is involved in the patent activities (about 90% of the applications are done by the business sector BES). In addition to that, the dataset was searched up to the year 2012, so that relatively new teams in our samples or significant team member changes up to now lead to lower numbers of matches.



## Chapter 3 - Relating Gender Diversity to Research Performance

**Anne Laure Humbert, Elisabeth Anna Guenther**

One key question addressed by the GEDII project is the potential effect of gendered processes on team performance. In the following section, we explore the relationship between gender diversity and performance and the extent to which this relationship is mediated by team processes such as power disparity, perception of leadership or team climate. The analysis is conducted at the team level, since the aim is to relate gendered processes within the team to team productivity measures obtained through bibliometric data mining.



*Figure 2: Gender diversity - performance link. Source: based on Humbert and Guenther, 2017*

Based on a review of the literature on team effectiveness, gender diversity is used as an input variable in a process that relates to research output. This schematic conceptual model also examines whether there is a direct relationship between gender diversity and research performance, or whether this is fully or partially mediated by other team processes and dynamics, such as team climate, diversity climate or the perception of leadership style. In addition to these relationships, other contextual factors at the organisational or individual level also need to be considered, although they are not represented.

### The impact of gender diversity on research performance

Research on the impact of gender diversity on performance is inconclusive (Müller, Klatt, Callerstig, & Sandström, 2016). Several studies indicate that a good gender balance is beneficial for corporate performance and innovation processes within teams (Curtis, Schmid, & Struber, 2012; Hoogendoorn, Oosterbeek, & van Praag, 2013; McKinsey & Company, 2008, 2016). Some research has shown that performance is negatively affected regardless of whether it is women or men that are under-represented (Gratton, Kelan, Voigt, Walker, & Wolfram, 2007). Within R&D more specifically, gender diversity within teams has been linked to more novel solutions and radical innovation (Bear & Woolley, 2011; Díaz-García,

Gonzalez-Moreno, & Saez-Martinez, 2013; Østergaard, Timmermans, & Kristinsson, 2011). However, a meta-analysis found a negative relationship between gender diversity and a team's task performance in the form of output and productivity (Schneid, Isidor, Li, & Kabst, 2015). That study, however, does not distinguish between the different nature of tasks. Evidence suggests that gender diversity can have a positive effect, but predominantly within teams that carry out creative, innovative tasks such as writing scientific publications (Campbell, Mehtani, Dozier, & Rinehart, 2013; Østergaard et al., 2011). Because the tasks carried out in a research context are highly specialised, creative and potentially demanding – a non-routine task in Perrow's (1967) classification – we assume that the ability for novel solutions and radical innovations are positively linked to gender balance. We therefore hypothesise:

*H1a: Gender balance within teams has a positive effect on research performance.*

A gender balance approach treats the under-representation of either sex-group equally, regardless of whether it is women or men who are under-represented. However, research studies showed there is a productivity gap between women and men academics (Aiston & Jung, 2015; Busolt & Kugele, 2009; Müller et al., 2016). One reason behind this gap is that women academics tend to have less time for research due to teaching load or academic citizenship and service (Link, Swann, & Bozeman, 2008; Winslow, 2010). Consequently, the ratio of women within a team might have a different influence on the overall team-performance. We therefore hypothesise:

*H1b: Women's representation in teams is negatively related to research performance.*

Up to now, gender diversity in research has largely been treated as synonymous with the sex-composition of a team. This can either take a gender-neutral perspective (i.e. gender balance or the proportion of the under-represented sex on teams) or a gendered perspective (i.e. women's representation on teams). However, counting heads only provides a snapshot of the current team and does not consider gendered processes within a team.

The GEDII project aimed to go beyond counting heads and extend not only the concept of gender diversity but also how it is measured. To this end, the Gender Diversity Index not only includes measures of gender representation but also of gender attrition along seven grounds of diversity: age, education, care responsibilities, marital status, team tenure, contract type and seniority (Humbert & Guenther, 2017, 2018). This is in line with the argument that it is important to move beyond representation and to focus on inclusive climates within organisations and teams (Mor Barak et al., 2016; Shore, Cleveland, & Sanchez, 2017).

The scores of the Gender Diversity Index reward inclusive teams (Humbert & Guenther, 2018). Shore et al. (2011) define inclusion as a setting in which individuals can retain their

uniqueness while also being treated as insiders at the same time. Within an inclusive climate, individuals can bring in their full spectrum of talent (Mor Barak et al., 2016). In an inclusive environment, women and men get the opportunity to realise themselves, regardless of their individual diversity characteristics. Shore et al. (2011, 2017) suggest that an inclusive environment is conducive to team performance. We therefore hypothesise:

*H1c: The Gender Diversity Index is positively related to research performance.*

Thus far the sex-composition of a team and gendered processes in teams have been considered separately. However, this fails to account for the intertwined nature of those aspects. The sex-composition of a team is co-shaped by gendered processes as those impact recruitment and retention processes. Then again, a focus on gender-inclusiveness alone does not provide information on whether teams are affected by being either women- or men-dominated. Moreover, while an inclusive team environment as well as gender balance should be conducive for team performance, a high representation of women could be detrimental. Consequently, to fully be able to assess the influence of a gender-inclusive team setting it is necessary to also control for the sex-composition of a team, both in terms of the representation of women and gender balance. We therefore hypothesise:

*H2: Gender diversity within teams is positively related to research performance, when controlling for gender balance and the representation of women.*

Measures of gendered processes within teams provide little information about the gender climate in which a team operates, such as gender stereotypes. Gender stereotypes influence the perception of a person's status and performance (Müller et al., 2016). Research on stereotype threats shows that stigmatised groups – in the case of science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) women often are stigmatised – underperform if existing stereotypes are not tackled (Harrison, Stevens, Monty, & Coakley, 2006; Shapiro & Williams, 2012; Walton, Murphy, & Ryan, 2015). We therefore hypothesise:

*H3: Gender diversity within teams positively influences research performance, when controlling for gender balance, the representation of women and gender stereotypes.*

The influence of gender diversity on team performance is likely to be mediated by other team processes (Müller et al., 2016). Van Knippenberg et al. (2013) argue that a team's diversity mindset influence its capabilities to benefit from its diversity. Consequently, if a team provides an environment that is safe for minorities – such as women in STEM – to express their opinions and to work in, the overall team performance might benefit from it. Additionally, an unwelcoming diversity climate could decrease team effectiveness. For

instance, Raver and Gelfand (2005) showed that ambient sexual harassment and sexual hostility increase team conflict. Gender diversity within teams may construct a safe diversity climate, which in turn can increase performance. We therefore hypothesise:

*H4: Diversity climate mediates the relationship between gender diversity and research performance.*

Depending on whether teams see cultural differences as an important source influences not only the power distribution within the team but also to what extent individuals perceive their self- and group-efficacy (Ely & Thomas, 2001). In other words, the perception on how much a team member can influence and co-shape team processes affects intrinsic motivation and therefore also performance. Teams that are more gender diverse may benefit from low levels of power disparity, which in turn can increase research performance. We therefore hypothesise:

*H5: The perception of power disparity mediates the relationship between gender diversity and research performance.*

Research shows that team climate, in its different expressions, influences team effectiveness and performance (Mathieu, Maynard, Rapp, & Gilson, 2008). Teams with an innovative team climate – that is teams that share a vision, have a strong task-orientation, where members feel they can participate and where there is strong support for innovative practices – are positively linked to the speed of innovation (Pirola-Merlo, 2010). Furthermore, a collaborative team climate fosters creativity within intrinsically motivated teams (Zhu, Gardner, & Chen, 2016). Teams that are more gender diverse may generate a climate that is more diverse and therefore more supportive of innovation, which in turn positively affects performance. We therefore hypothesise:

*H6: Team climate mediates the relationship between gender diversity and research performance.*

The style and behaviour of team leaders are also very important when it comes to team processes (Guzzo, R. & Dickson, 1996; Müller et al., 2016). For instance, autocratic leadership style and power concentration in formal team leaders can reduce the communication within teams and therefore negatively affect team learning and team performance (Tost, Gino, & Larrick, 2013). At the same time, shared leadership approaches have been positively linked to team performance (D’Innocenzo, Mathieu, & Kukenberger, 2016). Gender diverse teams may be associated with more diffuse and/or democratic management styles, which in turn

fosters greater performance. We therefore hypothesise:

*H7: The perception of leadership style mediates the relationship between gender diversity and research performance.*

## Methodology

In the following we first describe case selection as well as different measures used to test the hypotheses set out above, except for those that were already described in the methodology section (see page 10). We then outline the modelling procedure used in the analysis.

### Case selection

In order to gain a deeper insight on gender diversity, team dynamics and their relationship to team performance the survey aimed for a very high in-team response rate, ideally 100% of team members. To minimise the standard errors of estimates, only teams which met the following criteria were used for the calculation of the Gender Diversity Index: 100% response rate for teams with 4 respondents, 50% response rate for teams with 5 to 9 respondents, and 40% response rate for teams with 10 or more respondents (101 out of 159 teams).

### Measures

*Gender diversity* – Gender diversity is measured through three indicators: the Gender Diversity Index, gender balance within teams and women's representation on teams. The Gender Diversity Index was developed within the framework of the GEDII project to capture gendered processes within a team (Humbert & Guenther, 2017, 2018). It consists of a composite measure that summarises the gender representation and attrition within teams across seven grounds of diversity. This measure is bound between 0 and 1, where 1 stands for high levels of gender inclusiveness. While the Gender Diversity Index provides a measure of gendered processes, it does not provide direct information on the composition of the team. Two such measures are therefore used in combination with the Gender Diversity Index. The first is the overall representation of women on teams, calculated as the overall proportion of women. The second is a measure of gender balance on the team which is calculated as the representation of the under-represented sex-group, and rescaled so that it is bound between 0 and 1. All three indicators derived from the survey data and are calculated for each team.

*Research performance* – Research performance is operationalized through two measures used in bibliometric studies. The first is Field Adjusted Production (FAP), which uses a methodology for normalisation to field specific publication standards across different subject areas and stands for the relative quantity of research output of a team (Koski, Sandström, & Sandström, 2016). As such, FAP estimates of how many actively publishing researchers a

team is made off, based on the publication record from the team. For instance, where a team consists of four senior researchers, it is expected to have a FAP score of four. If that same team, however, achieves a score of five this would suggest they outperform similar teams in their area of research as they produce as many publications in their area of research as normally would be expected from five senior researchers.

The second is based on the Percentile Model (PM, for more details see Chapter 2). The Percentile Model (PM) builds on the FAP and takes into account the number of citations obtained and ranks them within their specific subject area into percentile groups (top 1%, top 5%, etc...). The higher the PM score, the more likely is that the output of a team belongs to the top research groups within a field. For instance, if a team's publications are mainly amongst the top 1% of all cited publications within their area of research, they would achieve one of the highest PM scores, while teams with few citations would be on the bottom end of the PM score (Sandström & Wold, 2015).

The measures used to capture gender stereotypes, diversity climate, team influence, team climate and the perception of leadership style are described in the methodology section of this report (Chapter 1).

### **Control variables**

The sample used for the analysis results from the amalgamation of two data sources: the cross-country survey and bibliometric data mining. Controls are applied from the two sources. Since FAP is a measure of productivity that is size dependent, the analysis controls both for the *identified number of publishing researchers* and the *number of senior researchers* in teams derived from the bibliometric information. This is complemented by a control variable calculated from the survey data which captures respondents' average *level of experience* within each team (below/above four years). The possibility to add the number of respondents from each team as a further control variable was considered, but a high VIF suggested high levels of multicollinearity with bibliometric team size.

	FAP	PM	N° Team members	searchersN° Senior	% Women	Gender Balance	Gender Diversity Index	Team Influence	Team Climate	Leadership Style	Diversity Climate	Gender Stereotype	Experience
FAP													
PM	0.720***												
N° Team Members	0.530***	0.341***											
N° Senior Researchers	0.775***	0.488***	0.669***										
% Women	-0.167	-0.055	0.088	-0.066									
Gender Balance	-0.042	-0.007	-0.017	0.040	0.254**								
Gender Diversity Index	0.158	0.059	0.144	0.176	0.342***	0.623***							
Team Influence	-0.109	-0.119	0.187*	-0.168	-0.151	-0.066	-0.110						
Team Climate	-0.002	0.087	0.003	-0.036	0.079	-0.223**	-0.060	0.143					
Leadership Style	0.049	0.063	-0.222**	-0.008	0.081	-0.077	-0.008	0.064	0.623***				
Diversity Climate	0.068	-0.010	0.042	0.120	-0.162*	-0.087	0.046	0.108	0.305***	0.282***			
Gender Stereotype	-0.006	-0.029	0.189*	-0.039	-0.113	0.006	-0.048	-0.091	0.045	0.013	-0.050		
Experience	0.215*	0.012	-0.191*	0.192	0.003	-0.149	0.046	0.109	0.026	0.018	-0.172*	-0.202*	
Computed correlation used Pearson-method with pairwise-deletion.													

Table 8: Correlation table

## Modelling

The analysis uses a generalized linear model (GLM) process (McCullagh & Nelder, 1989) with a negative binomial link. The negative binomial link is needed since performance indicators are akin to count data, for which a Poisson link was initially considered. However, initial plotting of the data and summary statistics shows that the variance of the data was clearly larger than the mean of the data, signalling over-dispersion. In this case, the use of a negative binomial link is more appropriate. This corresponds to the modelling techniques used in much of bibliometric research. The analysis was performed using R, and more specifically the `glm.nb` command of the MASS package (Venables & Ripley, 2002). Multi-collinearity can represent a significant source of error in modelling. For this reason, the VIFs were computed for all models. In all the models presented below, all VIFs are well below the threshold of 10 (Belsley, Kuh, & Welsch, 1980).

Mediation was assessed using the three-step procedure outlined by Baron and Kenny (1986). In this three regression models are performed for each of the two measures of performance in this analysis:

- Regression of the dependent variable on the independent variable and controls
- Regression of the mediator variable on the independent variable and controls
- Regression of the dependent variables on both the mediator, independent variables and controls.

There is mediation when the relationship at step 2 is statistically significant, with full mediation if the coefficient of the independent variable becomes non-significant or partial mediation if the same coefficient decreases but remains statistically significant. In the first and third steps, the GLM uses a negative binomial link. In the second step, the unit link is used since the distribution of the variables is approximately Normal.

## Results

The following section summarises the main results of the different models and explores the link of gender diversity and team performance.

### *Gender diversity and research performance*

Model 1 examines the effects of the overall gender balance of a team on research performance. Results suggest that gender balance within teams has no statistically significant effect on performance (FAP or PM), when number of senior researchers, team size and level of experiences are controlled for (Model 1).



*Model 1: Influence of gender balance on research performance (H1a)*

	FAP			PM		
	<i>B</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	2.09	1.63–2.55	<.001	4.03	3.43–4.64	<.001
Gender Balance	-0.24	-0.67–0.19	.300	-0.23	-0.80–0.33	.446
Level of Experience	0.32	-0.29–0.94	.309	-0.58	-1.44–0.31	.164
N° Senior Researcher	0.25	0.16–0.34	<.001	0.24	0.12–0.37	<.001
N° Team Members	0.01	-0.02–0.03	.578	-0.01	-0.04–0.03	.712
Observations	99			99		
R <sup>2</sup> / adj. R <sup>2</sup>	.524 / .525			.321 / .321		

However, teams that are unbalanced can be either women-dominated or men-dominated. Because these two situations can have a different effect on performance, it is therefore important to look at either women or men's representation alone in relation to performance. Model 2 shows that women's representation within a team has a negative relationship with FAP (-0.75,  $p = 0.004$ ). This confirms the findings of many studies in the literature which find a productivity gap in terms of publications when it comes to publications (Aiston & Jung, 2015; Busolt & Kugele, 2009; Müller et al., 2016). However, there is no effect of women's representation on PM, suggesting that the sex composition of team does not affect vertical standing, in the sense of quality ranking, within respective subject areas.

*Model 2: Influence of women representation within a team on research performance (H1b)*

	FAP			PM		
	<i>B</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	2.28	1.84–2.73	<.001	4.06	3.45–4.69	<.001
% of Women	-0.75	-1.26–-0.24	.004	-0.32	-0.98–0.35	.365
Level of Experience	0.29	-0.31–0.90	.335	-0.59	-1.46–0.31	.154
N° Senior Researcher	0.24	0.16–0.33	<.001	0.24	0.12–0.37	<.001
N° Team Members	0.01	-0.02–0.03	.545	-0.01	-0.04–0.03	.657
Observations	99			99		
R <sup>2</sup> / adj. R <sup>2</sup>	.556 / .556			.322 / .322		

The aim of this analysis is to examine the potential effects of gendered processes within research teams, as measured by the Gender Diversity Index. The Gender Diversity Index measures the extent to which both women and men can equally realise themselves within research teams along seven aspects of diversity. Model 3 examines the effect of gendered processes, measured with the Gender Diversity Index, on research performance. The results are not statistically significant for neither FAP nor PM.

*Model 3: Influence of Gender Diversity Index on research performance (H1c)*

	FAP			PM		
	<i>B</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	1.79	1.32–2.27	<.001	4.05	3.44–4.69	<.001
Gender Diversity Index	0.27	-0.27–0.80	.350	-0.02	-0.78–0.71	.955
Level of Experience	0.55	-0.18–1.29	.140	-0.47	-1.52–0.61	.340
N° Senior Researcher	0.22	0.14–0.31	<.001	0.23	0.11–0.36	<.001
N° Team Members	0.01	-0.02–0.03	.711	-0.02	-0.05–0.02	.426
Observations	82			82		
R <sup>2</sup> / adj. R <sup>2</sup>	.910 / .910			.914 / .914		

Thus far, the empirical link between performance and (1) women's representation, (2) gender balance and (3) gendered processes within research team has provided mixed

findings. Furthermore, while studies have sometimes included one of these measures into its analysis, to our knowledge all three aspects have not been combined. To provide a fuller account of the effects of the GDI on performance, its effects need to be examined in relation to – and not separately from – both gender balance and women’s representation in research teams.

Model 4 shows that the composition of teams (women’s representation and gender balance) matter to assess the link between gender diversity and research performance. In this model, both variables are included in the model. It is clear that both variables measure a slightly different aspect of team composition, as evidenced by the fact that their correlation is low ( $r = 0.25$ ). When these two variables are included in the model, the scores of the Gender Diversity Index show a statistically significant positive relationship ( $0.84, p = 0.017$ ) with FAP, although the proportion of women on the team is no longer significant. The models suggest that when considering the sex composition of the team, more inclusive teams (meaning teams with a score of 1 on the Gender Diversity Index) benefit from the equivalent of an additional 0.84 publishing researchers compared to teams with no gender diversity. This suggests that more inclusive teams tend to attract and retain researchers who publish above the average of their subject area. However, there is no significant effect on the rank of a team within their subject area, as measured by PM.

*Model 4: Impact of gender diversity on research performance, controlled for gender balance and women's representation (H2)*

	FAP			PM		
	<i>B</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	2.12	1.59–2.65	<.001	4.25	3.57–4.97	<.001
Gender Diversity Index	0.84	0.12–1.58	.017	0.45	-0.58–1.52	.358
% of Women	-0.54	-1.26–0.22	.143	-0.13	-1.12–0.96	.794
Gender Balance	-0.48	-1.19–0.22	.183	-0.51	-1.51–0.46	.301
Level of Experience	0.35	-0.36–1.07	.343	-0.63	-1.68–0.45	.215
N° Senior Researcher	0.23	0.14–0.31	<.001	0.24	0.12–0.37	<.001
N° Team Members	0.00	-0.03–0.03	.950	-0.02	-0.06–0.02	.320
Observations	81			81		
R <sup>2</sup> / adj. R <sup>2</sup>	.927 / .927			.929 / .929		

In addition to the sex composition of the team, the analysis also considers the relationship

between the Gender Diversity Index and research performance, while controlling for the potential effects of gender stereotypes within teams. The scale (from 1 to 5) captured the extent to which women and men were perceived as similar (1) or different (5).

Model 5 shows that the effect of gender diversity on research performance increases marginally if an additional control for gender stereotypes is included. Teams with a high score on the Gender Diversity Index have an additional number of publications equivalent to 0.91 publishing researchers, compared to teams with a score of 0 on the Gender Diversity Index (FAP). The Gender Diversity has no significant effect on the rank of the team within their area of research by team (PM).

*Model 5: Influence of gender diversity on research performance, controlled by gender stereotypes (H3)*

	FAP			PM		
	<i>B</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	1.17	-0.14-2.48	.079	4.34	2.67-6.04	<.001
Gender Diversity Index	0.91	0.20-1.63	.010	0.45	-0.58-1.53	.359
% of Women	-0.47	-1.19-0.27	.203	-0.14	-1.13-0.96	.790
Gender Balance	-0.51	-1.20-0.18	.156	-0.51	-1.51-0.47	.308
Gender Stereotypes	0.33	-0.09-0.75	.115	-0.03	-0.60-0.55	.911
Level of Experience	0.47	-0.24-1.20	.208	-0.64	-1.70-0.46	.220
N° Senior Researcher	0.24	0.16-0.32	<.001	0.24	0.12-0.37	<.001
N° Team Members	-0.00	-0.03-0.02	.735	-0.02	-0.06-0.02	.338
Observations	81			81		
R <sup>2</sup> / adj. R <sup>2</sup>	.929 / .929			.929 / .929		

### ***Gender diversity and team performance mediated by team processes***

Next, whether team processes have a mediating effect on the relation between gender diversity and research performance is considered since previous research has theorised that the link may not be a direct one. To this end, the analysis focuses on various aspects of team processes identified in the literature on team effectiveness: the perception of power disparity within teams, team climate, leadership style and diversity climate. In doing so, the analysis takes into consideration cognitive gender diversity, an aspect of gender diversity not included in the Gender Diversity Index. Since the Gender Diversity Index has no statistically

significant effect on PM, there is no need to assess potential mediations. This section focuses only on FAP as a result.

The mediating team processes examined in turn are:

- the diversity climate in the wider organisation
- team influence and power disparity
- team climate and
- the perception of leadership style

There is no statistically significant relation between the Gender Diversity Index and diversity climate. Moreover, diversity climate does not have a significant mediation effect on the relationship between the Gender Diversity Index and performance.

*Model 6: Influence of gender diversity on research performance mediated by the perception of diversity climate (H4)*

	Diversity Climate			FAP		
	<i>B</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	4.46	3.87–5.04	<.001	1.57	-1.04–4.21	.237
Gender Diversity Index	0.22	-0.09–0.54	.168	0.93	0.21–1.67	.009
% Women	-0.04	-0.37–0.29	.813	-0.48	-1.20–0.27	.195
Gender Balance	-0.21	-0.53–0.10	.194	-0.53	-1.23–0.17	.146
Gender Stereotype	-0.04	-0.23–0.14	.660	0.33	-0.09–0.75	.120
Experience	-0.54	-0.87–-0.21	.002	0.42	-0.34–1.20	.289
N° Senior Researchers	0.02	-0.02–0.05	.390	0.24	0.16–0.32	<.001
N° Team Members	0.00	-0.01–0.01	.761	-0.00	-0.03–0.02	.738
Diversity Climate				-0.09	-0.61–0.41	.725
Observations	81			81		
R <sup>2</sup> / adj. R <sup>2</sup>	.695 / .922			.929 / .930		

The Gender Diversity Index is negatively related to team influence (-0.35,  $p = 0.04$ ), but there is no evidence of mediation since the effect of team influence on FAP is not statistically significant.

*Model 7: Influence of gender diversity on research performance mediated by power disparity (H5)*

	Team Influence			FAP		
	<i>B</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	2.61	2.01-3.22	<.001	1.43	-0.54-3.39	.126
Gender Diversity Index	-0.35	-0.67--0.02	.040	0.89	0.17-1.62	.014
% Women	-0.12	-0.46-0.21	.473	-0.50	-1.22-0.26	.185
Gender Balance	0.41	0.09-0.74	.015	-0.48	-1.19-0.23	.198
Gender Stereotype	0.08	-0.11-0.27	.396	0.33	-0.08-0.76	.111
Experience	0.09	-0.25-0.43	.610	0.47	-0.24-1.20	.207
N° Senior Researchers	-0.03	-0.07-0.01	.100	0.23	0.15-0.32	<.001
N° Team Members	0.01	-0.00-0.02	.175	-0.00	-0.03-0.02	.781
Team Influence				-0.09	-0.62-0.44	.706
Observations	81			81		
R <sup>2</sup> / adj. R <sup>2</sup>	.885 / .969			.929 / .930		

Model 8 fails to show any mediation by team climate since the Gender Diversity Index has no statistically significant effects on FAP.

*Model 8: Influence of gender diversity on research performance mediated by team climate (H6)*

	Team Climate			FAP		
	<i>B</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	3.48	2.94–4.03	<.001	0.77	-1.67–3.24	.510
Gender Diversity Index	0.04	-0.26–0.33	.800	0.90	0.19–1.63	.011
% Women	0.35	0.04–0.65	.030	-0.50	-1.23–0.26	.190
Gender Balance	-0.18	-0.47–0.12	.248	-0.49	-1.19–0.20	.173
Gender Stereotype	0.16	-0.01–0.34	.065	0.31	-0.12–0.75	.143
Experience	-0.21	-0.52–0.10	.187	0.50	-0.23–1.23	.190
N° Senior Researchers	0.01	-0.02–0.05	.484	0.24	0.15–0.32	<.001
N° Team Members	-0.00	-0.02–0.01	.442	-0.00	-0.03–0.02	.766
Team Climate				0.11	-0.48–0.70	.684
Observations	81			81		
R <sup>2</sup> / adj. R <sup>2</sup>	.719 / .967			.929 / .930		

Model 9 fails to show any mediation effect by perception of leadership style.

*Model 9: Influence of gender diversity on research performance mediated by the perception of leadership style (H7)*

	Leadership Style			FAP		
	B	CI	p	B	CI	p
(Intercept)	3.61	2.89–4.32	<.001	0.62	-1.40–2.64	.540
Gender Diversity Index	-0.00	-0.39–0.39	.994	0.92	0.21–1.64	.009
% Women	0.43	0.03–0.84	.039	-0.52	-1.24–0.24	.173
Gender Balance	-0.01	-0.40–0.38	.955	-0.53	-1.23–0.16	.136
Gender Stereotype	0.12	-0.11–0.35	.299	0.31	-0.11–0.74	.140
Experience	-0.27	-0.68–0.14	.202	0.53	-0.20–1.27	.163
N° Senior Researchers	0.03	-0.02–0.07	.267	0.23	0.15–0.32	<.001
N° Team Members	-0.01	-0.02–0.01	.458	-0.00	-0.03–0.02	.782
Leadership Style				0.15	-0.28–0.58	.465
Observations	81			81		
R <sup>2</sup> / adj. R <sup>2</sup>	.852 / .925			.930 / .930		

## Conclusion

Overall, the analysis show that more inclusive teams – that is teams with a score of 1 on the Gender Diversity Index – tend to perform better and generate more research output. When controlling for gender stereotypes, gender balance and the representation of women within teams, a score of 1 on the Gender Diversity Index is associated with an increase of 0.91 FAP (Model 5). This means that more inclusive teams perform on par with teams that have and additional 0.91 publishing senior researchers. However, there is no statistically significant effect on the quality rank of the published research (PM). Initial modelling does not indicate a significant mediation effect of team processes. However, it could be that a more nuanced approach is needed to understand the complexity of intertwined processes.

There are a number of limitations to the analysis above. First, it should be noted that the data combines two sources: survey data and bibliometric data mining. This introduces a time gap, where the models capture team characteristics at a time *t*, but relate it to performance data that precedes this point in time. This asynchronicity needs to be further explored



through more data analysis, and where possible through further bibliometric data mining to capture performance at time  $t$ . In addition, the usual caveats as to the causal nature of the relationships explored here apply. It is not possible to establish a causal relationship between gender diversity within research teams, beyond that of a simple association.

## References

- Adams, J et al. (2007). The use of bibliometrics to measure research quality in UK higher education institutions. Universities UK, Research Report. Evidence.
- Aiston, S. J., & Jung, J. (2015). Women academics and research productivity: an international comparison. *Gender and Education*, 27(3), 205–220.  
<http://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2015.1024617>
- Aksnes, DW (2003a). A macro study of self-citations. *Scientometrics* 56(2), 235–246.
- Aksnes, DW (2003b). Characteristics of highly cited papers. *Research Evaluation* 12(3), 159–170.
- Anderson, N., & West, M. A. (1998). Measuring climate for work group innovation: development and validation of the team climate inventory. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, 235–258.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173–1182. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173>
- Bear, J. B., & Woolley, A. W. (2011). The role of gender in team collaboration and performance. *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, 36(2), 146–153.  
<http://doi.org/10.1179/030801811x13013181961473>
- Belsley, D. A., Kuh, E., & Welsch, R. E. (1980). *Regression Diagnostics: Identifying Influential Data and Sources of Collinearity*. Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.  
<http://doi.org/10.1002/0471725153>
- Berger, R., Romeo, M., Guardia, J., Yepes, M., & Soria, M. A. (2012). Psychometric Properties of the Spanish Human System Audit Short-Scale of Transformational Leadership. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 15(1), 367–376.  
[http://doi.org/10.5209/rev\\_SJOP.2012.v15.n1.37343](http://doi.org/10.5209/rev_SJOP.2012.v15.n1.37343)
- Blossfeld, H.-P. (2001). *Careers of couples in contemporary societies: from male breadwinner to dual-earner families*. Oxford [UK]; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Boada-Grau, J., de Diego-Vallejo, R., de Llanos-Serra, E., & Vigil-Colet, A. (2011). Version breve en español del Team Climate Inventory (TCI-14): desarrollo y propiedades psicometricas., 23(2), 308–313. Retrieved from <http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=ovftl&NEWS=N&AN=01438443-201123020-00022>
- Borgmann, C. L., & Furner, J. (2002). Scholarly Communication and Bibliometrics. *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*: 36(1), 1-53.
- Bornmann, L., & Daniel, H., D. (2008). What do citation counts measure? A review of studies on citing behavior. *Journal of Documentation*, 64(1), 45–80.
- Boyack, K. W, & Klavans, R. (2006). Identifying a better measure of relatedness for mapping science. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 57(2), 251–263.
- Braun, T., Glänzel, W, & Schubert, A. (1990). Publication productivity: from frequency distributions to scientometric indicators. *Journal of Information Science* 16, 37–44.

- Busolt, U., & Kugele, K. (2009). The gender innovation and research productivity gap in Europe. *International Journal of Innovation and Sustainable Development*, 4(2/3), 109. <http://doi.org/10.1504/IJISD.2009.028066>
- Butler, L. (2008). Using a balanced approach to bibliometrics: quantitative performance measures in the Australian Research Quality Framework. *Ethics in Science and Environmental politics*, vol. 8, preprint doi: 10.3354/esep00077.
- Campbell, L. G., Mehtani, S., Dozier, M. E., & Rinehart, J. (2013). Gender-heterogeneous working groups produce higher quality science. *PloS One*, 8(10), e79147. <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0079147>
- Carpenter, M., & Narin, F. (1981). The adequacy of the Science Citation Index (SCI) as an indicator of international scientific activity. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 32 (6), 430–439.
- Curşeu, P. L., & Sari, K. (2015). The effects of gender variety and power disparity on group cognitive complexity in collaborative learning groups. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 23(4), 425–436. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2013.788029>
- Curtis, M., Schmid, C., & Struber, M. (2012). Gender Diversity and Corporate performance. Credit Suisse. © 2012 Credit Suisse GroupAG, (August), 32. Retrieved from [richard.kersley@credit-suisse.com](mailto:richard.kersley@credit-suisse.com)
- CWTS (2007). Scoping study on the use of bibliometric analysis to measure the quality of research in UK higher education institutions. Report to HEFCE by the Leiden group. [[http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rdreports/2007/rd18\\_07/rd18\\_07.pdf](http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rdreports/2007/rd18_07/rd18_07.pdf)]
- D’Innocenzo, L., Mathieu, J. E., & Kukenberger, M. R. (2016). A Meta-Analysis of Different Forms of Shared Leadership–Team Performance Relations. *Journal of Management*, 42(7), 1964–1991. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314525205>
- de Bruin, R. E., & Moed, H. F. (1990). The unification of addresses in scientific publications. *Informetrics* 89/90, 65–78. <<https://doclib.uhasselt.be/dspace/>>
- Díaz-García, C., Gonzalez-Moreno, A., & Saez-Martinez, F. J. (2013). Gender diversity within R & D teams: Its impact on radicalness of innovation. *Innovation: Management, Policy and Practice*, 15(2), 149–160. <http://doi.org/10.5172/impp.2013.15.2.149>
- Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural Diversity at Work: The Effects of Diversity Perspectives on Work Group Processes and Outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2), 229. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2667087>
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). The three worlds of welfare capitalism. Princeton N. J.: Princeton University Press.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1999). Social foundations of postindustrial economies. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (2002). Why we need a new welfare state. New York: Oxford University Press.
- European Commission (2008). Benchmarking policy measures for gender equality in science. Science. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. Retrieved from <http://www.employment-studies.co.uk/pdflibrary/eur23314.pdf>

- European Commission (2017). European Scoreboard. doi:10.2873/076586
- Ferrera, M. (1996). The "Southern Model" of Welfare in Social Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 6(1), 17–37. doi:10.1177/095892879600600102
- Glänzel, W. (1996). The need for standards in bibliometric research and technology. *Scientometrics*, 35, 167–176.
- Glänzel, W., Schubert, A., & Telcs, A. (1984). Characterization by Truncated Moments and its Application to Pearson-Type Distributions. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete* 66, 173-183. (Correction: Ibid. 74, 317 (1987))
- Glänzel, W., Schubert, A., Schoepflin, U., & Czerwon, H. (1999). An item-by-item subject classification of papers published in journals covered by the SSCI database using reference analysis. *Scientometrics*, 46(3), 431-441.
- Glänzel, W., Thijs, B., & Schlemmer, B. (2004). A bibliometric approach to the role of author self-citations in scientific communication, *Scientometrics*, 59(1), 63–77.
- Gratton, L., Kelan, E., Voigt, A., Walker, L., & Wolfram, H.-J. (2007). Innovative Potential: Men and Women in Teams Executive Summary.
- Guzzo, R., & Dickson, M. (1996). Team in organizations: Research on performance and effectiveness. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47, 307–338.  
<http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.47.1.307>
- Harrison, L. A., Stevens, C. M., Monty, A. N., & Coakley, C. A. (2006). The consequences of stereotype threat on the academic performance of White and non-White lower income college students. *Social Psychology of Education*, 9(3), 341–357.  
<http://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-005-5456-6>
- Hicks, D. (1999). The difficulty of achieving full coverage of international social science literature and the bibliometric consequences. *Scientometrics*, 44(2), 193-215.
- Hicks, D. (2004). The four literatures of social science. In: *Handbook of Quantitative Science and Technology Research: The use of publication and patent statistics in studies of S&T systems*. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 473–496.
- Hoogendoorn, S., Oosterbeek, H., & van Praag, M. (2013). The Impact of Gender Diversity on the Performance of Business Teams: Evidence from a Field Experiment. *Management Science*, 59(7), 1514–1528. <http://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1120.1674>
- Humbert, A. L., & Guenther, E. A. (2017). D3.1 The Gender Diversity Index, Preliminary Considerations and Results." Project Deliverable. doi:10.17862/cranfield.rd.5110978.v1.
- Humbert, A. L., & Guenther, E. A. (2018). D3.2 Measuring gender diversity in research teams: methodological foundations of the Gender Diversity Index. Project Deliverable.
- Kearney, E., Razinskas, S., Weiss, M., & Hoegl, M. (n.d.). Gender diversity, time pressure, and stereotypical thinking.
- Kivimäki, M., & Elovainio, M. (1999). A short version of the Team Climate Inventory: Development and psychometric properties. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 241–246. <http://doi.org/10.1348/096317999166644>
- Korpi, W. (2000). Faces of inequality: Gender, class, and patterns of inequalities in different types of welfare states. *Social Politics: international studies in gender, state & society*,

7(2), 127-191.

- Koski, T., Sandström, E., & Sandström, U. (2016). Towards field-adjusted production: Estimating research productivity from a zero-truncated distribution. *Journal of Informetrics*, 10(4), 1143–1152. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2016.09.002>
- Leydesdorff, L. (2008). Caveats for the Use of Citation Indicators in Research and Journal Evaluations. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 59(2), 278-287.
- Link, A. N., Swann, C. A., & Bozeman, B. (2008). A time allocation study of university faculty. *Economics of Education Review*, 27(4), 363-374.
- Lundberg, J. (2006). Bibliometrics as a research assessment tool – impact beyond the impact factor. PhD-thesis, Karolinska Institute. Stockholm.
- Martin, P. Y. (2003). “Said and Done” versus “Saying and Doing”: Gendering Practices, Practicing Gender at Work. *Gender & Society*, 17(3), 342–366. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0891243203251716>
- Mathieu, J., Maynard, M. T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997-2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 410–476. <http://doi.org/10.1002/chp.21123>
- McAllister, P. R., Narin, F., & Corrigan, J. G. (1983). Programmatic evaluation and comparison based on standardized citation scores. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 30, 205–211.
- McCullagh, P., & Nelder, J. A. (1989). *Generalized Linear Models*, Second Edition. Taylor & Francis. Retrieved from [https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=h9kFH2\\_FfBkC](https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=h9kFH2_FfBkC)
- McKinsey & Company. (2008). *Women Matter 2*.
- McKinsey & Company. (2016). *Women Matter 2016 Reinventing the workplace to unlock the potential of gender diversity*.
- Miller, A. L., & Borgida, E. (2016). The separate spheres model of gendered inequality. *PloS one*, 11(1), e0147315.
- Moed, H. F. (2005). *Citation Analysis in Research Evaluation*. Dordrecht: Springer Verlag.
- Moed, H. F., & van Leeuwen T. N. V. (1995). Improving the Accuracy of Institute for Scientific Information's Journal Impact Factors. *JASIS* 46(6), 461–467.
- Moed, H. F., & Vriens M. (1989). Possible inaccuracies occurring in citation analysis. *Journal of Information Science* 15, 95–107.
- Moed, H. F., & van Raan, A. F. J. (1988). Indicators of research performance: applications in university research policy. In: *Handbook of Quantitative Studies of Science and Technology*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, pp. 177–206.
- Mor Barak, M. E., Lizano, E. L., Kim, A., Duan, L., Rhee, M.-K., Hsiao, H.-Y., & Brimhall, K. C. (2016). The Promise of Diversity Management for Climate of Inclusion: A State-of-the-Art Review and Meta- Analysis. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance*, 3131(April), 305–333. <http://doi.org/10.1080/23303131.2016.1138915>
- Müller, J., Klatt, S., Callerstig, A.-C., & Sandström, U. (2016). D1. 1 Conceptual Framework (Project Deliverable). Retrieved from [www.gedii.eu](http://www.gedii.eu)

- Müller, J. (2018). D2.4 Comparative Case Study Report. Project Deliverable.
- Narin, F., & Hamilton, K. S. (1996). Bibliometric performance measures. *Scientometrics*, 36(3), 293–310.
- Narin, F. (1976). *Evaluative bibliometrics: the use of publication and citation analysis in the evaluation of scientific activity*. New Jersey: Computer Horizons, Inc.
- Østergaard, C. R., Timmermans, B., & Kristinsson, K. (2011). Does a different view create something new? the effect of employee diversity on innovation. *Research Policy*, 40(3), 500–509. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2010.11.004>
- Perrow, C. (1967). A Framework for the Comparative Analysis of Organizations. *American Sociological Review*, 32(2), 194–208. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2091811>
- Pinto, M. B., & Pinto, J. K. (1990). Project Team Communication and Cross-Functional Cooperation in New Program Development. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 7(3), 200–212. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1540-5885.730200>
- Pirola-Merlo, A. (2010). Agile innovation: The role of team climate in rapid research and development. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83(4), 1075–1084. <http://doi.org/10.1348/096317909X480653>
- Raver, J. L., & Gelfand, M. J. (2005). Beyond the individual victim: Linking sexual harassment, team processes and team performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(3), 387–400. <http://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2005.17407904>
- Rinia, T. E., van Leeuwen, T. N., Bruins, E. E. W., van Vuren, H. G., & van Raan, A. F. J. (2002). Measuring knowledge transfer between fields of science. *Scientometrics*, 54(3), 347–362.
- Roche, T., & Smith, D. L. (1978). Frequency of citations as criterion for the ranking of departments, journals and individuals. *Sociological Inquiry*, 48(1), 49–57.
- Rousseau, R. (2005). Median and percentile impact factors: A set of new indicators. *Scientometrics* 63 (3), 431–441.
- Sandström, U., & Sandström, E. (2009). The Field Factor: towards a metric for Academic Institutions. *Research Evaluation*, 18(3), 243–250.
- Sandström, U. (2009). Bibliometric evaluation of research programs – A study of scientific quality. Swedish Environmental Protection Agency Report 6321. 79 pp. ISBN 91-620-5943-9.
- Sandström, E., Koski, T., & Sandström, U. (2011). Estimating Research Productivity from a Zero-Truncated Distribution. Paper to the 13th ISSI Conference in Durban (South Africa) July 2011.
- Sandström, U., & Wold, A. (2015). Centres of excellence: reward for gender or top-level research? In R. Jubileumsfond (Ed.), *RJ Yearbook 2015/2016*, pp. 69–89. Makadam Publishers.
- Schneid, M., Isidor, R., Li, C., & Kabst, R. (2015). The influence of cultural context on the relationship between gender diversity and team performance: a meta-analysis. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(6), 733–756. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2014.957712>

- Schubert, A., & Glänzel, W. (1984). A dynamic look at a class of skew distributions: a model with scientometric applications. *Scientometrics* 3, 149–167.
- Schubert, A., & Telcs, A. (1986). Publication Potential – an indicator of scientific strength for cross-national comparison. *Scientometrics* 9(5-6), 231–238.
- Schubert, A., Glänzel, W., & Braun, T. (1988). Against absolute methods: relative scientometric indicators and relational charts as evaluation tools. In: *Handbook of Quantitative Studies of Science and Technology*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, pp. 137–176.
- Seglen, P. O. (1992). The skewness of science. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 43(9), 628–638.
- Seglen, P.O. (1994). Causal relationship between article citedness and journal impact. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 45, 1–11.
- Seglen, P.O. (1998). Citation rates and journal impact factors are not suitable for evaluation of research. *Acta Orthop Scand* 69(3), 224–229.
- Settles, I. H., Cortina, L. M., Malley, J., & Stewart, A. J. (2006). The climate for women in academic science: The good, the bad, and the changeable. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 30(1), 47–58. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00261.x>
- Shapiro, J. R., & Williams, A. M. (2012). The Role of Stereotype Threats in Undermining Girls' and Women's Performance and Interest in STEM Fields. *Sex Roles*, 66(3–4), 175–183. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-011-0051-0>
- Shore, L. M., Cleveland, J. N., & Sanchez, D. (2017). Inclusive workplaces: A review and model. *Human Resource Management Review*, pp. 176–189. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.07.003>
- Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Ehrhart, K. H., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research. *Journal of Management*. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310385943>
- Strating, M. M. H., & Nieboer, A. P. (2009). Psychometric test of the Team Climate Inventory-short version investigated in Dutch quality improvement teams. *BMC Health Services Research*, 9, 126. <http://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-9-126>
- Telcs, A., Glänzel, W., & Schubert, A. (1985). Characterization and statistical test using truncated expectations for a class of skew distributions. *Mathematical Social Sciences* 10, 169–178.
- Thijs, B., & Glänzel, W. (2005). The influence of author self-citations on bibliometric meso-indicators. The case of European universities. *Scientometrics*, 66 (1), 71–80.
- Tost, L. P., Gino, F., & Larrick, R. P. (2013). When power makes others speechless: The negative impact of leader power on team performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(5), 1465–1486. <http://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0180>
- van Knippenberg, D., van Ginkel, W. P., & Homan, A. C. (2013). Diversity mindsets and the performance of diverse teams. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 121(2), 183–193. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2013.03.003>
- van Raan, A. F. J. (1996). Advanced bibliometric methods as quantitative core of peer review

- based evaluation and foresight exercises. *Scientometrics* 36(3), 397–420.
- van Raan, A. F. J. (2004). Measuring Science: Capita Selecta of Current Main Issues. In: *Handbook of Quantitative Science and Technology Research: The use of publication and patent statistics in studies of S&T systems*. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers 2004, pp. 19-50.
- Venables, W. N., & Ripley, B. D. (2002). *Modern Applied Statistics with S*. Fourth Edition. New York.: Springer.
- Visser, M. S., & Nederhof, A. J. (2007). Bibliometric study of the Uppsala University, Sweden, 2002–2006. In: *Quality and renewal 2007: An overall evaluation of research at Uppsala University 2006/2007*. Uppsala: Uppsala University.
- Waltman, L., & Van Eck, N.J. (2013). A smart local moving algorithm for large-scale modularity-based community detection. *European Physical Journal B*, 86(11), 471.
- Walton, G. M., Murphy, M. C., & Ryan, A. M. (2015). Stereotype Threat in Organizations: Implications for Equity and Performance. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2(1), 523–550. <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111322>
- Winslow, S. (2010). Gender Inequality and Time Allocations Among Academic Faculty. *Gender & Society*, 24(6), 769–793. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0891243210386728>
- Zhu, Y.-Q., Gardner, D. G., & Chen, H.-G. (2016). Relationships Between Work Team Climate, Individual Motivation, and Creativity. *Journal of Management*, XX(X), 14920631663816. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316638161>
- Zitt, M., Ramanana-Rahary, S., & Bassecoulard, E. (2005). Relativity of citation performance and excellence measures: from cross-field to cross-scale effects of field-normalisation. *Scientometrics*, 63 (2), 373–401.



## Annex I – Team Contact Questionnaire

### GEDII Questionnaire Team CONTACT

Study title: Gender-Diversity-Impact. Improving Research and Innovation through Gender Diversity (GEDII) <https://www.gedii.eu/>  
Funding Organisation: European Commission, H2020, Grant Agreement Nr 665851.

Thank you very much for participating in our survey. Its purpose is to understand basic team level characteristics of research and engineering groups working in the public and the private sector. Filling out this questionnaire will take about 5 minutes and will give us some information on your team.

In our email, you will find the link to the team member questionnaire and a team ID code. Please distribute the link and team ID code to all of your team members.

**1 Please enter your team ID code. [Filled in automatically by system]**

\_\_\_\_\_

**2 To which sector is your team rather tied to?**

- ☐ Medical engineering
- ☐ Transport

**3 In which type of organisation do you work?**

- ☐ University
- ☐ Public research centre
- ☐ Private sector/ industry
- ☐ Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

**4 How many employees does your organisation have?**

- ☐ Less than 50
- ☐ 50 - <250
- ☐ 250 - <1000
- ☐ 1000 or more

**5 How many women and men are working in your team?**

We define a team as a group of persons working towards a shared goal (e.g. a technical product, a research project). Each team member needs to have a formal organisational role/relationship and/or official contract with your organisation (e.g. an employee, a PhD student, etc).

\_\_\_\_\_ women                      \_\_\_\_\_ men

**6 Please enter the names of you team members.**

---

---

**7 Can you describe in 1-2 sentences what this team is working on?**

---

---

**8 In which year was the current team leader officially appointed as team leader by your organisation?**

---

**9 Does the team employ a particular formal working methodology as part of your research or problem solving (such as Agile methods, TRIZ, Design Thinking, ...)?**

- ☐ Yes, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ No
- ☐ I don't know

**10 Do team members have the opportunity to interact face to face?**

- ☐ Most team members share the same physical location (lab, office, building) in walking distance to each other
- ☐ Some team members are within walking distance, others are located further away
- ☐ Most team members are working in different locations; face-to-face meetings require travel arrangements

**11 Does your organisation have a Gender Equality Plan?**

The gender equality measure might be part of a wider diversity framework including individual initiatives, organizational settings and others.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ I don't know

**12 Does your research integrate a “gender dimension”?**

Examples of a gender dimension in research include conducting medical        drug trials on both women and men to assess their effects on different types of subjects. An example for transport engineering is assessing the effects of an impact on pregnant crash test dummies.

- ☐ Yes, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ No ☐ I don't know

**13 Is your team involved in any Responsible Research & Innovation(RII) activities? If so, which?**

Examples of RRI include the adaption of open access publication schemes, science education activities or public engagement among others.

- ☐ Ethics
- ☐ Gender Equality
- ☐ Governance
- ☐ Open Access
- ☐ Public Engagement
- ☐ Science Education
- ☐ I don't know

## Annex II – Team Member Questionnaire

### GEDII Questionnaire Team MEMBERS

Study title: Gender-Diversity-Impact. Improving Research and Innovation through Gender Diversity (GEDII) <https://www.gedii.eu/>

Funding Organisation: European Commission, H2020, Grant Agreement Nr 665851.

The questionnaire forms part of a country level survey carried out simultaneously in Germany, Lithuania, Spain, Sweden and the UK. Its purpose is to understand basic team level characteristics of research and engineering groups working in the public and the private sector. We kindly invite you to fill out this questionnaire which will take about **10-15 minutes**.

Your data will not be stored in any way containing direct references to your organisation, team or person. Upon completion of the survey, the resulting dataset will be downloaded and then deleted from the Unipark servers. Unipark is the academic branch of Questback dedicated to research surveys; servers are located in Germany complying with German data protection legislation and international certification (ISO 27001, ISO 20000).

You can exercise your rights of accessing, modifying, opposing, and cancelling your data by contacting us through our webpage ([www.gedii.eu](http://www.gedii.eu)).

These rights are protected by the Spanish Organic Law 15/1999 on Personal Data Protection and EU legislation.

## Section A Getting started

1 Please enter your team ID code.

\_\_\_\_\_

2 Which is your highest level of education?

- ☐ Secondary education
- ☐ Bachelor
- ☐ Master or equivalent postgraduate qualification
- ☐ Doctorate or higher
- ☐ Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

3 In which discipline did you obtain your highest qualification?

- ☐ Chemistry, Physics & Engineering
- ☐ Life Science & Medical Science
- ☐ Sociology, Economics & Political Science
- ☐ Computer Science & Mathematics
- ☐ Psychology & Education
- ☐ Agriculture & Food Science
- ☐ Biology, Environmental Science & Geography
- ☐ Humanities
- ☐ Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

4 I was born in (year)

\_\_\_\_\_

5 I am:

- ☐ A woman      ☐ A man      ☐ Other

**5a (Filter If checked "Other"):** One aim of this study is to construct a gender diversity index which operates with a binary gender variable, despite other identities in-between. If you prefer not to identify with either woman or man, some sections of this questionnaire can't be used. However, we encourage you to respond to all items in any case, contributing to the overall picture of your team.

- ☐ I would tend to identify as a woman
- ☐ I would tend to identify as a man
- ☐ Neither

## Section B – You and your team

[Anonymous] If you are unsure regarding the team this questionnaire refers to, please get in touch with the person from your organization who forwarded you our email (containing the URL to this survey).

[Personalized] If you are unclear to which team you belong for this questionnaire, please consult with our team contact person, #u\_t\_team\_contact#.

### 6 How much of your work time do you dedicate to your team?

- ☐ < 20%
- ☐ 20 - 39%
- ☐ 40 - 59%
- ☐ 60 - 79%
- ☐ 80 - 100%

### 7 In which year did you join your team?

\_\_\_\_\_

### 8 Which of the following best describes your primary, current role in the team?

- ☐ MA Student
- ☐ PhD Student
- ☐ Research or lab assistant / technician
- ☐ Postdoc / Junior researcher
- ☐ Senior researcher
- ☐ Team leader
- ☐ Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

### 9 How often and by which means do you normally communicate with your team colleagues?

	Never	Once per month or less	Once per week or less	A few times per week	Once per day or more
Formal project team meetings with the majority of team members					
Memos or written reports of any kind					
Making an appointment with one or several team member(s)					
Telephone, skype calls, chats, email					
Informal or unplanned discussion (e.g. just stopping by, in the hall, over coffee)					

### 10 To which extent do you think that you can influence your team members?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
I have preferential position in my team and I can easily influence the other team members					
I have the resources and power to influence the actions of the other team members					
I have more power within my team compared to the other team members.					

### 11 How would you characterise the working climate within your team?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
I am clear about what my team's objectives are					
I am in agreement with the team's objectives					
The team's objectives are clearly understood by other members of the team					
The team's objectives can actually be achieved					
The team's objectives are worthwhile to the organisation					
We keep each other informed about work-related issues in the team					
There are real attempts to share information throughout the team					
We have a 'we are in it together' attitude					
We are prepared to question the basis of what the team is doing					
We critically appraise potential weaknesses in what we are doing in order to achieve the best possible outcome					
We build on each other's ideas in order to achieve the best possible outcome					
We are always searching for fresh, new ways of looking at problems					
We take the time needed to develop new ideas					
We co-operate in order to help each other and apply new ideas					

**12 Filter (from question 15): If you are not the team leader: Please assess your team leaders' leadership style.**

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
She/he develops ways of motivating us					
I feel proud to work with her/him					
I have trust in her/his ability to overcome any obstacle					
She/he is concerned with training those who need it					
She/he gives advice to those who need it					
She/he gets us to rely on reasoning and evidence to solve problems					
She/he promotes the use of intelligence to overcome obstacles					
She/he presents things through an approach that stimulates me					
She/he has realistic expectations on the outcome of my work					
She/he has realistic expectations on the time schedule I need for my work					
She/he actively fosters trust, involvement and cooperation among team members					

**13 How would you characterise the working climate at your wider working environment?**

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
Senior employees respect junior male and female employees equally					
In meetings, people pay just as much attention when women speak as when men speak					
Allegations of gender based and sexual harassment are taken seriously by management					
In this organisation, I would feel comfortable to raise issues about the treatment of women or men					



**14 Is there any senior member within your team whom you currently regard as a mentor —someone who gives advice and counsel on career issues and/or sponsors or advocates for you?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

**14a (Filter from question 14) My mentor is**

- ☐ A man
- ☐ A women

**14b (Filter (from question 14). Please indicate the level of mentoring you currently receive by your mentor (check all that apply).**

- ☐ Serves as a role model
- ☐ Gives advice on my research directions
- ☐ Introduces me to his/her professional networks
- ☐ Advises about preparation for advancement (e.g. promotion, leadership position)
- ☐ Informs me about laboratory / institute / organisational politics
- ☐ Helps to obtain resources (funding, grants, etc.) that I need
- ☐ Acts as an advocate for me
- ☐ Provides advice on work-life balance
- ☐ Other, please specify

## **Section C – Professional situation and career**

**15 What type of contract do you have?**

- ☐ Temporary / casual
- ☐ Permanent / tenured

**16 How many hours a week are you contracted for?**

- ☐ Less than 20 hours/ week
- ☐ 20 up to 35 hours/week
- ☐ More than 35 hours

**17 How many hours do you actually work per week in this job?**

- ☐ As many hours as I am contracted for
- ☐ 1-5 hours more than I am contracted for
- ☐ 6-10 hours more than I am contracted for
- ☐ 11 hours or more than I am contracted for

**18 How many years of experience do you have in your research area (including PhD years if applicable)?**

- ☐ 2 years or less
- ☐ 3-5 years
- ☐ 6-9 years
- ☐ 10-19 years
- ☐ 20-29 years
- ☐ 30 years or more

**19 How much external funding have you raised as lead researcher since 1<sup>st</sup> January 2013 for your institution or your person?**

For projects involving several organizations, you need to be the lead researcher for your institution but not necessarily of the overall project.

- ☐ none
- ☐ less than 9999 EUR/ GBP / SEK
- ☐ 10 000 – 24 999 EUR / GBP / SEK
- ☐ 25 000 - 49 999 Euro / GBP / SEK
- ☐ 50 000 to -99 999 Euro / GBP / SEK
- ☐ 100 000 – 499 999 Euro / GBP / SEK
- ☐ more than 500 000 Euro / GBP / SEK

**20 How much of your weekly working time can you spend on average on activities that are geared towards publications and patents?**

- ☐ Publications/ patents are typically not part of my work
- ☐ < 20%
- ☐ 20 - 39%
- ☐ 40 - 59%
- ☐ 60 - 79%
- ☐ 80 - 100%

**21 Are you an editor to scientific journals that have an impact factor? If yes, to how many?**

- ☐ Yes, I am an editor to \_\_\_\_ scientific journal(s)
- ☐ No

**22 Are you a member of a management board of a professional or scientific association in your field? If yes, of how many?**

- ☐ Yes, I am member to \_\_\_\_ boards
- ☐ No

**23 Did you engage in any of the following dissemination and knowledge transfer**

**activities during the past year? Check all that apply.**

- ☐ Workshops and dissemination events for academic audiences
- ☐ Workshops and dissemination events for non-academic audiences (e.g. schools, teachers)
- ☐ Popular press (Radio, TV, Newspapers or Magazines)
- ☐ Social media including blogs for my professional work (on a regular basis)
- ☐ Science cafés, science festivals, reseachers' nights
  
- ☐ Other, please specify
- ☐ None of the above

**24 Have you “published” under open access schemes?**

- ☐ Yes, software under Open Source licenses
- ☐ Yes, data under open access
- ☐ Yes, scientific articles under open access
- ☐ Other, please specify
- ☐ None of the above

**25 Do you involve citizens in the discussion of the implications of your research?**

- ☐ On a regular basis
- ☐ Occasionally
- ☐ Never

## **Section D Personal information**

**26 Do you consider yourself to be a member of a minority ethnic group?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

**27 Do you consider yourself to have a disability or chronic illness?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

**28 Do you live with a partner (marriage, cohabitation, civil partnership, etc)?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

**29 Please share with us your opinion on the following statements.**

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
Women and men have their respective strengths in different areas					
Women and men generally have different ways of contributing to a team task					
Women and men generally have different communication styles					
Many of the widespread ideas about how women and men differ are accurate					

**30 Do you have/ have had care responsibilities for children under 16 years of age or for dependent adults? Select all that apply.**

- ☐ Yes, I currently have care responsibilities for children under 16 years
- ☐ Yes, I had care responsibilities in the past for children under 16 years but not anymore
- ☐ Yes, I currently care for dependent adults
- ☐ Yes, I had care responsibilities in the past for dependent adults but not anymore
- ☐ No I have never had any care responsibilities

**30a *Filter (from question 30): If you have/ have had care responsibilities:* To which extent do/did these care responsibilities affect your work?**

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ To some extent
- ☐ To a large extent

**30b Filter (from question 30a): If your care responsibilities affect/ affected your work : In which way do/did your care responsibilities affect your work? Select all that apply.**

- ☐ More than 6 months of interruption of my professional career (excluding maternity/paternity/parental leave)
- ☐ Less than 6 months of interruption of my professional career (excluding maternity/paternity/parental leave)
- ☐ I reduced my working hours slightly
- ☐ I reduced my working hours significantly
- ☐ My work schedules got much more fragmented
- ☐ Participation in travel related businesses (such as congresses) dropped
- ☐ The amount of my scientific papers/ patents dropped
- ☐ I quit my job
- ☐ Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ None of the above

**31 How many peer reviewed articles have you published since 1<sup>st</sup> January 2013?**

- ☐ 0
- ☐ 1-4
- ☐ 5-9
- ☐ 10 - 19
- ☐ 20 - 39
- ☐ 40 or more

**32 On how many European patents have you been named as an inventor since 1<sup>st</sup> January 2013 (including pending accepted applications)?**

- ☐ 0
- ☐ 1-4
- ☐ 5-9
- ☐ 10 - 19
- ☐ 20 - 39
- ☐ 40 or more

## Annex III – Overview of Recruitment Efforts 1<sup>st</sup> Wave

Table 9: Recruitment efforts Germany

Germany				
Public Sector / Academia				
Action		Time frame 2017	Invitations to survey	Response success (participation)
Author lists for Transport and (Bio-) Medical Engineering	Address and team verification	January - June	70 (Transportation <sup>8</sup> )	4
Mass e-mail to all identified authors in WoS file	Preparation and send out	June	1347 (BioMed) 480 (Transportation)	4
Further look up of relevant departments in Universities	Online team and address research and send out	May	50	No participation
Personal alumni contacts	Address research and send out	April to July	5	1
Private sector / Companies				
Action		Time frame	Invitation to survey	Response success (participation)
List of companies with patent applications - contact via partner VDE	Providing list by HFU, send out by VDE	January	22	No participation
Via contact e-mail lists VDE	Preparation of contact mail and send out	March to June	30	No participation
Looking up of responsible persons for gender diversity, contacts via VDE	Address verification and send out	July to September	15	No participation
Personal alumni contacts	Address research and send out	April to July	6	4

8 Medical Engineering directly via mass-email due to experience with very poor response success in field of Transportation in combination with too large amount of address data in Germany.

Table 10: Recruitment efforts Spain

Spain				
Public Sector / Academia				
Action		Time frame 2017	Invitations to survey	Response success (participation)
Verified team leader lists for Transport and (Bio-) Medical Engineering	Address and team verification	January-March	283 (Biomed) 258 (Transport)	40
Mass e-mail to all identified authors from WoS	Preparation and send out	-	-	
Further look up of relevant departments in Universities	Online team and address research and send out	January-March	(see above)	(see above)
Personal recruitment /networks	HR and gender equality officers of research centers and universities	April – August	50	24
Private sector / Companies				
Action		Time frame	Invitation to survey	Response success (participation)
List of companies with patent applications	Providing list by HFU	January	50 (Biomed) 28 (Transport)	10
Looking up of responsible persons for gender diversity Personal contacts	Address verification and send out  Telephone follow up	-  May – August	  (see above)	  (see above)
Other				

In Spain, the participation of one entire research institute with 17 groups was achieved. The survey was distributed to research groups through a collaborative agreement with the Human Resource department and Diversity Manager within the framework of a more extensive questionnaire. The original GEDII questionnaire was extended with several additional questions while preserving all original items used in the cross-country survey.

Table 11: Recruitment efforts UK

UK				
Public Sector / Academia				
Action		Time frame 2017	Invitations to survey	Response success (participation)
Verified team leader lists for Transport and (Bio-) Medical Engineering	Address and team verification	January - June	75 Teams (27 TP, 38 BM)	1 Team
Mass e-mail to all identified authors in the lists	Preparation and send out	May/June	4 771 authors (1073 TP, 3368 BM)	3 Teams
Equality officers and ATHENA SWAN contacts at Universities	Online team and address research and send out	May - August	14 universities	1 Team
Other	Recruitment at conferences, events and personal contacts	May - August	-	3 Teams
Private sector / Companies				
Action		Time frame	Invitation to survey	Response success (participation)
List of companies with patent applications	Contacts from WISE network	April - August	5 companies (4 TP, 1 BM)	none
	Address and team verification	February - August	59 companies (44 TP, 15 BM)	none



Table 12: Recruitment efforts Lithuania

Lithuania				
Public Sector / Academia				
Action		Time frame 2017	Invitations to survey	Response success (participation)
Author lists for Transport and (Bio-) Medical Engineering	Address and team verification	January - June	27 teams (11 TP, 16 BM)	6
Mass e-mail to all identified authors in the lists	Preparation and send out	June/July	635 authors	1
Private sector / Companies				
Action		Time frame	Invitation to survey	Response success (participation)
List of companies with patent	Providing list by HFU	no Lithuanian company in the list	-	-
Companies without patent	Research key companies and contact them	February - August	12 companies	1

Table 13: Recruitment efforts Sweden



Sweden				
Public Sector / Academia				
Action		Time frame 2017	Invitations to survey	Response success (participation)
Author lists for Transport and (Bio-) Medical Engineering	Address and team verification	May to October	98	0
Mass e-mail to all identified authors in the lists	Preparation and send out	May to October	1500	30
Further look up of relevant departments in Universities	Online team and address research and send out	n.a	n.a	n.a
Personal alumni contacts	Address research and send out	n.a	n.a	n.a
Private sector / Companies				
Action		Time frame 2017	Invitation to survey	Response success (participation)
List of companies with patent applications	Providing list by HFU	May to October	20	1
Looking up of responsible persons for gender diversity	Address verification and send out	May to October	n.a.	0
Personal alumni contacts	Address research and send out	n.a	n.a	n.a
Other				

## Annex IV – Example Bibliometric Performance Profile

Grp 999 Gedii Test


### GRP 999\_RESULTS - BIBLIOMETRIC INDICATORS

<b>NUMBER OF PAPERS (P)</b>	<b>69</b>
Number of papers (articles, letters and reviews) published by UoA "Grp 999_results" during 2008-2016.	
<b>NUMBER OF FRACTIONALIZED PAPERS (Frac P)</b>	<b>11.0</b>
Sum of author fractionalized papers.	
<b>CITATIONS PER PAPER (CPP)</b>	<b>8.9</b>
Number of citations per paper.	
<b>JOURNAL NORMALIZED CITATION SCORE (NCSj)</b>	<b>0.99</b>
CPP normalized in relation to the UoA "Grp 999_results" journal set (average=1.00).	
<b>NORMALIZED JOURNAL CITATION SCORE (NJCS)</b>	<b>1.26</b>
The impact of the journal set normalized in relation to its sub-fields (average=1.00).	
<b>FIELD NORMALIZED CITATION SCORE (NCSf)</b>	<b>1.31</b>
CPP normalized in relation to the UoA "Grp 999_results" sub-field set (average=1.00).	
<b>SUM OF FIELD NORMALIZED CITATION SCORE (Sum NCSf)</b>	<b>14.4</b>
NCSf times Frac P.	
<b>TOP 5 % (TOP5%)</b>	<b>8.52</b>
Percentage of papers above the 95th citation percentile.	




## GRP 999\_RESULTS - BIBLIOMETRIC INDICATORS

<b>HIRSCH INDEX (h-index)</b>	<b>14</b>
The h number papers that have at least h citations each.	
<b>AUTHOR MEAN (AUm)</b>	<b>8.1</b>
Mean number of authors per paper.	
<b>INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION MEAN (IntCOLLm)</b>	<b>1.5</b>
Mean number of countries per paper.	



Citation profile: The distribution of field normalized citation score for Grp 999\_results (bars) compared with all papers from all groups (7477) (line).

## GRP 999\_RESULTS - PUBLICATION PROFILE



The map shows papers (nodes) published by Grp 999\_results.  
Relations (edges) are based on bibliographic coupling.  
Most frequent keywords are displayed for groups of related papers.  
Papers with high field normalized citation score (>3) are marked with a pink border.

## MOST FREQUENT JOURNALS

IEEE T MED IMAGING (6)  
RADIOLOGY (5)  
PROSTATE (3)  
MED PHYS (3)  
MED IMAGE ANAL (3)  
HISTOPATHOLOGY (3)  
IEEE T BIO-MED ENG (2)  
EUR RADIOL (2)  
AM J CLIN PATHOL (2)  
WOUND REPAIR REGEN (1)  
VACCINE (1)  
ULTRASOUND MED BIOL (1)

## MOST FREQUENT COLLABORATORS


RADBOUD UNIV NIMEGEN (128)  
BARCELONA UNIV (8)  
COMP VIS CTR (6)  
RADBOUD UNIV NIMEGEN MED CTR (4)  
MED CTR UNIV (4)  
HOSP GERMANS TRIAS & PUJOL UNIV (4)  
FRAUNHOFER MEVIS (4)  
TWEENTE UNIV (3)  
MAASTRICHT UNIV (3)  
HOSP BADALONA GERMANS TRIAS & PUJOL (3)  
GRONINGEN UNIV (3)  
GIRONA UNIV (3)

## MOST FREQUENT SUBFIELDS

RADIOLOGY, NUCLEAR MEDICINE & MEDICAL IMAGING (26)  
ENGINEERING (15)  
COMPUTER SCIENCE (11)  
PATHOLOGY (10)  
ONCOLOGY (9)  
CELL BIOLOGY (8)  
IMAGING SCIENCE & PHOTOGRAPHIC TECHNOLOGY (6)  
UROLOGY & NEPHROLOGY (4)  
ENDOCRINOLOGY & METABOLISM (4)  
SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY - OTHER TOPICS (3)  
RESEARCH & EXPERIMENTAL MEDICINE (3)  
OBSTETRICS & GYNECOLOGY (3)

Grp 999 Gedii Test

## GRP 999\_RESULTS - COLLABORATION NETWORK



## Annex V – Descriptive Statistics of Survey Results

**Sandra Klatt, Wiebke Kronsbein**

Three different questionnaires have been created within the survey: a team contact questionnaire, a “personalized” survey for team members and an “anonymous” survey for team members (see methodology for details).

	Team contact		Personalized		Anonymous		Anonymous 2 <sup>9</sup>		Total <sup>10</sup>
Total Sample	159		1686		1430		176		3292
Reached Entry Page	128		1241		230		86		1557
Complete (code 31, 32, 33, 34)	128		1123		170		64		1357
Not finished (code 22)	-		118		60		22		200

Table 14: Field statistics retrieved from Unipark

The total sample of recruited teams is 159 groups summing a total of 3292 team members. This pool comprises all team members whose group leader agreed to participate in our survey, facilitating the respective member names. Invitation emails were sent to all 3292 individuals out of which 1557 visited at least the entry page of the survey. A total of 1357 team members completed the survey, yielding an overall response rate of 47.3%. Noteworthy is the difference in initial responses between the “personalized” vs “anonymous” survey format: whereas the response rate – in terms of visiting at least the entry page of the survey – for the “personalized” version is roughly 73%, the response rate for the anonymous is rather low at 20%. Most respondents dropped out at the early stage of questionnaire: about a third dropped out on the introduction page, another third on the first two pages (“getting started”, “you and your team”) of the survey.

The survey was available online from March 2017 until 31st of January 2018.

The following descriptive statistics present tables for the variables of the questionnaires.

<sup>9</sup> Numbers refer to members of research groups only, excluding administrative staff.

<sup>10</sup>Excluding Team contact column.

## Responses per Country x Gender (v\_7R)

Countries of the first wave Germany, UK, Lithuania, Spain and Sweden have responses as follows. Gender has been recodified.

Country	5. I am (gender)			Total
	A woman	A man	Other	
Germany	40 48.2%	43 51.8%	0 0%	83 100%
UK	41 56.2%	32 43.8%	0 0%	73 100%
Lithuania	8 30.8%	18 69.2%	0 0%	26 100%
Spain	184 35.9%	329 64.1%	0 0%	513 100%
Sweden	138 48.9%	144 51.1%	0 0%	282 100%



Spain had the most responses (513), followed by Sweden (282). To extent the number of responses, the survey was extended in a second wave to further countries:

Country	5. I am (gender)			Total
	A woman	A man	Other	
Austria	1 100%	0 0%	0 0%	1 100%
Belgium	11 55%	9 45%	0 0%	20 100%
Czech Republic	0 0%	2 100%	0 0%	2 100%
Denmark	17 45.9%	20 54.1%	0 0%	37 100%
Finland	4 66.7%	2 33.3%	0 0%	6 100%
France	5 38.5%	8 61.5%	0 0%	13 100%
Italy	23 34.3%	44 65.7%	0 0%	67 100%
Netherlands	38 42.2%	52 57.8%	0 0%	90 100%
Norway	27 77.1%	8 22.9%	0 0%	35 100%
Poland	6 75%	2 25%	0 0%	8 100%
Portugal	4 18.2%	18 81.8%	0 0%	22 100%
Switzerland	30 38.5%	48 61.5%	0 0%	78 100%

The Netherlands (90), Switzerland (78) and Italy (67) obtained the most responses in the second wave. In contrast, the total numbers per country show that the distribution of the survey was not very successful in the Austria, Czech Republic, Finland and Poland. The following figure illustrates the distribution of responses by country.




Figure 3: Responses by country GEDII survey

## Team Member Questionnaire

### Highest level of education (v\_4R)

#### 2. Which is your highest level of education?

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Secondary education	10	0.74	0.74	0.74
Bachelor	79	5.82	5.82	6.56
Master or equivalent postgraduate qualification	541	39.87	39.87	46.43
Doctorate or higher	727	53.57	53.57	100.00
Other, please specify:	0	0.00	0.00	100.00
missing	0	0.00		

total N=1357 · valid N=1357 ·  $\bar{X}$ =3.46 ·  $\sigma$ =0.64

### Discipline of highest qualification (v\_5R)

The survey targeted researchers in the fields of medical engineering and transportation. Consequently, 44% of the respondents gained their highest qualification in the discipline of chemistry, physics and engineering, followed by 26% in life science and medical science.

#### 3. In which discipline did you obtain your highest qualification?

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Chemistry, Physics & Engineering	596	43.92	44.02	44.02
Life Science & Medical Science	348	25.64	25.70	69.72
Sociology, Economics & Political Science	110	8.11	8.12	77.84
Computer Science & Mathematics	122	8.99	9.01	86.85
Psychology & Education	52	3.83	3.84	90.69
Agriculture & Food Science	7	0.52	0.52	91.21
Biology, Environmental Science & Geography	101	7.44	7.46	98.67
Humanities	18	1.33	1.33	100.00
missing	3	0.22		

total N=1357 · valid N=1354 ·  $\bar{X}$ =2.41 ·  $\sigma$ =1.87

### Age (v\_6)

The mean (average) age of the participants is 38 years, the median is 36 years. The majority of the survey participants is between 25-33 years old, which reflects the age of a typical PhD student.




Figure 4: Age distribution team members

##	Min.	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max.	NA's
##	23.00	30.00	36.00	38.05	44.00	93.00	2

### Gender (v\_7)

Gender distribution of respondents is slightly higher for man (57%) than for women (42%). However, the overall participation of women and men was relatively balanced.

#### 5. I am (gender)

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
A woman	574	42.30	42.30	42.30
A man	778	57.33	57.33	99.63
Other	5	0.37	0.37	100.00
missing	0	0.00		

total N=1357 · valid N=1357 ·  $\bar{X}=1.58$  ·  $\sigma=0.50$

## Gender (v\_7R - recodified)

### 5. I am (gender)

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
A woman	577	42.52	42.55	42.55
A man	779	57.41	57.45	100.00
Other	0	0.00	0.00	100.00
missing	1	0.07		

total N=1357 · valid N=1356 ·  $\bar{X}=1.57$  ·  $\sigma=0.49$

## Gender and highest education level (v\_4R x v\_7R)

The shares of women and men are more or less equally distributed between the different education levels.

2. Which is your highest level of education?	5. I am (gender)			Total
	A woman	A man	Other	
Secondary education	5 0.9%	5 0.6%	0 0%	10 0.7%
Bachelor	43 7.5%	36 4.6%	0 0%	79 5.8%
Master or equivalent postgraduate qualification	226 39.2%	314 40.3%	0 0%	540 39.8%
Doctorate or higher	303 52.5%	424 54.4%	0 0%	727 53.6%
Other, please specify:	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
<b>Total</b>	577 100%	779 100%	0 100%	1356 100%

$\chi^2=5.122$  ·  $df=3$  · Cramer's V=0.061 · Fisher's p=0.165

### Team tenure (v\_11)

Team tenure was calculated based upon the question: “In which year did you join your team?” As can be seen from the distribution shown below, short term membership up to 3-4 years are the most frequent option, which larger membership patterns becoming more and more rare. The mean team tenure is 6.651 years, the median value is 4 years.




Figure 5: Distribution of team tenure in years

Summary statistics:

##	Min.	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max.	NA's
##	0.000	3.000	4.000	6.651	9.000	38.000	20

### *Dedication to team (v\_10)*

#### 6. How much of your work time do you dedicate to your team?

<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw %</i>	<i>valid %</i>	<i>cumulative %</i>
< 20%	242	17.83	17.99	17.99
20 - 39%	316	23.29	23.49	41.49
40 - 59%	272	20.04	20.22	61.71
60 - 79%	189	13.93	14.05	75.76
80 - 100%	326	24.02	24.24	100.00
missing	12	0.88		

*total N=1357 • valid N=1345 •  $\bar{X}$ =3.03 •  $\sigma$ =1.44*

*Dedication to team and gender (v\_10 x v\_7R)*

6. How much of your work time do you dedicate to your team?	5. I am (gender)			Total
	A woman	A man	Other	
< 20%	111	131	0	242
	45.9%	54.1%	0%	100%
	19.4%	16.9%	0%	18%
	8.3%	9.7%	0%	18%
20 - 39%	139	177	0	316
	44%	56%	0%	100%
	24.3%	22.9%	0%	23.5%
	10.3%	13.2%	0%	23.5%
40 - 59%	106	166	0	272
	39%	61%	0%	100%
	18.6%	21.5%	0%	20.2%
	7.9%	12.4%	0%	20.3%
60 - 79%	77	112	0	189
	40.7%	59.3%	0%	100%
	13.5%	14.5%	0%	14.1%
	5.7%	8.3%	0%	14%
80 - 100%	138	187	0	325
	42.5%	57.5%	0%	100%
	24.2%	24.2%	0%	24.2%
	10.3%	13.9%	0%	24.2%
Total	571	773	0	1344
	42.5%	57.5%	0%	100%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	42.5%	57.5%	0%	100%
$\chi^2=3.035 \cdot df=4 \cdot \text{Cramer's } V=0.048 \cdot p=0.552$				



Overall, men on average can dedicate more time to their team than women.




Figure 6: Working time dedicated to team by gender

### Current role (v\_12R)

The majority (34%) of the survey participants are currently in the position of a PhD student within their team, followed by 21% of senior researchers and 19% of post docs or junior researchers.

#### 8. Which of the following best describes your primary, current role in the team?

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
MA Student	32	2.36	2.38	2.38
PhD Student	451	33.24	33.58	35.96
Research or lab assistant / technician	162	11.94	12.06	48.03
Postdoc / Junior researcher	254	18.72	18.91	66.94
Senior researcher	284	20.93	21.15	88.09
Team leader	160	11.79	11.91	100.00
Other, please specify:	0	0.00	0.00	100.00
missing	14	1.03		

total N=1357 • valid N=1343 •  $\bar{X}$ =3.59 •  $\sigma$ =1.48

### Current role and gender (v\_12R x v\_7R)

The role in their team is approximately equally distributed among women and men; women have a higher share in the function of a research/ lab assistant.

8. Which of the following best describes your primary, current role in the team?	5. I am (gender)		Total
	A woman	A man	
MA Student	14 2.5%	18 2.3%	32 2.4%
PhD Student	178 31.3%	273 35.3%	451 33.6%
Research or lab assistant / technician	93 16.3%	69 8.9%	162 12.1%
Postdoc / Junior researcher	112 19.7%	142 18.4%	254 18.9%
Senior researcher	112 19.7%	171 22.1%	283 21.1%
Team leader	60 10.5%	100 12.9%	160 11.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>569 100%</b>	<b>773 100%</b>	<b>1342 100%</b>
$\chi^2=19.347 \cdot df=5 \cdot \text{Cramer's } V=0.120 \cdot p=0.002$			

### Communication with your team (v\_13 to v\_17)

The following figure shows that the communication of the research teams is dominated by informal or unplanned discussions (v\_17). Most teams talk to their team members spontaneously and informally once a day or at least a few times a week. Formal project meetings with the majority of the team or appointments with several team members are typically scheduled not more than once per week or even once per month. The following graphic provides an overview of all item:




Figure 7: Communication within the team

### Formal project team meetings (v\_13)

Formal project team meetings with the majority of team members				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Never	66	4.86	4.92	4.92
Once per month or less	568	41.86	42.36	47.28
Once per week or less	533	39.28	39.75	87.02
A few times per week	139	10.24	10.37	97.39
Once per day or more	35	2.58	2.61	100.00
missing	16	1.18		
total N=1357 · valid N=1341 · $\bar{X}$ =2.63 · $\sigma$ =0.83				

### Memos or written reports (v\_14)

Memos or written reports of any kind				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Never	194	14.30	14.69	14.69
Once per month or less	622	45.84	47.09	61.77
Once per week or less	306	22.55	23.16	84.94
A few times per week	165	12.16	12.49	97.43
Once per day or more	34	2.51	2.57	100.00
missing	36	2.65		
total N=1357 · valid N=1321 · $\bar{X}$ =2.41 · $\sigma$ =0.97				

### Making appointments with one or several team member(s) (v\_15)

Making an appointment with one or several team member(s)				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Never	34	2.51	2.56	2.56
Once per month or less	321	23.66	24.15	26.71
Once per week or less	487	35.89	36.64	63.36
A few times per week	399	29.40	30.02	93.38
Once per day or more	88	6.48	6.62	100.00
missing	28	2.06		
total N=1357 · valid N=1329 · $\bar{X}$ =3.14 · $\sigma$ =0.94				

### Telephone, skype calls, chats, email (v\_16)

Telephone, skype calls, chats, email				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Never	41	3.02	3.06	3.06
Once per month or less	158	11.64	11.79	14.85
Once per week or less	244	17.98	18.21	33.06
A few times per week	493	36.33	36.79	69.85
Once per day or more	404	29.77	30.15	100.00
missing	17	1.25		
total N=1357 · valid N=1340 · $\bar{X}$ =3.79 · $\sigma$ =1.09				

*Informal or unplanned discussion (e.g. just stopping by, in the hall, over coffee) (v17)*

<b>Informal or unplanned discussion (e.g. just stopping by, in the hall, over coffee)</b>				
<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw %</i>	<i>valid %</i>	<i>cumulative %</i>
Never	39	2.87	2.91	2.91
Once per month or less	101	7.44	7.53	10.43
Once per week or less	183	13.49	13.64	24.07
A few times per week	433	31.91	32.27	56.33
Once per day or more	586	43.18	43.67	100.00
missing	15	1.11		
<i>total N=1357 · valid N=1342 · <math>\bar{X}</math>=4.06 · <math>\sigma</math>=1.06</i>				

### Influence on other team members (v\_143, v\_144, v\_145)




Figure 8: Power disparity

### Preferential position (v\_143)

I have preferential position in my team and I can easily influence the other team members				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	104	7.66	7.72	7.72
Disagree	334	24.61	24.80	32.52
Undecided	385	28.37	28.58	61.10
Agree	412	30.36	30.59	91.69
Strongly agree	112	8.25	8.31	100.00
missing	10	0.74		

total N=1357 · valid N=1347 ·  $\bar{X}$ =3.07 ·  $\sigma$ =1.09

### Resources and power to influence the team (v\_144)

I have the resources and power to influence the actions of the other team members				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	119	8.77	8.87	8.87
Disagree	334	24.61	24.91	33.78
Undecided	386	28.45	28.78	62.57
Agree	420	30.95	31.32	93.89
Strongly agree	82	6.04	6.11	100.00
missing	16	1.18		
total N=1357 · valid N=1341 · $\bar{X}$ =3.01 · $\sigma$ =1.08				

### More power within the team (v\_145)

I have more power within my team compared to the other team members.				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	224	16.51	16.73	16.73
Disagree	467	34.41	34.88	51.61
Undecided	332	24.47	24.79	76.40
Agree	228	16.80	17.03	93.43
Strongly agree	88	6.48	6.57	100.00
missing	18	1.33		
total N=1357 · valid N=1339 · $\bar{X}$ =2.62 · $\sigma$ =1.14				



*Preferential position and gender (v\_143 x v\_7R)*

5. I am (gender)	I have preferential position in my team and I can easily influence the other team members					Total
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree	
A woman	57 9.9%	157 27.4%	174 30.3%	148 25.8%	38 6.6%	574 100%
A man	47 6.1%	177 22.9%	210 27.2%	264 34.2%	74 9.6%	772 100%
<b>Total</b>	104 7.7%	334 24.8%	384 28.5%	412 30.6%	112 8.3%	1346 100%

$\chi^2=21.096 \cdot df=4 \cdot \text{Cramer's } V=0.125 \cdot p=0.000$

*Resources and power to influence the team and gender (v\_144 x v\_7R)*

5. I am (gender)	I have the resources and power to influence the actions of the other team members					Total
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree	
A woman	57 10%	146 25.6%	170 29.8%	171 30%	26 4.6%	570 100%
A man	62 8.1%	188 24.4%	216 28.1%	248 32.2%	56 7.3%	770 100%
<b>Total</b>	119 8.9%	334 24.9%	386 28.8%	419 31.3%	82 6.1%	1340 100%

$\chi^2=6.391 \cdot df=4 \cdot \text{Cramer's } V=0.069 \cdot p=0.172$

More power within the team and gender (v\_145 x v\_7R)

5. I am (gender)	I have more power within my team compared to the other team members.					Total
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree	
A woman	114 20%	209 36.6%	136 23.8%	81 14.2%	31 5.4%	571 100%
A man	110 14.3%	257 33.5%	196 25.6%	147 19.2%	57 7.4%	767 100%
<b>Total</b>	224 16.7%	466 34.8%	332 24.8%	228 17%	88 6.6%	1338 100%
$\chi^2=14.240 \cdot df=4 \cdot \text{Cramer's } V=0.103 \cdot p=0.007$						

### Team climate (v\_151 to v\_164)




Figure 9: Team climate question items

### Clear about team's objectives (v\_151)

I am clear about what my team's objectives are

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	10	0.74	0.74	0.74
Disagree	69	5.08	5.10	5.84
Undecided	115	8.47	8.51	14.35
Agree	819	60.35	60.58	74.93
Strongly agree	339	24.98	25.07	100.00
missing	5	0.37		

total N=1357 · valid N=1352 ·  $\bar{X}$ =4.04 ·  $\sigma$ =0.78

### Agreement with the team's objectives (v\_152)

I am in agreement with the team's objectives

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	6	0.44	0.44	0.44
Disagree	38	2.80	2.82	3.26
Undecided	157	11.57	11.64	14.90
Agree	814	59.99	60.34	75.24
Strongly agree	334	24.61	24.76	100.00
missing	8	0.59		

total N=1357 · valid N=1349 ·  $\bar{X}$ =4.06 ·  $\sigma$ =0.72

*Team's objectives are clearly understood by other team members (v\_153)*

**The team's objectives are clearly understood by other members of the team**

<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw %</i>	<i>valid %</i>	<i>cumulative %</i>
Strongly disagree	14	1.03	1.04	1.04
Disagree	81	5.97	6.02	7.06
Undecided	295	21.74	21.92	28.97
Agree	775	57.11	57.58	86.55
Strongly agree	181	13.34	13.45	100.00
missing	11	0.81		

*total N=1357 · valid N=1346 ·  $\bar{X}$ =3.76 ·  $\sigma$ =0.80*

*Team's objectives can be achieved (v\_154)*

**The team's objectives can actually be achieved**

<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw %</i>	<i>valid %</i>	<i>cumulative %</i>
Strongly disagree	7	0.52	0.52	0.52
Disagree	42	3.10	3.11	3.63
Undecided	226	16.65	16.73	20.36
Agree	855	63.01	63.29	83.64
Strongly agree	221	16.29	16.36	100.00
missing	6	0.44		

*total N=1357 · valid N=1351 ·  $\bar{X}$ =3.92 ·  $\sigma$ =0.70*

*Team's objectives are worthwhile to the organisation (v\_155)*

The team's objectives are worthwhile to the organisation				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	7	0.52	0.52	0.52
Disagree	26	1.92	1.94	2.46
Undecided	183	13.49	13.66	16.12
Agree	716	52.76	53.43	69.55
Strongly agree	408	30.07	30.45	100.00
missing	17	1.25		
total N=1357 · valid N=1340 · $\bar{X}$ =4.11 · $\sigma$ =0.74				

*Keep each other informed about work-related issues in the team (v\_156)*

We keep each other informed about work-related issues in the team				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	20	1.47	1.49	1.49
Disagree	102	7.52	7.58	9.06
Undecided	187	13.78	13.89	22.96
Agree	737	54.31	54.75	77.71
Strongly agree	300	22.11	22.29	100.00
missing	11	0.81		
total N=1357 · valid N=1346 · $\bar{X}$ =3.89 · $\sigma$ =0.89				

*Real attempts to share information throughout the team (v\_157)*

There are real attempts to share information throughout the team				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	20	1.47	1.48	1.48
Disagree	78	5.75	5.78	7.26
Undecided	184	13.56	13.64	20.90
Agree	708	52.17	52.48	73.39
Strongly agree	359	26.46	26.61	100.00
missing	8	0.59		
total N=1357 · valid N=1349 · $\bar{X}$ =3.97 · $\sigma$ =0.88				

*'We are in it together' attitude (v\_158)*

We have a 'we are in it together' attitude				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	31	2.28	2.30	2.30
Disagree	127	9.36	9.43	11.73
Undecided	268	19.75	19.90	31.63
Agree	634	46.72	47.07	78.69
Strongly agree	287	21.15	21.31	100.00
missing	10	0.74		
total N=1357 · valid N=1347 · $\bar{X}$ =3.76 · $\sigma$ =0.97				

*Prepared to question the basis of what the team is doing (v\_159)*

We are prepared to question the basis of what the team is doing				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	24	1.77	1.78	1.78
Disagree	110	8.11	8.18	9.96
Undecided	345	25.42	25.65	35.61
Agree	713	52.54	53.01	88.62
Strongly agree	153	11.27	11.38	100.00
missing	12	0.88		
total N=1357 · valid N=1345 · $\bar{X}$ =3.64 · $\sigma$ =0.85				

*Critical appraisal of potential weaknesses in what they do (v\_160)*

We critically appraise potential weaknesses in what we are doing in order to achieve the best possible outcome				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	21	1.55	1.56	1.56
Disagree	98	7.22	7.26	8.82
Undecided	314	23.14	23.28	32.10
Agree	728	53.65	53.97	86.06
Strongly agree	188	13.85	13.94	100.00
missing	8	0.59		
total N=1357 · valid N=1349 · $\bar{X}$ =3.71 · $\sigma$ =0.85				



### *Building on each other's ideas (v\_161)*

<b>We build on each other's ideas in order to achieve the best possible outcome</b>				
<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw %</i>	<i>valid %</i>	<i>cumulative %</i>
Strongly disagree	13	0.96	0.97	0.97
Disagree	81	5.97	6.04	7.00
Undecided	197	14.52	14.68	21.68
Agree	757	55.78	56.41	78.09
Strongly agree	294	21.67	21.91	100.00
missing	15	1.11		
<i>total N=1357 · valid N=1342 · <math>\bar{X}</math>=3.92 · <math>\sigma</math>=0.83</i>				

### *Searching for fresh, new ways of looking at problems (v\_162)*

<b>We are always searching for fresh, new ways of looking at problems</b>				
<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw %</i>	<i>valid %</i>	<i>cumulative %</i>
Strongly disagree	15	1.11	1.11	1.11
Disagree	92	6.78	6.80	7.91
Undecided	305	22.48	22.56	30.47
Agree	675	49.74	49.93	80.40
Strongly agree	265	19.53	19.60	100.00
missing	5	0.37		
<i>total N=1357 · valid N=1352 · <math>\bar{X}</math>=3.80 · <math>\sigma</math>=0.87</i>				

### *Taking the time needed to develop new ideas (v\_163)*

#### **We take the time needed to develop new ideas**

<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw %</i>	<i>valid %</i>	<i>cumulative %</i>
Strongly disagree	22	1.62	1.63	1.63
Disagree	179	13.19	13.26	14.89
Undecided	376	27.71	27.85	42.74
Agree	602	44.36	44.59	87.33
Strongly agree	171	12.60	12.67	100.00
missing	7	0.52		

*total N=1357 · valid N=1350 ·  $\bar{X}$ =3.53 ·  $\sigma$ =0.93*

### *Co-operation to help each other and apply new ideas (v\_164)*

#### **We co-operate in order to help each other and apply new ideas**

<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw %</i>	<i>valid %</i>	<i>cumulative %</i>
Strongly disagree	22	1.62	1.63	1.63
Disagree	62	4.57	4.59	6.22
Undecided	203	14.96	15.04	21.26
Agree	734	54.09	54.37	75.63
Strongly agree	329	24.24	24.37	100.00
missing	7	0.52		

*total N=1357 · valid N=1350 ·  $\bar{X}$ =3.95 ·  $\sigma$ =0.85*

### Team leaders' leadership style (v\_170 to v\_180)

The question was: "Please assess your team leaders' leadership style." Team leaders were not able to respond to this question.




Figure 10: Team leadership

### Motivation (v\_170)

She/he develops ways of motivating us				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	19	1.40	1.59	1.59
Disagree	103	7.59	8.63	10.23
Undecided	208	15.33	17.44	27.66
Agree	609	44.88	51.05	78.71
Strongly agree	254	18.72	21.29	100.00
missing	164	12.09		
total N=1357 · valid N=1193 · $\bar{X}$ =3.82 · $\sigma$ =0.92				

### Proud to work with the team leader (v\_171)

I feel proud to work with her/him				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	16	1.18	1.34	1.34
Disagree	43	3.17	3.61	4.95
Undecided	159	11.72	13.34	18.29
Agree	509	37.51	42.70	60.99
Strongly agree	465	34.27	39.01	100.00
missing	165	12.16		
total N=1357 · valid N=1192 · $\bar{X}$ =4.14 · $\sigma$ =0.88				

*Trust in the team leader's ability to overcome any obstacle (v\_172)*

<b>I feel proud to work with her/him</b>				
<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw %</i>	<i>valid %</i>	<i>cumulative %</i>
Strongly disagree	16	1.18	1.34	1.34
Disagree	43	3.17	3.61	4.95
Undecided	159	11.72	13.34	18.29
Agree	509	37.51	42.70	60.99
Strongly agree	465	34.27	39.01	100.00
missing	165	12.16		
<i>total N=1357 · valid N=1192 · <math>\bar{X}</math>=4.14 · <math>\sigma</math>=0.88</i>				

*Team leader's concern about training (v\_173)*

<b>She/he is concerned with training those who need it</b>				
<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw %</i>	<i>valid %</i>	<i>cumulative %</i>
Strongly disagree	26	1.92	2.18	2.18
Disagree	95	7.00	7.98	10.17
Undecided	221	16.29	18.57	28.74
Agree	565	41.64	47.48	76.22
Strongly agree	283	20.85	23.78	100.00
missing	167	12.31		
<i>total N=1357 · valid N=1190 · <math>\bar{X}</math>=3.83 · <math>\sigma</math>=0.95</i>				

*Team leader's advice (v\_174)*

She/he gives advice to those who need it				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	6	0.44	0.51	0.51
Disagree	54	3.98	4.55	5.05
Undecided	109	8.03	9.18	14.23
Agree	589	43.40	49.58	63.80
Strongly agree	430	31.69	36.20	100.00
missing	169	12.45		
total N=1357 · valid N=1188 · $\bar{X}$ =4.16 · $\sigma$ =0.81				

*Getting the team members to rely on reasoning and evidence (v\_175)*

She/he gets us to rely on reasoning and evidence to solve problems				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	7	0.52	0.59	0.59
Disagree	34	2.51	2.86	3.45
Undecided	160	11.79	13.46	16.90
Agree	606	44.66	50.97	67.87
Strongly agree	382	28.15	32.13	100.00
missing	168	12.38		
total N=1357 · valid N=1189 · $\bar{X}$ =4.11 · $\sigma$ =0.78				

*Promoting the use of intelligence to overcome obstacles (v\_176)*

She/he promotes the use of intelligence to overcome obstacles				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	7	0.52	0.59	0.59
Disagree	30	2.21	2.53	3.11
Undecided	144	10.61	12.12	15.24
Agree	622	45.84	52.36	67.59
Strongly agree	385	28.37	32.41	100.00
missing	169	12.45		
total N=1357 · valid N=1188 · $\bar{X}$ =4.13 · $\sigma$ =0.76				

*Presenting things through an approach that stimulates (v\_177)*

She/he presents things through an approach that stimulates me				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	24	1.77	2.02	2.02
Disagree	86	6.34	7.24	9.26
Undecided	269	19.82	22.64	31.90
Agree	523	38.54	44.02	75.93
Strongly agree	286	21.08	24.07	100.00
missing	169	12.45		
total N=1357 · valid N=1188 · $\bar{X}$ =3.81 · $\sigma$ =0.95				

### Realistic expectations on the outcome of work (v\_178)

She/he has realistic expectations on the outcome of my work				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	20	1.47	1.68	1.68
Disagree	73	5.38	6.15	7.83
Undecided	219	16.14	18.45	26.28
Agree	613	45.17	51.64	77.93
Strongly agree	262	19.31	22.07	100.00
missing	170	12.53		
total N=1357 · valid N=1187 · $\bar{X}$ =3.86 · $\sigma$ =0.89				

### Realistic expectations on time schedules (v\_179)

She/he has realistic expectations on the time schedule I need for my work				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	27	1.99	2.27	2.27
Disagree	124	9.14	10.43	12.70
Undecided	294	21.67	24.73	37.43
Agree	541	39.87	45.50	82.93
Strongly agree	203	14.96	17.07	100.00
missing	168	12.38		
total N=1357 · valid N=1189 · $\bar{X}$ =3.65 · $\sigma$ =0.96				



*Fostering trust, involvement and co-operation among team members (v\_180)*

She/he actively fosters trust, involvement and cooperation among team members

<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw %</i>	<i>valid %</i>	<i>cumulative %</i>
Strongly disagree	27	1.99	2.28	2.28
Disagree	85	6.26	7.17	9.45
Undecided	183	13.49	15.44	24.89
Agree	537	39.57	45.32	70.21
Strongly agree	353	26.01	29.79	100.00
missing	172	12.68		

*total N=1357 · valid N=1185 ·  $\bar{X}$ =3.93 ·  $\sigma$ =0.97*

### Working climate at the wider working environment (v\_186 to v\_189)




Figure 11: Working climate – all items

### Senior employees respect junior male and female employees equally (v\_186)

Senior employees respect junior male and female employees equally				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	11	0.81	0.81	0.81
Disagree	47	3.46	3.48	4.29
Undecided	125	9.21	9.25	13.55
Agree	534	39.35	39.53	53.07
Strongly agree	634	46.72	46.93	100.00
missing	6	0.44		
total N=1357 · valid N=1351 · $\bar{X}$ =4.28 · $\sigma$ =0.83				

#### Attention when women speak or when men speak (meetings) (v\_187)

In meetings, people pay just as much attention  
when women speak as when men speak

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	27	1.99	2.00	2.00
Disagree	70	5.16	5.19	7.19
Undecided	107	7.89	7.93	15.11
Agree	423	31.17	31.33	46.44
Strongly agree	723	53.28	53.56	100.00
missing	7	0.52		

total N=1357 · valid N=1350 ·  $\bar{X}$ =4.29 ·  $\sigma$ =0.96

#### Allegations of gender based or sexual harassment are taken seriously (v\_188)

Allegations of gender based and sexual harassment  
are taken seriously by management

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	13	0.96	0.97	0.97
Disagree	29	2.14	2.16	3.13
Undecided	332	24.47	24.74	27.87
Agree	414	30.51	30.85	58.72
Strongly agree	554	40.83	41.28	100.00
missing	15	1.11		

total N=1357 · valid N=1342 ·  $\bar{X}$ =4.09 ·  $\sigma$ =0.91

### Feeling comfortable to raise issues about the treatment of women or men (v\_189)

In this organisation, I would feel comfortable to raise issues about the treatment of women or men

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Strongly disagree	16	1.18	1.19	1.19
Disagree	48	3.54	3.57	4.77
Undecided	201	14.81	14.97	19.73
Agree	525	38.69	39.09	58.82
Strongly agree	553	40.75	41.18	100.00
missing	14	1.03		

total N=1357 · valid N=1343 ·  $\bar{X}$ =4.15 ·  $\sigma$ =0.89

### Mentoring

#### Senior team member as mentor (v\_63)

14. Is there any senior member within your team whom you currently regard as a mentor - someone who gives advice and counsel on career issues and/or sponsors or advocates for you?

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Yes	736	54.24	54.64	54.64
No	611	45.03	45.36	100.00
missing	10	0.74		

total N=1357 · valid N=1347 ·  $\bar{X}$ =1.45 ·  $\sigma$ =0.50

#### Gender of the mentored team member (v\_63 x v\_7R)

Taking the gender of the mentored team member into consideration, women have slightly fewer times a mentor (53%) than men (56%).

5. I am (gender)	14. Is there any senior member within your team whom you currently regard as a mentor – someone who gives advice and counsel on career issues and/or sponsors or advocates for you?		Total
	Yes	No	
A woman	302 52.5%	273 47.5%	575 100%
A man	434 56.3%	337 43.7%	771 100%
<b>Total</b>	736 54.7%	610 45.3%	1346 100%

$\chi^2=1.739 \cdot df=1 \cdot \varphi=0.037 \cdot p=0.187$

#### Gender of mentor (v\_64)

Asked about the gender of the mentor, 513 (65%) state that the mentor is a man, only 278 (35%) state that the mentor is a woman.

14a. My mentor is (gender)				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
A man	513	37.80	64.85	64.85
A woman	278	20.49	35.15	100.00
missing	566	41.71		

total N=1357 · valid N=791 ·  $\bar{X}=1.35$  ·  $\sigma=0.48$

### Level of mentoring (v\_70 to v\_79)




Figure 12: Level of mentoring - all items

### Role Model (v\_72)

Serves as a role model

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	948	69.86	69.86	69.86
quoted	409	30.14	30.14	100.00
missing	0	0.00		

total N=1357 · valid N=1357 ·  $\bar{X}$ =0.30 ·  $\sigma$ =0.46

### Advice on research (v\_73)

Gives advice on my research directions

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	72 4	53.3 5	53.3 5	53.35
quoted	63 3	46.6 5	46.6 5	100.00
missing	0	0.00		

total N=1357 · valid N=1357 ·  $\bar{X}$ =0.47 ·  $\sigma$ =0.50

### Introduction to his/her professional networks (v\_74)

Introduces me to his/her professional networks

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	98 2	72.3 7	72.3 7	72.37
quoted	37 5	27.6 3	27.6 3	100.00
missing	0	0.00		

total N=1357 · valid N=1357 ·  $\bar{X}$ =0.28 ·  $\sigma$ =0.45

### Advice about preparation for advancement (v\_75)

Advises about preparation for advancement  
(e.g. promotion, leadership position)

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	102 7	75.6 8	75.6 8	75.68
quoted	330 2	24.3 2	24.3 2	100.00
missing	0	0.00		

total N=1357 · valid N=1357 ·  $\bar{X}$ =0.24 ·  $\sigma$ =0.43

### Information about laboratory, institute, organisational politics (v\_76)

Informs me about laboratory / institute / organisational politics

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	979	72.14	72.14	72.14
quoted	378	27.86	27.86	100.00
missing	0	0.00		

total N=1357 · valid N=1357 ·  $\bar{X}$ =0.28 ·  $\sigma$ =0.45

### Help to obtain resources (v\_77)

Helps to obtain resources (funding, grants, etc.) that I need

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	936	68.98	68.98	68.98
quoted	421	31.02	31.02	100.00
missing	0	0.00		

total N=1357 · valid N=1357 ·  $\bar{X}$ =0.31 ·  $\sigma$ =0.46

### Acting as advocate (v\_78)

Acts as an advocate for me

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1094	80.62	80.62	80.62
quoted	263	19.38	19.38	100.00
missing	0	0.00		

total N=1357 · valid N=1357 ·  $\bar{X}$ =0.19 ·  $\sigma$ =0.40



### Advice on work-life balance (v\_79)

Provides advice on work-life balance				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1096	80.77	80.77	80.77
quoted	261	19.23	19.23	100.00
missing	0	0.00		

total N=1357 · valid N=1357 ·  $\bar{X}$ =0.19 ·  $\sigma$ =0.39

### Others (v\_70)

Other, please specify:				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1340	98.75	98.75	98.75
quoted	17	1.25	1.25	100.00
missing	0	0.00		

total N=1357 · valid N=1357 ·  $\bar{X}$ =0.01 ·  $\sigma$ =0.11

### Type of contract (v\_80)

15. What type of contract do you have?

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Temporary / casual	797	58.73	59.30	59.30
Permanent / tenured	547	40.31	40.70	100.00
missing	13	0.96		

total N=1357 · valid N=1344 ·  $\bar{X}$ =1.41 ·  $\sigma$ =0.49

### Type of contract and gender (v\_80 x v\_7R)

When taking gender into consideration, there is no difference between men and women regarding the %-shares of the type of contract.

15. What type of contract do you have?	5. I am (gender)		Total
	A woman	A man	
Temporary / casual	341 59.4%	456 59.3%	797 59.3%
Permanent / tenured	233 40.6%	313 40.7%	546 40.7%
<b>Total</b>	574 100%	769 100%	1343 100%

$\chi^2=0.000 \cdot df=1 \cdot \phi=0.001 \cdot p=1.000$

### Contracted hours (v\_81)

The majority, about 84%, have a full-time contract.

#### 16. How many hours a week are you contracted for?

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Less than 20 hours/ week (part time)	99	7.30	7.38	7.38
20 up to 35 hours/week (part time)	122	8.99	9.10	16.48
More than 35 hours (full time)	1120	82.54	83.52	100.00
missing	16	1.18		

total N=1357 · valid N=1341 ·  $\bar{X}$ =2.76 ·  $\sigma$ =0.57

### Contracted hours and gender (v\_81 x v\_7R)

When taking gender into consideration, more men (86%) than women (80%) have a full-time contract.

16 How many hours a week are you contracted for?				
5. I am (gender)				Total
	Less than 20 hours/ week (part time)	20 up to 35 hours/week (part time)	More than 35 hours (full time)	
A woman	47 8.2%	69 12%	457 79.8%	573 100%
A man	52 6.8%	53 6.9%	662 86.3%	767 100%
<b>Total</b>	99 7.4%	122 9.1%	1119 83.5%	1340 100%

$\chi^2=12.073 \cdot df=2 \cdot \text{Cramer's } V=0.095 \cdot p=0.002$

### Actual working hours (v\_82)

17. How many hours do you actually work per week in this job?

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
As many hours as I am contracted for	405	29.85	30.25	30.25
1-5 hours more than I am contracted for	379	27.93	28.30	58.55
6-10 hours more than I am contracted for	283	20.85	21.14	79.69
11 hours or more than I am contracted for	272	20.04	20.31	100.00
missing	18	1.33		

total N=1357 · valid N=1339 ·  $\bar{X}$ =2.32 ·  $\sigma$ =1.11

### Actual working hours and gender (v\_82 x v\_7R)

17. How many hours do you actually work per week in this job?					
5. I am (gender)	As many hours as I am contracted for	1-5 hours more than I am contracted for	6-10 hours more than I am contracted for	11 hours or more than I am contracted for	Total
A woman	203 35.7%	165 29%	112 19.7%	89 15.6%	569 100%
A man	202 26.3%	213 27.7%	171 22.2%	183 23.8%	769 100%
<b>Total</b>	405 30.3%	378 28.3%	283 21.2%	272 20.3%	1338 100%

$\chi^2=21.468 \cdot df=3 \cdot \text{Cramer's } V=0.127 \cdot p=0.000$

### Years of experience in research area (v\_83)

18. How many years of experience do you have  
in your research area (including PhD years if applicable)?

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
2 years or less	273	20.12	20.27	20.27
3-5 years	329	24.24	24.42	44.69
6-9 years	228	16.80	16.93	61.62
10-19 years	332	24.47	24.65	86.27
20-29 years	144	10.61	10.69	96.96
30 years or more	41	3.02	3.04	100.00
missing	10	0.74		

total N=1357 · valid N=1347 ·  $\bar{X}$ =2.90 ·  $\sigma$ =1.41

### *Raising of external funding*

The possible answers to the question of “How much external funding have you raised as lead researcher since 1st January 2013 for your institution or your person?” was slightly differently in dependence to the common currency in the country. Therefore, there is data about EUR (majority of data) and GBP.

### *Raising of external funding EUR (v\_84)*

19. (EUR) How much external funding have you raised as lead researcher since 1st January 2013 for your institution or your person?

<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw %</i>	<i>valid %</i>	<i>cumulative %</i>
none	691	50.92	53.03	53.03
less than 9999 EUR	101	7.44	7.75	60.78
10 000 - 24 999 EUR	83	6.12	6.37	67.15
25 000 - 49 999 Euro	67	4.94	5.14	72.29
50 000 - 99 999 Euro	66	4.86	5.07	77.36
100 000 - 499 999 Euro	162	11.94	12.43	89.79
more than 500 000 Euro	133	9.80	10.21	100.00
missing	54	3.98		

*total N=1357 · valid N=1303 ·  $\bar{X}$ =2.80 ·  $\sigma$ =2.27*

### Raising of external funds EUR and gender (v\_84 x v\_7R)

When taking gender into consideration, the share of women is slightly higher in the categories of raising funds up to 49,999 Euros, whereas in the categories from 50,000 Euros onwards it is reversed: the share of men is higher.

19. (EUR) How much external funding have you raised as lead researcher since 1st January 2013 for your institution or your person?	5. I am (gender)		Total
	A woman	A man	
none	295 42.8% 54.3%	395 57.2% 52%	690 100% 53%
less than 9999 EUR	48 47.5% 8.8%	53 52.5% 7%	101 100% 7.8%
10 000 - 24 999 EUR	43 51.8% 7.9%	40 48.2% 5.3%	83 100% 6.4%
25 000 - 49 999 Euro	29 43.3% 5.3%	38 56.7% 5%	67 100% 5.1%
50 000 - 99 999 Euro	26 39.4% 4.8%	40 60.6% 5.3%	66 100% 5.1%
100 000 - 499 999 Euro	55 34% 10.1%	107 66% 14.1%	162 100% 12.4%
more than 500 000 Euro	47 35.3% 8.7%	86 64.7% 11.3%	133 100% 10.2%
<b>Total</b>	543 41.7% 100%	759 58.3% 100%	1302 100% 100%
$\chi^2=11.641 \cdot df=6 \cdot \text{Cramer's } V=0.095 \cdot p=0.070$			

### Raising of external funding GBP (v\_208)

19. (UK) How much external funding have you raised as lead researcher since 1st January 2013 for your institution or your person?

<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw %</i>	<i>valid %</i>	<i>cumulative %</i>
none	17	1.25	77.27	77.27
less than 9999 GBP	2	0.15	9.09	86.36
10 000 - 24 999 GBP	0	0.00	0.00	86.36
25 000 - 49 999 GBP	0	0.00	0.00	86.36
50 000 - 99 999 GBP	2	0.15	9.09	95.45
100 000 - 499 999 GBP	0	0.00	0.00	95.45
more than 500 000 GBP	1	0.07	4.55	100.00
missing	1335	98.38		

*total N=1357 · valid N=22 ·  $\bar{X}$ =1.73 ·  $\sigma$ =1.67*



Raising of external funding GBP and gender (v\_208 x v\_7R)

19. (UK) How much external funding have you raised as lead researcher since 1st January 2013 for your institution or your person?	5. I am (gender)		Total
	A woman	A man	
none	12 70.6% 100%	5 29.4% 50%	17 100% 77.3%
less than 9999 GBP	0 0% 0%	2 100% 20%	2 100% 9.1%
10 000 - 24 999 GBP	0 0% 0%	0 0% 0%	0 100% 0%
25 000 - 49 999 GBP	0 0% 0%	0 0% 0%	0 100% 0%
50 000 - 99 999 GBP	0 0% 0%	2 100% 20%	2 100% 9.1%
100 000 - 499 999 GBP	0 0% 0%	0 0% 0%	0 100% 0%
more than 500 000 GBP	0 0% 0%	1 100% 10%	1 100% 4.5%
<b>Total</b>	12 54.5% 100%	10 45.5% 100%	22 100% 100%
$\chi^2=7.765 \cdot df=3 \cdot \text{Cramer's } V=0.594 \cdot \text{Fisher's } p=0.007$			

**Weekly working time on activities that are geared towards publications and patents (v\_85)**

Almost 29% of the participants spend 20% or less of their time on activities geared towards publications and patents, in contrast to 13% who dedicate 80% or more working time towards that goal. Only 8% of the participants state that work towards publications in terms of papers or patents is not considered part of their work.

20. How much of your weekly working time can you spend on average on activities that are geared towards publications and patents?

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
< 20%	389	28.67	28.84	28.84
20 - 39%	280	20.63	20.76	49.59
40 - 59%	219	16.14	16.23	65.83
60 - 79%	184	13.56	13.64	79.47
80 - 100%	171	12.60	12.68	92.14
Publications/ patents are typically not part of my work	106	7.81	7.86	100.00
missing	8	0.59		

total N=1357 • valid N=1349 •  $\bar{X}$ =2.84 •  $\sigma$ =1.64

Weekly working time on activities that are geared towards publications and patents and gender (v\_85 x v\_7R)

20. How much of your weekly working time can you spend on average on activities that are geared towards publications and patents?	5. I am (gender)		Total
	A woman	A man	
< 20%	162 41.8% 28.3%	226 58.2% 29.1%	388 100% 28.8%
20 - 39%	116 41.4% 20.3%	164 58.6% 21.1%	280 100% 20.8%
40 - 59%	88 40.2% 15.4%	131 59.8% 16.9%	219 100% 16.2%
60 - 79%	73 39.7% 12.8%	111 60.3% 14.3%	184 100% 13.6%
80 - 100%	66 38.6% 11.5%	105 61.4% 13.5%	171 100% 12.7%
Publications/ patents are typically not part of my work	67 63.2% 11.7%	39 36.8% 5%	106 100% 7.9%
<b>Total</b>	572 42.4% 100%	776 57.6% 100%	1348 100% 100%
$\chi^2=20.975 \cdot df=5 \cdot \text{Cramer's } V=0.125 \cdot p=0.001$			

### Editor of scientific journals that have an impact factor (v\_86)

21. Are you an editor of scientific journals  
that have an impact factor?  
If yes, to how many (next table v\_96)?

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
No	1224	90.20	90.67	90.67
Yes,	126	9.29	9.33	100.00
missing	7	0.52		
total N=1357 · valid N=1350 · $\bar{X}$ =1.09 · $\sigma$ =0.29				

### Editor: Numbers of scientific journals that have an impact factor (v\_96)

Yes				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
-99	1231	90.71	90.71	90.71
1	67	4.94	4.94	95.65
2	33	2.43	2.43	98.08
3	19	1.40	1.40	99.48
4	3	0.22	0.22	99.71
5	1	0.07	0.07	99.78
6	1	0.07	0.07	99.85
7	1	0.07	0.07	99.93
8	1	0.07	0.07	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =-89.64 · $\sigma$ =29.27				

### Memberships of a management board of a professional or scientific association (v\_87)

22. Are you a member of a management board of a professional or scientific association in your field?

If yes, to how many?

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
No	1114	82.09	82.70	82.70
Yes	233	17.17	17.30	100.00
missing	10	0.74		
total N=1357 · valid N=1347 · $\bar{X}$ =1.17 · $\sigma$ =0.38				

### Number of memberships of a management board of a professional or scientific association (v\_97)

Yes

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
-99	1136	83.71	83.71	83.71
1	125	9.21	9.21	92.93
2	60	4.42	4.42	97.42
3	22	1.62	1.62	99.04
4	7	0.52	0.52	99.56
5	4	0.29	0.29	99.85
6	2	0.15	0.15	100.00
10	1	0.07	0.07	93.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =1.34 · $\sigma$ =0.97				

*Involvement of citizens in the discussion of implications of research (v\_95)*


25. Do you involve citizens in the discussion  
of the implications of your research?

<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw</i> %	<i>valid</i> %	<i>cumulative</i> %
On a regular basis	145	10.69	10.78	10.78
Occasionally	688	50.70	51.15	61.93
Never	512	37.73	38.07	100.00
missing	12	0.88		

*total N=1357 · valid N=1345 ·  $\bar{X}$ =2.27 ·  $\sigma$ =0.64*

***Engagement in dissemination and knowledge transfer activities during the past year  
(v\_213 to v\_220)***

Asked about the engagement in dissemination and knowledge transfer activities during the past year, by far the most answers is noted for “workshops and dissemination events for academic audiences” with 937 answers (69%). The second most selected answer with 470 (35%) is “workshops and dissemination events for non-academic audiences (e.g. schools, teachers)”. The least selected activity is “social media including blogs for my professional work (on a regular basis) with 192 answers (14%). Finally, 261 answers (19%) state that they are not at all engaged in dissemination and transfer activities during the past year.



*Figure 13: Dissemination and knowledge transfer activities*

#### Workshops and dissemination events for academic audiences (v\_215)

##### Workshops and dissemination events for academic audiences

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	420	30.95	30.95	30.95
quoted	937	69.05	69.05	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.69 · $\sigma$ =0.46				

#### Workshops and dissemination events for non-academic audiences (v\_216)

##### Workshops and dissemination events for non-academic audiences (e.g. schools, teachers)

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	887	65.36	65.36	65.36
quoted	470	34.64	34.64	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.35 · $\sigma$ =0.48				

#### Popular press (v\_217)

##### Popular press (Radio, TV, Newspapers or Magazines)

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1082	79.73	79.73	79.73
quoted	275	20.27	20.27	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.20 · $\sigma$ =0.40				



### *Social media (v\_218)*

Social media including blogs  
for my professional work (on a regular basis)

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1165	85.85	85.85	85.85
quoted	192	14.15	14.15	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.14 · $\sigma$ =0.35				

### *Science cafés, science festivals, researchers' nights (v\_219)*

Science cafés, science festivals, researchers' nights

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1148	84.60	84.60	84.60
quoted	209	15.40	15.40	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.15 · $\sigma$ =0.36				

### *Other (v\_213)*

Other, please specify:

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1316	96.98	96.98	96.98
quoted	41	3.02	3.02	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.03 · $\sigma$ =0.17				

*None of the above (v\_220)*

None of the above				
<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw %</i>	<i>valid %</i>	<i>cumulative %</i>
not quoted	1096	80.77	80.77	80.77
quoted	261	19.23	19.23	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.19 · $\sigma$ =0.39				

### Publishing under open access schemes (v\_199 to v\_201, v\_210, v\_211)




Figure 14: Open access publishing

### Software under open source licenses (v\_199)

Yes, software under Open Source licenses

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1254	92.41	92.41	92.41
quoted	103	7.59	7.59	100.00
missing	0	0.00		

total N=1357 · valid N=1357 ·  $\bar{x}$ =0.08 ·  $\sigma$ =0.26

#### Data under open access (v\_200)

Yes, data under open access

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1270	93.59	93.59	93.59
quoted	87	6.41	6.41	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.06 · $\sigma$ =0.25				

#### Scientific articles under open access (v\_201)

Yes, scientific articles under open access

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	673	49.59	49.59	49.59
quoted	684	50.41	50.41	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.50 · $\sigma$ =0.50				

#### Other (v\_210)

Other, please specify:

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1345	99.12	99.12	99.12
quoted	12	0.88	0.88	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.01 · $\sigma$ =0.09				

#### None (v\_221)

None of the above

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	777	57.26	57.26	57.26
quoted	580	42.74	42.74	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.43 · $\sigma$ =0.49				

### Member of a minority ethnic group (v\_100)

26. Do you consider yourself to be a member of a minority ethnic group?

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Yes	110	8.11	8.17	8.17
No	1237	91.16	91.83	100.00
missing	10	0.74		
total N=1357 · valid N=1347 · $\bar{X}$ =1.92 · $\sigma$ =0.27				

### Disability or chronic illness (v\_101)

27. Do you consider yourself to have a disability or chronic illness?

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Yes	61	4.50	4.56	4.56
No	1278	94.18	95.44	100.00
missing	18	1.33		
total N=1357 · valid N=1339 · $\bar{X}$ =1.95 · $\sigma$ =0.21				

### Living in a partnership (v\_102)

28. Do you live with a partner (marriage, cohabitation, civil partnership, etc.)?

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Yes	941	69.34	70.07	70.07
No	402	29.62	29.93	100.00
missing	14	1.03		
total N=1357 · valid N=1343 · $\bar{X}$ =1.30 · $\sigma$ =0.46				

### Gender stereotypes beliefs (v\_195 to v\_198)




Figure 15: Gender stereotype beliefs

*Women and men have strengths in different areas (v\_195)*

Women and men have their respective strengths  
in different areas

<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw</i> %	<i>valid</i> %	<i>cumulative</i> %
Strongly disagree	213	15.70	15.77	15.77
Disagree	435	32.06	32.20	47.96
Undecided	248	18.28	18.36	66.32
Agree	359	26.46	26.57	92.89
Strongly agree	96	7.07	7.11	100.00
missing	6	0.44		

*total N=1357 · valid N=1351 ·  $\bar{X}$ =2.77 ·  $\sigma$ =1.20*

*Women and men generally have different ways of contributing to a team task (v\_196)*

Women and men generally have different ways  
of contributing to a team task

<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw</i> %	<i>valid</i> %	<i>cumulative</i> %
Strongly disagree	204	15.03	15.08	15.08
Disagree	470	34.64	34.74	49.82
Undecided	245	18.05	18.11	67.92
Agree	363	26.75	26.83	94.75
Strongly agree	71	5.23	5.25	100.00
missing	4	0.29		

*total N=1357 · valid N=1353 ·  $\bar{X}$ =2.72 ·  $\sigma$ =1.16*

*Women and men generally have different communication styles (v\_197)*

**Women and men generally have different communication styles**

<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw %</i>	<i>valid %</i>	<i>cumulative %</i>
Strongly disagree	118	8.70	8.73	8.73
Disagree	330	24.32	24.41	33.14
Undecided	253	18.64	18.71	51.85
Agree	551	40.60	40.75	92.60
Strongly agree	100	7.37	7.40	100.00
missing	5	0.37		

*total N=1357 · valid N=1352 ·  $\bar{X}$ =3.14 ·  $\sigma$ =1.13*

*Many of the widespread ideas about how women and men differ are accurate (v\_198)*

**Many of the widespread ideas about how women and men differ are accurate**

<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw %</i>	<i>valid %</i>	<i>cumulative %</i>
Strongly disagree	299	22.03	22.18	22.18
Disagree	517	38.10	38.35	60.53
Undecided	406	29.92	30.12	90.65
Agree	113	8.33	8.38	99.04
Strongly agree	13	0.96	0.96	100.00
missing	9	0.66		

*total N=1357 · valid N=1348 ·  $\bar{X}$ =2.28 ·  $\sigma$ =0.93*

*Graphical summary gender stereotypes beliefs*



### Care responsibilities (v\_132, v\_119 to v\_122)

In total, 727 (54%) state that they did have or have not any care responsibilities. Current care responsibilities are distributed as follows: for children under 16 years there are 487 (36%) positive answers and for dependent adults 58 (4%). 119 (9%) had care responsibilities for children under 16 years in the past, 45 (3%) state that they had care responsibilities for dependent adults in the past.




Figure 16: Care responsibilities - all items

### Children under 16y (v\_132)

Yes, for children under 16 years

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	870	64.11	64.11	64.11
quoted	487	35.89	35.89	100.00
missing	0	0.00		

total N=1357 · valid N=1357 ·  $\bar{X}$ =0.36 ·  $\sigma$ =0.48

*In the past children under 16y (v\_119)*

Yes, in the past for children under 16 years				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1238	91.23	91.23	91.23
quoted	119	8.77	8.77	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.09 · $\sigma$ =0.28				

*For dependent adults (v\_120)*

Yes, for dependent adults				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1299	95.73	95.73	95.73
quoted	58	4.27	4.27	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.04 · $\sigma$ =0.20				

*In the past for dependent adults (v\_121)*

Yes, in the past for dependent adults				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1312	96.68	96.68	96.68
quoted	45	3.32	3.32	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.03 · $\sigma$ =0.18				

### No care responsibilities (v\_122)

No				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	630	46.43	46.43	46.43
quoted	727	53.57	53.57	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.54 · $\sigma$ =0.50				

### Care responsibilities affecting the work (extent) (v\_123)

30a. To which extent do/did these care responsibilities affect your work?

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Not at all	113	8.33	17.77	17.77
To some extent	378	27.86	59.43	77.20
To a large extent	145	10.69	22.80	100.00
missing	721	53.13		
total N=1357 · valid N=636 · $\bar{X}$ =2.05 · $\sigma$ =0.64				

**Care responsibilities affecting the work (extent) and work hours contracted for (v\_123 x v\_81)**

30a. To which extent do/did these care responsibilities affect your work?	16 How many hours a week are you contracted for?			Total
	Less than 20 hours/ week (part time)	20 up to 35 hours/week (part time)	More than 35 hours (full time)	
Not at all	15 23.4%	15 21.7%	83 16.7%	113 17.9%
To some extent	28 43.8%	39 56.5%	307 61.6%	374 59.3%
To a large extent	21 32.8%	15 21.7%	108 21.7%	144 22.8%
<b>Total</b>	64 100%	69 100%	498 100%	631 100%
$\chi^2=8.366 \cdot df=4 \cdot \text{Cramer's } V=0.081 \cdot p=0.079$				

**Care responsibilities affecting the work (extent) and gender (v\_123 x v\_7R)**

30a. To which extent do/did these care responsibilities affect your work?	5. I am (gender)		Total
	A woman	A man	
Not at all	55 18.9%	58 16.8%	113 17.8%
To some extent	160 55%	218 63.2%	378 59.4%
To a large extent	76 26.1%	69 20%	145 22.8%
<b>Total</b>	291 100%	345 100%	636 100%
$\chi^2=4.767 \cdot df=2 \cdot \text{Cramer's } V=0.087 \cdot p=0.092$			

### Care responsibilities affecting the work (ways)(v\_124 to v\_129, v\_133 to v\_137)




Figure 17: Care responsibilities affecting work - all items

### Slight reduction work hours (v\_129)

Slight reduction of my working hours				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1078	79.44	79.44	79.44
quoted	279	20.56	20.56	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{x}$ =0.21 · $\sigma$ =0.40				

### Significant reduction work hours (v\_124)

Significant reduction of my working hours				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1261	92.93	92.93	92.93
quoted	96	7.07	7.07	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.07 · $\sigma$ =0.26				

### Much more fragmented work schedules (v\_125)

My work schedules got much more fragmented				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1110	81.80	81.80	81.80
quoted	247	18.20	18.20	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.18 · $\sigma$ =0.39				

### Travel related business dropped (v\_126)

Participation in travel related businesses (such as congresses) dropped				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1124	82.83	82.83	82.83
quoted	233	17.17	17.17	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.17 · $\sigma$ =0.38				

### Amount of scientific papers/patents dropped (v\_127)

The amount of my scientific papers/ patents dropped				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1253	92.34	92.34	92.34
quoted	104	7.66	7.66	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.08 · $\sigma$ =0.27				

### Quitting the job (v\_128)

I quit my job				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1348	99.34	99.34	99.34
quoted	9	0.66	0.66	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.01 · $\sigma$ =0.08				

### More than 6 months interruption of career (v\_133)

More than 6 months of interruption of my professional career (excluding maternity /paternity/ parental leave)				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1269	93.52	93.52	93.52
quoted	88	6.48	6.48	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.06 · $\sigma$ =0.25				

### Less than 6 months interruption of career (v\_134)

Less than 6 months of interruption of my professional career  
(excluding maternity/ paternity/ parental leave)

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1328	97.86	97.86	97.86
quoted	29	2.14	2.14	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.02 · $\sigma$ =0.14				

### Other (v\_135)

Other, please specify:

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1318	97.13	97.13	97.13
quoted	39	2.87	2.87	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.03 · $\sigma$ =0.17				

### None (v\_137)

None of the above

value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	1331	98.08	98.08	98.08
quoted	26	1.92	1.92	100.00
missing	0	0.00		
total N=1357 · valid N=1357 · $\bar{X}$ =0.02 · $\sigma$ =0.14				



### Peer reviewed articles (v\_130)

While 21% of the team members have no peer reviewed articles published since 2013, 36% state 1 to 4 and 24% have 10 or more peer reviewed publications. Note that these performance measures are self-reported and different from the bibliometric performance data compiled from the Web of Science.

#### 31. How many peer reviewed articles have you published since 1st January 2013?

<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw %</i>	<i>valid %</i>	<i>cumulative %</i>
0	284	20.93	21.16	21.16
1-4	484	35.67	36.07	57.23
5-9	243	17.91	18.11	75.34
10 - 19	164	12.09	12.22	87.56
20 - 39	106	7.81	7.90	95.45
40 or more	61	4.50	4.55	100.00
missing	15	1.11		

*total N=1357 • valid N=1342 •  $\bar{X}$ =2.63 •  $\sigma$ =1.39*

*Peer reviewed articles and gender (v\_130 x v\_7R)*

Largest differences in terms of self-reported publication counts by gender are observed for high output researchers: there are 74% of men that have 40+ publications compared to 26% of women. In comparison, the distribution is more balanced between men and women at the early career stages: 49% of women have 0 publications versus 51% of men.

31. How many peer reviewed articles have you published since 1st January 2013?	5. I am (gender)		Total
	A woman	A man	
0	139 48.9% 24.3%	145 51.1% 18.8%	284 100% 21.2%
1-4	214 44.3% 37.5%	269 55.7% 34.9%	483 100% 36%
5-9	105 43.2% 18.4%	138 56.8% 17.9%	243 100% 18.1%
10 - 19	58 35.4% 10.2%	106 64.6% 13.8%	164 100% 12.2%
20 - 39	39 36.8% 6.8%	67 63.2% 8.7%	106 100% 7.9%
40 or more	16 26.2% 2.8%	45 73.8% 5.8%	61 100% 4.5%
<b>Total</b>	571 42.6% 100%	770 57.4% 100%	1341 100% 100%
$\chi^2=16.945 \cdot df=5 \cdot \text{Cramer's } V=0.112 \cdot p=0.005$			

### Patents (v\_131)

While almost 89% have no European patents registered since 2013, 10% have 1 to 4 patents, about 1% have 5 or more patents. This reflects the low share of private industries in the survey participants, who typically tend to engage more in patents than in publications.

32. On how many European patents have you been named as an inventor since 1st January 2013 (including pending accepted applications)?

<i>value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>raw %</i>	<i>valid %</i>	<i>cumulative %</i>
0	1191	87.77	88.55	88.55
1 - 4	134	9.87	9.96	98.51
5 - 9	13	0.96	0.97	99.48
10 - 19	2	0.15	0.15	99.63
20 - 39	4	0.29	0.30	99.93
40 or more	1	0.07	0.07	100.00
missing	12	0.88		

*total N=1357 • valid N=1345 •  $\bar{X}$ =1.14 •  $\sigma$ =0.45*

### Patents and gender (v\_131 x v\_7R)

When taking gender into consideration, 93% of the women and about 86% of the men have no patent; 7% of the women and 12% of the men have one to four patents. No woman has 10 or more patents.

32. On how many European patents have you been named as an inventor since 1st January 2013 (including pending accepted applications)?	5. I am (gender)		Total
	A woman	A man	
0	529 44.5% 92.6%	661 55.5% 85.5%	1190 100% 88.5%
1 - 4	40 29.9% 7%	94 70.1% 12.2%	134 100% 10%
5 - 9	2 15.4% 0.4%	11 84.6% 1.4%	13 100% 1%
10 - 19	0 0% 0%	2 100% 0.3%	2 100% 0.1%
20 - 39	0 0% 0%	4 100% 0.5%	4 100% 0.3%
40 or more	0 0% 0%	1 100% 0.1%	1 100% 0.1%
<b>Total</b>	571 42.5% 100%	773 57.5% 100%	1344 100% 100%
$\chi^2=19.719 \cdot df=5 \cdot \text{Cramer's } V=0.121 \cdot \text{Fisher's } p=0.001$			

## Team Contact Questionnaire

The team contact questionnaire was answered by one person of the team.

### Type of organisation (TC\_OrgType)

Type of organisation				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
0	6	3.77	5.77	5.77
University	72	45.28	69.23	75.00
Public research center	15	9.43	14.42	89.42
Private sector / industry	5	3.14	4.81	94.23
Other, please specify:	6	3.77	5.77	100.00
missing	55	34.59		
total N=159 · valid N=104 · $\bar{X}$ =1.47 · $\sigma$ =1.28				

### Number of employees (TC\_NumEmployees)

Number of employees				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
< 50	6	3.77	5.77	5.77
50 - 250	13	8.18	12.50	18.27
250 - 500	10	6.29	9.62	27.88
500 - 1000	6	3.77	5.77	33.65
> 1000	69	43.40	66.35	100.00
missing	55	34.59		
total N=159 · valid N=104 · $\bar{X}$ =4.14 · $\sigma$ =1.33				

***Founding year of the team (TC\_FoundingYear)***

“In which year was the current team leader officially appointed as team leader by your organisation?”




Figure 18: Founding year or the research group

### Working methodology (TC\_Method)

Asked about a particular formal working methodology such as Agile methods, TRIZ, Design Thinking used, most teams do not use any specific working methodology.

Working methodology				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Yes, please specify:	18	11.32	17.31	17.31
No	81	50.94	77.88	95.19
I don't know	5	3.14	4.81	100.00
missing	55	34.59		

total N=159 · valid N=104 ·  $\bar{X}$ =1.88 ·  $\sigma$ =0.46

### Colocation (TC\_Colocation)

Do team members have the opportunity to interact face to face? Asked this question, 85% of the teams share the same physical location (lab, office, building) in walking distance to each other.

Colocation				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Most team members share the same physical location (lab, office, building) in walking distance to each other	88	55.35	84.62	84.62
Some team members are within walking distance, others are located further away	11	6.92	10.58	95.19
Most team members are working in different locations; face-to-face meetings require travel arrangements	5	3.14	4.81	100.00
missing	55	34.59		

total N=159 · valid N=104 ·  $\bar{X}$ =1.20 ·  $\sigma$ =0.51

### Gender Equality Plan (TC\_GEP)

Does your organization have a Gender Equality Plan? About 60% of the teams are working in organizations with a Gender Equality Plan, while 20% do not.

GEP				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Yes	62	38.99	59.62	59.62
No	21	13.21	20.19	79.81
I don't know	21	13.21	20.19	100.00
missing	55	34.59		

total N=159 · valid N=104 ·  $\bar{X}=1.61$  ·  $\sigma=0.81$

### Gender dimension in research (TC\_GenderDim)

For 57% there is no gender dimension in research, while for 30% teams there is a gender dimension applied in research.

Does your research integrate a "gender dimension"?				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
Yes, please specify:	31	19.50	29.81	29.81
No	59	37.11	56.73	86.54
I don't know	14	8.81	13.46	100.00
missing	55	34.59		

total N=159 · valid N=104 ·  $\bar{X}=1.84$  ·  $\sigma=0.64$



**Is your team involved in any Responsible Research & Innovation (RRI) activities? If so, which?**

Most of the teams are engaged in Science Education (57), followed by RRI activities in Open Access (41) and Public Engagement (36). The least chosen RRI activity involves the concept of Governance (11).




Figure 19: RRI - activities - all items

**RRI Ethics (TC\_RRI\_Ethics)**

Ethics				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	83	52.20	79.81	79.81
quoted	21	13.21	20.19	100.00
missing	55	34.59		

total N=159 · valid N=104 ·  $\bar{X}$ =0.20 ·  $\sigma$ =0.40

### RRI Gender Equality (TC\_RRI\_Gender)

Gender Equality				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	86	54.09	82.69	82.69
quoted	18	11.32	17.31	100.00
missing	55	34.59		
total N=159 · valid N=104 · $\bar{X}$ =0.17 · $\sigma$ =0.38				

### RRI Governance (TC\_RRI\_Gov)

Governance				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	93	58.49	89.42	89.42
quoted	11	6.92	10.58	100.00
missing	55	34.59		
total N=159 · valid N=104 · $\bar{X}$ =0.11 · $\sigma$ =0.31				

### RRI Open Access (TC\_RRI\_OA)

Open Access				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	63	39.62	60.58	60.58
quoted	41	25.79	39.42	100.00
missing	55	34.59		
total N=159 · valid N=104 · $\bar{X}$ =0.39 · $\sigma$ =0.49				

### RRI Public Engagement (TC\_RRI\_Pub)

Public Engagement				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	68	42.77	65.38	65.38
quoted	36	22.64	34.62	100.00
missing	55	34.59		
total N=159 · valid N=104 · $\bar{X}$ =0.35 · $\sigma$ =0.48				

### RRI Science Education (TC\_RRI\_SciEdu)

Science Education				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	47	29.56	45.19	45.19
quoted	57	35.85	54.81	100.00
missing	55	34.59		
total N=159 · valid N=104 · $\bar{X}$ =0.55 · $\sigma$ =0.50				

### Do not know about RRI (TC\_RRI\_DKnow)

I don't know				
value	N	raw %	valid %	cumulative %
not quoted	85	53.46	81.73	81.73
quoted	19	11.95	18.27	100.00
missing	55	34.59		
total N=159 · valid N=104 · $\bar{X}$ =0.18 · $\sigma$ =0.39				