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## MAIN FINDINGS

## Employees in Research and Development

- The number of research and development employees is increasing overall, including in the individual professions of researcher, technician, and other R\&D personnel.
- In 2020, a total of 118,004 employees (i.e., 80,959 full-time equivalents - FTE) worked in research and development, of which 36,191 were women.
- Men are more numerous in all research and development professions and their share is increasing.
- Overall, women accounted for $30.7 \%$ ( $28.6 \%$ in FTEs) of research and development employees in 2020:
- Women made up $30.4 \%$ ( $28.6 \%$ in FTEs) of all positions in research and development in 2020:
- $27.6 \%$ of researchers ( $24.1 \%$ in FTEs).
- 29.2 \% of technicians (27.6\% in FTEs).
- $45.8 \%$ of other R\&D personnel ( $48.5 \%$ in FTEs)


## Researchers

- Researchers represented $55.2 \%$ of all research and development employees, with 61,966 persons $(41,198$ FTEs) in 2020.
- The representation of women among researchers was $\mathbf{2 7 . 6 \%}$ ( $\mathbf{2 4 . 1} \%$ in FTEs). The representation of women among researchers is slightly increasing after stagnating in recent years; in 2020, women made up $27.6 \%$ of researchers. However, despite this positive development, this is one of the lowest shares in the last 15 years, even though the total number of female researchers increased by 27,651 from 2005 to 2020.
- At the European level, the Czech Republic has the lowest proportion of women researchers out of all EU countries; in 2019 the figure was $\mathbf{2 7 . 2 \%}$ - data for 2020 were not available at the time the Monitoring Report was written.
- In all the other countries that were at the very bottom of the ranking in 2009 alongside the Czech Republic, the representation of women researchers has increased over the last 10 years, while in the Czech Republic it has decreased by 1.7 percentage points. Therefore, the Czech Republic has not been performing well at the EU level in the long term.


## The Ideal and Typical Career Path in Research

- In 2020, a total of 98,096 people were studying at the master's level and 21,048 at the doctoral level.
- 59,417 women ( $60.6 \%$ ) and 38,679 men (39.4\%) were enrolled in a master's degree programme.
- 9,369 women ( $44.5 \%$ ) and 11,679 men (55.5\%) were in a doctoral degree programme.
- The majority of all graduates from a master's programme were in the social sciences (46.7\%) and the minority were in the agricultural sciences (4.9\%). The distribution is the same among doctoral graduates, with the social sciences leading at $21.1 \%$ and the agricultural sciences coming last at $3.5 \%$.
- The share of women among master's students has remained at $60 \%$ over the last 10 years. Women have also long predominated among master's graduates, as $59.6 \%$ of master's graduates in 2020 were women. In the transition between graduating from a master's programme and starting a doctorate, women's interest in continuing their studies has been declining. Only 44.5\% of women who graduate with a master's degree decide to go on to pursue a doctoral degree - i.e., a drop of 13.9 percentage points.
- While the proportion of female students in doctoral programmes has stagnated, the percentage of women who successfully complete their doctoral degree has been increasing. Over the last 15 years, this figure rose by 10.3 percentage points. If the positive trend of recent years continues at the same rate in the future, then the number of female graduates and male graduates of doctoral programmes could be equal by 2027.
- The biggest drop in the proportion of women in the study-professional pathway in 2020 occurred in the transition between doctoral graduates ( $45.3 \%$ of whom are women) and researchers ( $27.6 \%$ of whom are women) which is a drop of 17.7 percentage points.
- In the technical sciences, men outnumber women at all stages of the study-professional pathway. However, over the course of their careers, as women progress from being master's students to pursuing a career as a researcher, it is in this field that the share of women decreases the least among all the disciplines investigated, as in 2020 it declined by 'only' 14.7 percentage points. The biggest drop was in the natural sciences, where the proportion of women fell by 36.9 percentage points over the course of their studyprofessional career. The problem of the small share of women in the natural and technical sciences is that these fields are becoming increasingly important in terms of the total number of people in these professions.
- In the agricultural, medical, and social sciences and the humanities, the majority of students and graduates of both master's and doctoral degrees are women. In the case of the research profession, however, the gender balance reverses in favour of men.


## Researchers by Field

- A total of 65,193 people were working in research in 2020. The largest share of researchers in the Czech Republic is in the technical sciences (37.4\%) and the natural sciences (31.0\%), and together they employ more than two-thirds of all researchers. At the same time, these two fields also have the smallest shares of women researchers. Women make up only $14.7 \%$ of researchers in the technical sciences, while in the natural sciences they account for close to a quarter at $24.8 \%$.
- On a full-time equivalent (FTE) basis, the proportion of women among researchers in both disciplines is slightly lower ( $13.0 \%$ in the technical sciences; $24.4 \%$ in the natural sciences).
- The medical sciences are closest to parity, as $48.2 \%$ of researchers in this field are women ( $50.3 \%$ in FTEs), followed by the agricultural sciences, where $45.8 \%$ of researchers are women ( $44.4 \%$ in FTEs).


## Researchers by Sector

- The sector with the largest proportion of researchers is the higher education sector. In 2020 it employed $41.9 \%$ of all researchers. It was closely followed by the business sector, with $40.7 \%$ of all researchers. The government sector employed $17.0 \%$ of all researchers in 2020 , while only $0.4 \%$ worked in the private nonprofit sector.
- The proportion of women among researchers in the higher education sector is slightly above one-third (35.7\%; 38.7\% in FTE), while in the business sector they make up less than one-seventh (13.7\%; $13.4 \%$ in FTE). In the government and private non-profit sectors, $40 \%$ of researchers are women.
- In the business sector, internationally controlled private businesses offer the most research positions (53.9\%) but employ the fewest women of all business establishments (11.5\%).
- In the government sector, the Czech Academy of Sciences offers the largest number of research positions (62.6\%), 36.4\% of which are held by women - the second lowest measured ratio in the government sector.
- The higher education sector is dominated by public and state universities (89.7\%) where $34.7 \%$ of researchers are women, the lowest figure in the sector.
- In international comparison, the share of women researchers in the Czech higher education and business sectors is the lowest in the European Union, and in the government sector the Czech Republic has the fourth-worst score in the EU.


## Academic Employees

- In 2020, the overall employment of academics was 18,507 full-time equivalent (FTEs) academics, of which women made up $36.0 \%$.
- Women were most commonly in the position of lecturers (56.4\%). However, the proportion of women decreases as the academic position rises, with women accounting for only $15.3 \%$ of full professors.
- The share of women among assistants was $48.8 \%$, while $40.9 \%$ of assistant professors and $26.8 \%$ of associate professors were women.
- If the rate of increase in the proportion of female professors, i.e., 1.8 percentage points every 10 years, continues at the same rate, we will reach parity in this role in 193 years.
- The highest proportions of women academics are found in the social sciences ( $45.5 \%$ ), the medical sciences (44.0\%), and the humanities (41.9\%), while the lowest shares are in the technical sciences (22.4\%) and the natural sciences (26.0\%).
- Overall, the biggest losses during the transitions between academic roles occur between the positions of assistant professor and associate professor, where the share of women drops by 14.1 percentage points.
- In the agricultural sciences, the proportion of women declines by 50.8 percentage points during the transition from lecturer to professor. The social sciences also suffer from strong vertical segregation, as the share of women drops by $47.2 \%$ between the lowest and highest academic career roles.
- The technical sciences are horizontally segregated and the share of women with the ambition of entering academia is the smallest in this field out of all the fields in question. However, the attrition rate in this field is relatively low as women rise through the academic ranks, and the probability of a woman reaching the academic position of full professor is higher in the technical sciences than in the other sciences.
- At every level of an academic career, the gender pay gap between academics is to the disadvantage of women.
- The largest wage gap is between associate professors, with men earning on average $12.3 \%$ more than women. The smallest wage gap is between male and female full professors (8.6\%).
- Since 2010, the pay gap has increased at all levels of qualification, except for lecturers.


## Decision-Makers

- Decision-making in science remains the domain of men, who in 2020 held $90.7 \%$ of management positions in research institutions, universities, and other research and development institutions. There are no women in leadership positions in the Czech Rectors' Confederation, the Council of Universities, the Technology

Agency of the Czech Republic, the Czech Science Foundation, and the Learned Society of the Czech Republic.

- The share of women in the decision-making and strategic and supervisory bodies of these institutions was 21.8\%.
- The share of women in advisory and expert bodies was $27.1 \%$.


## Science and engineering professionals

- In 2019, women made up 27.5\% of science and engineering professionals, the highest figure since 2011. This category includes specialists in science, mathematics, and statistics, as well as specialists in engineering, manufacturing, construction, and architecture.
- For professionals in this field, there are differences in average gross monthly salaries not only by gender but also by age.
- Women are generally at a disadvantage compared to men, with the largest pay gaps occurring in the 25-29 (15.9\%) and 35-44 (16.0\%) age categories.
- In an EU comparison, we find $29.5 \%$ of professionals in science and engineering in the Czech Republic are women, which is slightly above the EU-27 average.


## Patent applications

- The number of patents granted to women increased from 2005 to 2011 and has ranged between 9\% and $11 \%$ since then. In 2020, 10.2\% of patents were granted to women.
- The highest number of patents, $14.6 \%$, were granted to women working in scientific institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences.
- The lowest number of patents (7.8\%) were granted to women working in the commercial sector.

The source data on which this monitoring report is based are published by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS) and the Czech Statistical Office (CZSO). We also use data from Eurostat and the She Figures report, a publication issued by the European Commission that monitors the state of gender equality in research and innovation across Europe and beyond. We also draw on the annual reports of public research institutions and universities.
In relation to the indicators used in this publication, we additionally note the following:

- Due to a change in the data collection methodology (CZSO), time series primarily from 2005 onwards are available for a comparison of selected indicators over time.
- A time series on students published by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports in the framework of the Statistics on Performance Indicators of Public and Private Higher Education Institutions of the Czech Republic is re-generated every year in its entirety dating back to 2001. Universities have the possibility to change the data on the number of students and graduates retrospectively, which they do. Therefore, the data generated in this year may differ from data published in previous years (and therefore in previous monitoring reports).
- In the introductory, textual, and graphical parts, the data on R\&D personnel are presented in the form of a Head Count (HC), which is preferred to full-time equivalents (FTE). The former of these two types of data represents the physical counts of employees as of 31 December of a given year and indicates the number of persons involved in research and development (R\&D), irrespective of the time spent on these activities. FTE, by contrast, represents the number of employees converted to full-time equivalents and thus captures the actual time spent on R\&D. It tends to be mainly women who work part time, so the representation of women in FTEs is in most cases lower than the physical number of women. The reason for the preference for head counts stems from the desire for compatibility with the data on students (see the Ideal and Typical Career Path in Research), where naturally physical counts are included.

For the sake of better clarity and maintaining comparability with the source, this publication adopts the terminology used in the field of statistics (CZSO and MEYS data).

## Definitions of staff categories used in the Monitoring Report

| Research and development (R\&D) personnel | Research and development (R\&D) personnel. A group consisting of researchers, technicians, and other R\&D personnel. | Data: CZSO - Research and Development Indicators |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Researchers | R\&D personnel who create new or extend existing knowledge, usually by managing and/or carrying out activities that involve the conception or creation of new knowledge, products, processes, methods, and systems, applying scientific concepts and theories. Their job description usually includes conducting R\&D, including directing or supervising these activities (e.g., supervising graduate student research); disseminating and applying scientific knowledge gained from the study of particular disciplines; and collecting, processing, analysing, and interpreting scientific papers and reports. | Data: CZSO - Research and Development Indicators Data: Eurostat - Share of women researchers, by sectors of performance <br> Data: European Commission - She Figures |
| Technicians | R\&D staff who perform technical, professional, practical, and support tasks related to R\&D and the application of scientific concepts and operational methods, usually under the supervision of researchers. Technicians also includes research assistants such as research assistants or laboratory technicians who, while performing assigned research tasks, do not themselves create or extend existing knowledge. Their usual activities include installing, monitoring, operating, and servicing special instruments and equipment; carrying out and monitoring tests, experiments, laboratory analyses, and field investigations; collecting and testing samples; recording, observing, and analysing data without attempting to interpret the findings in a professional manner; drawing up, examining, and interpreting technical drawings and graphs; planning and carrying out mathematical, statistical, and related calculations; storing data in databases and editing computer records; retrieving and verifying bibliographic data, etc. | Data: CZSO - Research and Development Indicators |
| Other R\&D personnel | R\&D staff involved in or integrated into R\&D activities (e.g., tradespeople, secretaries, and clerks). Managers and administrative staff whose activities are in direct service of R\&D are also included. | Data: CZSO - Research and Development Indicators |
| Academic staff | Professors, associate professors, assistant professors, assistant, lecturers, and scientific and R\&D workers who are employees of the university. <br> They carry out direct teaching activities, work related to direct teaching activities, scientific, research, development and innovation, artistic or other creative activities. | Data: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistical Yearbook (Employees and wage resources) Data: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic |
| Science and engineering professionals | People in jobs with the highest skill levels. These include, for example: astronomers, meteorologists, chemists, geologists, statisticians, biologists, botanists, zoologists, specialists in manufacturing, construction, and related fields, architects, cartographers, surveyors, electrical engineers, or graphic and multimedia artists. The group is defined by the internationally used ISCO-08 classification, or its national version CZ-ISCO. | Data: CZSO - Labour Force Survey (LFS) |
| Persons in R\&D decision-making positions | Persons in institutional management (directors, rectors), persons in decision-making, strategic and control bodies, and persons in R\&D advisory bodies. | Data: Annual reports and the websites of relevant institutions |
| Persons in charge of institutions | The person in charge is the person who represents the institution. In selected institutions, this is the director, chairperson, rector, or dean. | Data: Annual reports and websites of relevant institutions |
| Persons in decisionmaking, policy-making, and control bodies | Persons in decision-making, policy-making, and control bodies are classified by institution: <br> - Public Research Institutions: Institute Council and Supervisory Board <br> - Higher education institutions (HEls): Academic Senate, ViceDean, Scientific/Artistic/Academic Council, Board of Directors <br> - Czech Science Foundation: Board, Scientific Council, Supervisory Council <br> - Technology Agency of the Czech Republic: Board, Research Council, Supervisory Council <br> - Czech Academy of Sciences: Academic Assembly, Supervisory Board, Academic Council, Scientific Council <br> - R\&D Council: members of the RVVI <br> - Council of HEls: Board, Assembly <br> - Czech Rectors' Conference: Board, Chambers of the Rectors' Conference (logically, this is quite similar to the management of HEls), plenary <br> - The Learned Society: Board, Council | Data: Annual reports and websites of relevant institutions |


| Persons in advisory and expert bodies | They are included here by institution: <br> - Czech Science Foundation: evaluation panels, sectoral committees <br> - Technology Agency of the Czech Republic: programme councils and commissions <br> - Czech Academy of Sciences: commissions and councils <br> - R\&D Council: commissions <br> - Council of HEls: working committees and working groups <br> - Czech Rectors' Conference: working groups and commissions | Data: Annual reports and website of relevant institutions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Overview of abbreviations used

| HC | Head Count, physical counts: The head count as of 31 December of a given year <br> indicates the number of persons involved in research and development (R\&D), <br> irrespective of the time spent on these activities. |
| :--- | :--- |
| FTE | Full-Time Equivalent: A unit to measure employed persons in a way that makes <br> them comparable even if they work or study a different number of hours per week. <br> The unit is obtained by comparing an employee's average number of hours worked <br> to the average number of hours of a full-time worker. A full-time person is therefore <br> counted as one FTE, while a part-time worker gets a score in proportion to the <br> hours he or she works or studies. For example, a part-time worker employed for <br> 20 hours a week where full-time work consists of 40 hours is counted as 0.5 FTE. |
| GPG | Gender pay gap: The difference in average gross hourly earnings between women <br> and men. It is based on salaries paid directly to employees before income tax and <br> social security contributions are deducted. |

According to the Czech Statistical Office (CZSO), a total of 118,004 employees worked in research and development (R\&D) in 2020. The majority ( $55.2 \%$ ) were researchers, almost a third ( $30.6 \%$ ) were employed as technicians, and $14.1 \%$ represented other R\&D personnel.

Figure 1: Proportion (\%) of employees in R\&D in 2020, by discipline (HC)


Source: CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.

Overall, women accounted for $30.7 \%$ of R\&D employees. Although the proportion of women among researchers, technicians, and other R\&D personnel has been increasing over the years, the trend has fluctuated, with positive and negative changes within tenths of a percent. Since 2005, when the total proportion of women working in R\&D was at its highest at $35 \%$, the share of women declined until 2017, when it reached an all-time low of $30.2 \% .^{1}$ Proportional representation remained uneven in 2020, both in aggregate and across fields, as can be seen in Figure 2.
In the category of other R\&D personnel, the structure of representation is closest to equality ( $45.8 \%$ women) but employees in this category make up only $14.1 \%$ of R\&D employees ( 16,700 persons) - see Figure 1 . However, the numerically largest area, which is researchers, has the smallest proportion of women and accounts for only $27.6 \%$ of the 65,193 persons who are women. Women technicians make up $29.2 \%$ of the total 36,151 technical staff.

Figure 2: Proportion (\%) of employees in R\&D in 2020, by sex and discipline (HC)


Source: CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.

[^0]
## Researchers

A closer look at the researcher category shows that a slight fluctuation in the proportion of women also characterises this category. The timeline shows a slight increase over the last two years, reaching $27.6 \%$ in 2020. Despite this positive development, however, this is one of the lowest shares of women researchers recorded in the last 15 years, even though the total number of researchers increased by 27,651 from 2005 to 2020. Over this period, the number of men researchers increased from 26,715 in 2005 to 47,201 in 2020, while the number of women researchers rose from 10,827 in 2005 to 17,922 in 2020.

Figure 3: Compound annual growth rate (\%) in the number of researchers, by sex, 2005-2020 (HC) ${ }^{2}$


Source: CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.

[^1]
## University studies

The aim of this chapter is to examine the gender aspects of education at the master's and doctoral levels in the Czech Republic, the current situation, and long-term development. We work primarily with data from the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS), which publishes statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities annually based on the ISCED-F classification of disciplines. ${ }^{3}$ For the purpose of the analysis, students and graduates of all nationalities, irrespective of type of the university (public vs private) and the type of study (full-time, remote, combined) were considered.

MEYS data indicate that in 2020 a total of 98,096 students were enrolled in a master's degree programme, 59,417 of whom were women (60.6\%) and 38,679 were men (39.4\%). A similarly large a share of women master's students was last recorded in 2011-2012, when the figures ranged from $60.7 \%$ to $60.8 \%{ }^{4}$ Women have long predominated among both undergraduate and graduate students. In 2020, 27,371 students graduated from a master's programme, $16,320(59.6 \%)$ of whom were women and $11,051(40.4 \%)$ were men. Over the last 10 years, the share of women among master's graduates has ranged from $59.6 \%$ to $60.5 \%$. The lowest figure was recorded in 2005 at $54.8 \%$, while in 2013 the figure was $60.5 \%$. Since then, it has been possible to observe a slight decline, with a drop of 2.1 percentage points between 2013 and 2020.

Figure 4: Compound annual growth rate in the number of master's students in the Czech Republic, by sex, 2005-2020 (HC) ${ }^{5}$

## Master's



Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic.
In 2020, there were 21,048 people studying in a doctoral programme, and 9,369 of them were women (44.5\%) and 11,679 were men ( $55.5 \%$ ). These figures, with small variations of a few tenths of a percent, have been almost constant since 2012, when the percentage of women doctoral students first reached a level above 44\% - 44.2\% to be precise. Since 2015, when women accounted for a record $46.8 \%$ of PhD students, there has been a 2.3 percentage point drop in the last 5 years. Men also predominate among doctoral graduates, 981 ( $54.7 \%$ ) of whom were men in 2020, compared to 841 ( $45.3 \%$ ) women. However, the proportion of women among graduates has been increasing over the long term; in 2005, women accounted for $35.0 \%$ of graduates. There has therefore been an increase of 10.3 percentage points over 15 years. If the positive trend observed in recent years continues at the same pace in the future, the number of women and men among graduates could be equal by 2027.

[^2]Figure 5: Compound annual growth rate in the number of doctoral students in the Czech Republic, by sex, 2005-2020 (HC) ${ }^{6}$


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic.

Considering that the number of persons studying a given university degree does not take into account the success rate at this education level, in the following analyses we focus on data on graduates who obtain the given degree. We also record the numbers of students enrolled in master's and doctoral level studies by discipline. ${ }^{7}$

In 2020, 27,371 people graduated from a master's programme. ${ }^{8}$ The largest number of graduates were in the social sciences, with $12,793(46.7 \%)^{9}$, followed by graduates in the technical sciences, with a total of 6,650 $(24.3 \%)^{10}$ successfully completing their master's studies. Graduates in the medical sciences also accounted for a double-digit share of the total number of graduates in the Czech Republic, with 3,405 (12.4\%). ${ }^{11}$ The humanities (7.5\%), natural sciences (4.9\%), and agricultural sciences (4.9\%) were less represented.

Figure 6: Proportion (\%) of master's graduates, by discipline, 2020


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic.

[^3]The proportion of women graduates of master's programmes is significantly higher than their male counterparts except in the technical sciences, where $32.2 \%$ of graduates were women. However, in the technical sciences, the number of women graduates has been increasing year on year and has grown by 8.8 percentage points since 2005. ${ }^{12}$ The timelines for all fields in the sciences overall and separately can be found in Figures 9 to 14.

Figure 7: Proportion (\%) of master's graduates, by sex and discipline, 2020 ${ }^{13}$


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic.

Since the beginning of measurement in 2005, women have always formed the majority among people completing a master's degree. The smallest share of women master's graduates was in 2005, at $54.8 \%$ ( 12,957 women graduates), and the peak was in 2013, at $60.5 \%$ ( 22,359 women graduates). As with other degrees, the proportion of women has been changing, but since 2009 the total share of women graduates has not fallen below 58\%, despite changes in the size of the population.

Figure 8: The compound annual growth rate (\%) of master's graduates in the Czech Republic, by sex, 2005-2020 (HC) ${ }^{14}$


[^4][^5]Figure 9 and 10: The natural sciences and technical sciences - the compound annual growth rate in the percentages of master's graduates, by sex, 2005-2020 (HC)15

## Natural Sciences



Technical Sciences


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic.
Below, we look at the situation in each sector. In the natural sciences, there has been a steady increase in the number of women graduates. While in 2005, 602 women ( $54.2 \%$ ) and 509 men ( $45.8 \%$ ) graduated with a master's degree in the natural sciences, by 2020 there were 863 women ( $65.0 \%$ ) compared to 465 men ( $35.0 \%$ ).

Looking at Figure 10, it is evident that the number of graduates in the technical sciences varies significantly by gender. From a ratio of $23.4 \%$ women to $76.6 \%$ men in 2005 , the proportion of women grew to $26.8 \%$ in 2010, $29.1 \%$ in 2015 , and to $32.2 \%$ in 2020 . Every five years the ratio has increased by an average of three percentage points. If this growth continues at the same rate, it can be assumed that gender parity among master's graduates in the technical sciences will be reached in 2050.

[^6]Figures 11 and 12: The agricultural sciences and medical sciences - the compound annual growth rate in the percentage of master's graduates, by sex, 2005-2020 (HC) ${ }^{16}$


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic.

The agricultural sciences, like the other disciplines surveyed, have an upward trend in terms of women's representation. From an initial 857 graduates in 2005, 474 of whom ( $55.3 \%$ ) were women and 383 ( $44.7 \%$ ) were men, the number of graduates in 2020 has increased to 737 women ( $64.3 \%$ ) and 409 men ( $35.3 \%$ ). However, the increase in the number of men has been marginal - by just 26 graduates, while the number of women rose by 263 , more than ten times the increase among men. Thus, the share of men has fallen by $9 \%$ over the last 15 years to $35.7 \%$ today.

The medical sciences, unlike the aforesaid disciplines, have long had the highest representation of women among graduates. In 2005, when the percentage of women graduates was at its lowest, women still made up $69.3 \%$ and the share has never fallen below $70 \%$ since then. The highest number of women master's graduates in this field was in 2009, when their share was as high as $76.6 \%$. As the number of men increased, the share of women decreased slightly, to 71.7\% in 2020.

[^7]Figures 13 and 14: The social sciences and the humanities

- the compound annual growth rate in the percentage of master's graduates, by sex, 2005-2020 (HC) ${ }^{17}$


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic.

The number of master's graduates in the social sciences increased regularly from 2005 to 2012. Starting from 2013, the figures have been decreasing. This has not, however, had a large impact on the percentage of women and men. In 2012, when a total of 20,655 people graduated in this field, 14,521 (70.3\%) of them were women and $6,134(29.7 \%)$ were men. This compares with the $7,932(66.8 \%)$ women graduates and $3,934(33.2 \%)$ men graduates that there were in 2005, the year that saw the lowest number of students complete their studies. In 2020, 8,772 (68.6\%) graduates were women and 4,021 (31.4\%) were men - and that was the second lowest proportion of women among master's graduates in the social sciences in the last 15 years.

While the number of women among humanities graduates increased by 840 from 2006 to 2012, the number of men graduates increased by only 42 over the same time period. Thus, the percentage of women graduates in this field increased from $62.2 \%$ in 2006 (vs $37.8 \%$ of men) to $72.2 \%$ (vs $27.8 \%$ of men) in 2012, an increase of 10 percentage points. However, since 2013, the proportion and number of women have been declining, with women making up $66.6 \%$ and men $33.4 \%$ of graduates in 2020. In contrast, the percentage of men graduating with a master's degree in the humanities has been increasing and rose by 5.6 percentage points from 2012 (27.8\%) to 2020 (33.4\%).

In 2020, 1,795 people graduated with a doctoral degree. The majority of graduates were in the natural sciences ( $25.3 \%$ ), closely followed by recent PhD graduates in the technical sciences ( $25.0 \%$ ) and the social sciences ( $21.1 \%$ ), while $12.9 \%$ of PhD graduates were in the humanities and $12.2 \%$ were in the medical sciences. The fewest doctoral graduates were in the agricultural sciences (3.5 \%).

[^8]Figure 15: Proportion (\%) of doctoral graduates by discipline, 2020


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic.

There is a fairly even distribution of women and men among doctoral graduates, except in the technical sciences. Despite the overall small share of women in the technical sciences, the proportion of women has been rising every year, except in 2012 and 2017. ${ }^{18}$ Specifically, the figures increased from $17.7 \%$ in 2005 to $28.3 \%$ in $2020 .{ }^{19}$ The most noticeable shift was in the agricultural sciences, where the share of women doctoral graduates increased by 15 percentage points between 2005 (43.7\%) and 2020 ( $58.7 \%$ ). In the medical sciences, the share grew by 14 percentage points over the same period (from 39.9\% in 2005 and $53.9 \%$ in 2020). The social sciences have been close to parity since the beginning of the observation period, i.e., in 2005, when women accounted for $43.3 \%$ of doctoral graduates, while by 2020 the figure was $52.4 \%$. The situation was similar in the humanities, where women made up $45.9 \%$ of graduates in 2005 compared to $49.1 \%$ in 2020. The timelines for all the disciplines in aggregate and separately can be found in Figures 18 to 23.

Figure 16: Proportion (\%) of doctoral graduates by sex and discipline, 202020


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic.

[^9]In the timeline shown in Figure 17, we can see that the gap between the proportion of women and men who are completing their doctoral studies is narrowing each year. In 2005, women accounted for only $35 \%$ of all PhD graduates, while five years later they already made up $39.7 \%$. This trend continued until 2015 , when the share of women was at $44.4 \%$. From 2015 to 2020, the growth slowed and since 2020 there has been only a marginal increase of 0.9 percentage points to reach the current $45.3 \%$.

Figure 17: The compound annual growth rate in the percentage of doctoral graduates in the Czech Republic, by sex, 2005-2020 (HC) ${ }^{21}$

## Ph.D. graduates



Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic.
Figures 18 and 19: The natural sciences and the technical sciences - compound annual growth the percentage of doctoral graduates, by sex, 2005-2020 (HC) 22

## Natural Sciences



Technical Sciences


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic.

A very slight increasing trend can also be observed in the proportion of women in the natural sciences, where women made up the majority share in 2014 (52.0\%) and 2016 (50.4\%), and the field has become relatively gender-balanced over time. Despite the fluctuating trend in the proportion of women, since 2010 the figure has not dropped below $46.0 \%$, and in fact in 2020 it was $48.5 \%$. To draw a comparison, women made up $65.0 \%$ of graduates at the master's level in 2020 - see Figure 9.

[^10]The technical sciences are the furthest behind in gender parity of all the disciplines. Despite the upward trend, the proportion of women in the field is very low. In 2020, women accounted for $28.3 \%$ of PhD graduates in the technical sciences. Over the last 10 years, this figure has increased by just 5.4 percentage points from $22.9 \%$ in 2010. The situation is also unfavourable for women graduates of master's programmes in the technical sciences (see Figure 10), though at the master's level there is a larger share of women than at the doctoral level; in 2020, the share of women master's graduates was $32.2 \%$. The complex issue of the small share of women in the technical sciences must therefore begin to be addressed at the primary level of education. It will take some time before positive developments at the primary and secondary level will become noticeable in tertiary education and especially at the doctoral level. Activities to boost interest in these fields therefore need to be initiated as soon as possible. ${ }^{23}$

Figures 20 and 21: The agricultural sciences and the medical sciences - compound annual growth rate in the percentage of doctoral graduates, by sex, 2005-2020 (HC) ${ }^{24}$


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic.

The agricultural sciences are one of the fields in which the situation has improved the most. From an initial 43.7\% in 2005, the proportion of women increased to $47.4 \%$ in 2010 and $57.8 \%$ in 2015. Between 2018 and 2019 the figure dropped to $50 \%$, but in 2020 returned to $58.7 \%$. However, it should be noted that the number of doctoral graduates has been in the tens of persons per year. In 2020, there were a total of 63 graduates -37 women and 26 men. Any increase or decrease in the number of graduates can consequently have quite a substantial impact on the percentage share of each gender. The fact that wages in the agricultural sciences are relatively low may also be a factor in why women make up the majority of graduates in this field and why men are less interested in pursuing a doctorate in this field. Professionally, graduates of the agricultural sciences earn wages that are about a quarter lower than graduates of the technical sciences and they also make less money than humanities graduates. ${ }^{25}$ Moreover, men are more likely than women to seek higher-paying jobs in lucrative industries. ${ }^{26}$

Until 2012 men predominated among graduates of doctoral programmes in the medical sciences. In 2013 the share of women exceeded $50.0 \%$ for the first time, but one year later it fell back to $48.7 \%$. Since 2015, however, the proportion of women doctoral graduates has remained above $50 \%$ and was at a record $61.8 \%$ in 2018. The distribution in 2020 was $53.9 \%$ women and $44.1 \%$ men. Women have long dominated among master's and doctoral students and graduates in this discipline. Based on data from previous years, the feminisation of the medical sciences can be expected to continue in the coming years. Stakeholders should therefore make greater efforts to achieve a gender balance among medical students, similarly to what has been going on in the field of education studies.

[^11]Figures 22 and 23: The social sciences and the humanities - compound annual growth rate in the percentage of doctoral graduates, by sex, 2005-2020 (HC) ${ }^{27}$


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic.

The social sciences are characterised by greater fluctuations in the share of both genders among doctoral graduates. From 2010 to 2020, except for 2017, the proportion of women ranged between $48.5 \%$ and $52.7 \%$. The share in 2020 was the second highest measured, with women making up $52.4 \%$ of doctoral graduates in the social sciences. However, the situation is different in the case of graduates of the master's programme, where on average make up $69.8 \%$ of graduates ${ }^{28}$ - see Figure 13. It is worth noting that although the highest number of master's graduates out of all the disciplines examined is in the social sciences, the number of doctoral graduates in the social sciences (378) is lower than the number in the natural sciences (454) and the technical sciences (449). ${ }^{29}$

In some ways, the humanities mimic the social sciences described above. However, in 2015 and 2018, there were very pronounced fluctuations in the proportion of women and men graduates in the humanities. In 2015,54.8\% of graduates in the humanities were women (compared to $48.8 \%$ in 2014 and $51.6 \%$ in 2016), and in 2018 the figure was $57.6 \%$ (compared to $48.1 \%$ in 2017 and $49.8 \%$ in 2018). In this discipline the trend in the share of women has varied and was quite volatile between 2010 and 2020, ranging widely between $45.2 \%$ to $57.6 \%$. In 2020, $49.1 \%$ of humanities doctoral graduates were women. Like in the social sciences, the number of women graduates of master's programmes in the humanities was higher than the number who completed a doctoral programme (see Figure 14), with women making up an average of $68.0 \%$ of the doctoral graduates in this field. ${ }^{30}$

[^12]
## From study to research

This section looks at the proportion of women and men in different scientific disciplines using data from the MEYS and the CZSO and maps the share of women and men in each field starting at the level of master's studies up to working in a research position. To illustrate this trajectory, we compared the years 2010 and 2020, which we present in aggregate and separately for individual scientific disciplines.

Across the observed period we found a stable predominance of women among students and graduates of master's programmes and a slight increase in the percentage of women at the doctoral level. The situation of women doctoral students has slightly improved over the last 10 years, but the rate of growth has been very low to marginal - between 2010 and 2020 the share of women studying at this level rose by only 1.5 percentage points. There has been a positive increasing trend in the share of women doctoral graduates, growing by 5.6 percentage points over the examined period from $39.7 \%$ in 2010 to $45.3 \%$ in 2020. Interestingly, more women who graduate with a doctoral degree choose not to pursue a career as researchers - in 2020 the difference between the share of women doctoral graduates and the share of women researchers was 17.2 percentage points compared to a difference of $12.1 \%$ in 2010 . This trend is the opposite of the above-average majority of women we see among master's students and graduates and the slightly below-average share among doctoral students. In fact, women make up less than a third of researchers. The share was $28.1 \%$ in 2010 and $27.6 \%$ in 2020, a decrease of 0.5 percentage points in 10 years. If the share of women continues to increase by a half a percentage point every decade, we will not reach parity by the end of the 21 st century.

In general, women are under-represented in research. Overall, the number of people working in research is increasing every year, but it is mainly men who are driving the numbers upwards, as can be seen in Figure 24. In 2010 there were 31,220 ( $71.9 \%$ ) men working as researchers; in 2020, the figure was 4,201 (72.4\%) - an increase of 15,981. In contrast, there were 12,198 (28.1\%) women working as researchers in 2010 and there were 17,992 (27.6\%) in 2020 - an increase of 5,794 women. ${ }^{31}$

Figure 24: Proportion (\%) of men and women in a typical academic career, students and academic staff, 2010 vs 2020, irrespective of discipline ${ }^{32}$


| Master's students | Master's graduates | Doctoral students | Doctoral graduates | Researchers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Women | 0 (\%) - - Me | 0 (\%) | 2020 (\%) | 020 (\%) |

Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.

As we can see in Figure 25, there has been an increase in the share of women graduates of master's and doctoral programmes in the natural sciences. Between 2010 and 2020 the share of women at the master's level increased by 3.3 percentage points to reach $65.0 \%$ and at the doctoral level there was an increase of 2.3 percentage points over 10 years. These figures indicate that there has not been much growth over the observed period. A relatively large proportion of women, however, decide not to continue their scientific career after completing their master's degree (see the difference of 13.6 percentage points between women master's graduates and women doctoral students). The only category that shows a decline in women is research, where the share of women decreased by 1.8 percentage points. In the natural sciences it is typical that a relatively large proportion of the women who successfully complete a PhD in this field choose not to pursue a research career - the gap between the share of women PhD graduates and the share of women in research was 23.7 percentage points in 2020.

[^13]Figure 25: The natural sciences - the proportion (\%) of men and women in a typical academic career, students and academic staff, 2010 vs $2020^{33}$


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic; CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.

The technical sciences have long been troubled by an imbalance in the representation of women, and the number of women is found to decrease at each successive stage over the course of progression from being a student to being a career researcher. The good news may be that at all levels of study, the share of women increased between 2010 and 2020, but the changes were only in units of percentages. The number of women studying at the master's level increased by $2.8 \%$, while the number of women master's graduates increased by 5.4 percentage points between 2010 and 2020. At the doctoral level, the situation was similar, with the share of women students growing by 3.2 percentage points to $26.7 \%$ and the share of women graduates increasing by 5.4 percentage points to $28.3 \%$ in 2020. Like in the natural sciences, there has been a sharp drop in the share of women pursuing a research career. In 2020, the decline was of 13.6 percentage points. Overall, women do not even make up a sixth of the total number of researchers. In 2020, there were 3,587 women researchers in this field (14.7 \%) compared to 20,781 men ( $85.3 \%$ ).

Figure 26: The technical sciences - proportion (\%) of men and women in a typical academic career, students and academic staff, 2010 vs $2020^{34}$


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic; CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.

[^14]A comparison of the data from 2010 and 2020 shows no significant change in the predominance of women among agricultural master's graduates during that period. However, a large share of them decided not to continue with doctoral studies and the drop between the two levels of study was 15.1 percentage points in 2020 . The representation of women among doctoral students felt below the $50 \%$ threshold to $49.2 \%$ in 2020 - compared to $51.0 \%$ in 2010. Women doctoral graduates made up $58.7 \%$ of all graduates in 2020 , an increase of 11.3 percentage points since 2010. It is important to note that despite the growth, the total number of graduates from the PhD programme in the agricultural sciences has remained very low over the long term, with 63 women ( $47.4 \%$ ) and 70 men ( $52.6 \%$ ) completing the programme in 2010, compared to 37 women ( $58.7 \%$ ) and 26 men (41.3\%) in 2020. A large percentage of women also leave this field in the period between completing their PhD and entering a scientific profession, with $12.9 \%$ of women exiting the field in 2020. In that same year, 45.8\% of researchers were women, an increase of 7.5 percentage points since 2010 . Given the major advances that have been made in digitisation, and particularly with the introduction of precision farming methods, autonomous robots, and crop and animal health monitoring, the demand for highly qualified professionals and researchers can be expected to increase sharply in the coming years. Because of the greater flexibility in working hours, the reduced physical demands that have been achieved through modern technology, and the immediacy of fieldwork, there will be more working opportunities for women in the agricultural field in the future. ${ }^{35}$

Figure 27: The agricultural sciences - proportion (\%) of men and women in a typical academic career, students and academic staff, 2010 vs $2020^{36}$


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic; CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.

In the medical sciences, women are over-represented among both master's students and graduates, accounting for $68.5 \%$ and $71.7 \%$ of students and graduates, respectively, and among doctoral students (51.6\%). After a period of growth in the 2000s, the representation of women in the medical sciences stagnated slightly, but it is the highest out of all the disciplines surveyed. Over the last 10 years, the proportion of women among doctoral graduates has risen proportionally from $44.3 \%$ in 2010 to $53.9 \%$ in 2020. Among researchers, $45.8 \%$ were women, and the medical sciences had one of the smallest outflows of women in the transition from obtaining a doctorate to entering a research profession - with a loss of women of just 5.1 percentage points. However, out of all the sciences surveyed the biggest decline in the transition from the master's to the doctoral level of study was observed in the medical sciences, which saw a loss of 20.1 percentage points in 2020.

[^15]Figure 28: The medical sciences - proportion (\%) of men and women in a typical academic career, students and academic staff, 2010 vs $2020{ }^{37}$


| Master's students | Master's graduates | Doctoral students | Doctoral graduates | Researchers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Wo | \%) 2010 - - | \%) 2010 | men (\%) 2020 | (\%) 2020 |

Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic; CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.

In the social sciences the number of women at the master's level decreased slightly from 2010 (by 1.9 percentage points) among both students and graduates, so that in 2020 66.5\% of students and $68.6 \%$ of graduates were women. Despite this negligible decrease, women account for more than three-fifths of students enrolled in a master's degree programme in the social sciences. The gender gap is closing at the doctoral level, where the gender ratio is fairly even from this stage onwards. This may be due to the fact that a large number of women decide to leave their studies after completing their master's degree. The drop in the proportion of women doctoral students in 2020 was 18.4 percentage points. In terms of the number of women among doctoral students, the figure remained unchanged at $50.2 \%$ in 2010 and 2020. However, there was a 3.9 percentage point increase in the share of women who earned a doctorate in the social sciences, with women accounting for $53.9 \%$ of graduates in this field in 2020. It is clear from the figures described above that, like in the agricultural and medical sciences, women dominate both the master's and doctoral levels of tertiary education. However, man still make up the majority in the research sector, though their predominance has been slowly declining over the years. In 2010, there were $1,958(59.3 \%)$ men and $1,342(40.7 \%)$ women working as researchers in the social sciences; in 2020, there were $3,223(54.2 \%)$ men and 2,507 ( $43.8 \%$ ) women. Although the total number of researchers in the social sciences is increasing every year, as is the representation of women, which has increased by 3.1 percentage points in 10 years, at the current growth rate parity cannot be expected until 2040.

[^16]Figure 29: The social sciences - proportion (\%) of men and women in a typical academic career, students and academic staff, 2010 vs $2020^{38}$


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic; CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.

The humanities followed a trend similar to that in the social sciences, where, despite the declining representation of women at the master's level, women made up the majority in $2020-66.0 \%$ of master's students were women (vs 68.5\% in 2010) and 66.6\% of graduates were women (vs 69.0\% in 2020). In 2020, the largest outflow of women from the ideal and the typical career path in research occurred after completing a master's degree and before starting a PhD, when the share of women in the field decreased by 14.9 percentage points. At the doctoral level the situation was similar, with a slight decrease of 1.7 percentage points in the percentage of women doctoral students between 2010 and 2020 to 52.9\%. However, the number of women who successfully completed their PhD grew: in 2020 almost half of all PhD graduates, i.e., $49.1 \%$, were women. The proportion of women among researchers in the social sciences remained virtually unchanged between 2010 and 2020, decreasing by just 0.2 percentage points to $42.4 \%$.

Figure 30: The humanities - proportion (\%) of men and women in a typical academic career, students and academic staff, 2010 vs $2020^{39}$


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistics on the performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic; CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.

[^17]
## RESEARCHERS BY DISCIPLINE

Figure 31: Researchers by discipline, 2020 (HC, \%)


Source: CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.

According to CZSO data, a total of 65,193 people were working in the research sector in 2020. The technical ( $37.4 \%$ ) and natural sciences ( $31.0 \%$ ) were the biggest fields, where $68.4 \%$ of all researchers were working. This was followed by the medical sciences ( $12.7 \%$ ) and, by a wide margin, by the social sciences ( $8.8 \%$ ), the humanities ( $6.1 \%$ ), and the agricultural sciences ( $4.1 \%$ ). In terms of year-on-year comparisons, increases were registered in shares of researchers in the natural sciences, the medical sciences, the agricultural sciences, and the humanities. Decreases were recorded in the technical and social sciences. However, changes were within tenths of a percent. In the previous section, which looked at the share of women and men in different fields from the point of studying in a master's programme through to earning a PhD and starting a career in research (Figures 4-30), gender representation was examined in reference to the ideal and the typical career path in research. Figure 32 below shows the distribution of researchers by gender and research area.
The lowest representation of women among researchers was found in the technical sciences, where there were 3,587 women researchers ( $14.7 \%$ ) and 20,781 ( $85.3 \%$ ) men researchers. This was followed by the natural sciences, where there were $5,020(24.8 \%)$ women and $15,195(75.2 \%)$ men. Other fields, however, are well on the way to gender equality, with women accounting for $42.4 \%$ of researchers in the humanities, $43.8 \%$ in the social sciences, $45.8 \%$ in the agricultural sciences, and $48.2 \%$ in the medical sciences - a sector where women have been over-represented for a long time.

Figure 32: Researchers by sex and field, 2020 (HC, \%) $)^{40}$


Source: CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.

[^18]Figure 33: Proportion of researchers in 2020, by sector (HC, \%) ${ }^{41}$


Source: CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.

The sector with the highest proportion of researchers is the higher education, where in 2020 there were a total of 27,325 researchers ( $41.9 \%$ ). The business sector was close behind with 26,522 researchers ( $40.7 \%$ ). The government sector employed 11,080 people as researchers ( $17.0 \%$ ), and the private non-profit sector employed only 266 researchers ( $0.4 \%$ ). Compared to 2019, the share of researchers in the higher education sector decreased by 0.1 percentage points, while the share of researchers in the business sector increased by 0.1 percentage points. In the private not-profit and government sectors, the figures remained unchanged.

In the higher education sector, the largest employer of researchers, slightly more than one-third of the researchers it employed in 2020 were women (35.7\%), as we can see in Figure 34. The business sector, which employed a total of 26,522 people in 2020, employed only 3,639 women as researchers (13.7\%) compared to 22,882 men ( $86.3 \%$ ) and performed the worst of all the sectors surveyed. In the other sectors, the number of women was above $40 \%$ - specifically $40.5 \%$ in the government sector and $41.0 \%$ in the private non-profit sector.

Figure 34: Proportion of researchers in 2020, by sex (HC, \%) $)^{42}$


[^19]
## Business sector

Figure 35: Proportion of researchers in the business sector in 2020, by type of employer (HC, \%) $)^{43}$


- Public enterprises
- Private domestic businesses
- Internationally controlled private businesses

Source: CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.
just $1,642(11.5 \%)$ compared to 12,641 (88.5\%) men. In public enterprises, which employed the fewest - just 1,642 (11.5\%) compared to 12,641 ( $88.5 \%$ ) men. In public enterprises, which employed the fewest researchers in numbers, women made up $13.3 \%$ of their research employees. Private domestic businesses were the largest employers of women, with 1,869 (16.6\%) women researchers and 9,407 (83.4\%) men researchers.

The predominance of internationally controlled private businesses among employers of researchers may be due to the fact that international companies often offer higher salaries than domestic companies in order to attract the best candidates. ${ }^{44}$ At the same time, it can be assumed that international businesses take advantage of the local less gender-sensitive culture, which, often unlike in their home countries, allows them to ignore gender equality issues. The Czech Republic has the smallest share of women among researchers working in the business sector in the European Union at $13.2 \%$ in 2019 - see Figure 66. International companies are also not actively motivated to address the gender equality of their research staff, as the Czech government offers no incentives and imposes no conditions for them to do so.

Figure 36: Proportion of researchers in the business sector in 2020, by sex (HC, \%) ${ }^{45}$


Source: CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.

[^20]
## Government sector

In the government sector, the majority of researchers work at the Czech Academy of Sciences, which in 2020 employed $62.6 \%$ of researchers in this sector. This is followed by researchers who work for other public research institutions (11.1\%) and healthcare institutions (10\%). A single-digit share of researchers work at libraries, archives, and museums (9.0\%) and other research institutions (7.3\%).

Figure 37: Proportion of researchers in the government sector in 2020, by place of work (HC, \%) ${ }^{46}$


Source: CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.

The predominance of women among medical science students and graduates is reflected in the proportion of women employed as researchers in medical facilities, where women accounted for $59.3 \%$ of researchers, specifically 656 women compared to 450 men. Despite having the second smallest number of researchers, libraries, archives, and museums have just under a onehalf share of women in their ranks, as $48.8 \%$ of their researchers are women. More than threefifths of researchers in the government sector work for the institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences (CAS), but only 36.4\% of the CAS's research employees are women - 2,521 women vs 4,410 men (64.6\%), the second-lowest figure in the government sector.
From 2005 to 2020, the share of women researchers working for the Czech Academy of Sciences increased by just 3.9 percentage points. ${ }^{47}$ The smallest number of women researchers (34.9\%) worked for other public research institutions, which as a group form the smallest employer of researchers. ${ }^{48}$

Figure 38: Proportion of researchers in the government sector in 2020, by sex (HC, \% $)^{49}$


Source: CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.

[^21]
## Higher education sector

Figure 39: Proportion of researchers in the higher education sector in 2020, by place of work (HC, \%) ${ }^{50}$


Source: CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.

In the higher education sector, public and state universities are by far the largest employers of researchers. In 2020, 24,510 (89.7\%) of the total of 27,325 researchers worked at these universities. Following at a distant second are university hospitals, employing 8.3\% of researchers. Private universities employed only $2.0 \%$ of researchers in this sector.
As far as gender parity is concerned, university hospitals come closest to attaining parity, with 1,047 women researchers (46.2\%) and 1,221 (53.8\%) men researchers. The long-standing predominance of women in the medical sciences is most likely fuelled by this distribution. In private universities, 40.0\% of women and $60.0 \%$ of men are engaged in research activities. The most substantial differences are in the largest group of providers of research work, i.e., public and state universities, where only 8,493 women ( $34.7 \%$ ) and 16,017 men ( $65.3 \%$ ) are employed. In the following section, the representation of women and men in academia will be discussed in greater detail.

Figure 40: Proportion of researchers in the higher education sector in 2020, by sex (HC, \%) ${ }^{51}$


[^22]Figure 41: Structure of academic staff (FTE) by academic position, 202052


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports Statistical Yearbook (Employees and wage resources).

According to data from the MEYS that publishes information on the full-time equivalent (FTE) of academic staff each year, in 2020 the total academic staff was equal to 18,507 FTEs, of which women made up $36.0 \%$. More than half of academics (52.9\%) were working as assistant professors. Associate professors accounted for $23.1 \%$ of staff, while full professors made up just 11.8\%. Assistants (7.3 \%) and lecturers ( $4.9 \%$ ) made up single-digit shares of academic staff.

In Figure 42 we can clearly see that the share of women in academic positions declines sharply the higher up the position is in the academic hierarchy. The largest number of women academics is found among lecturers, who accounted for $56.4 \%$ of all women academics in 2020. This is followed by women working as assistants, who have close to equal representation, with $48.8 \%$ women compared to $51.2 \%$ men. Only 40.9\% of assistant professors were women, and just over one-quarter (26.8\%) of associate professors were women. Out of the 2,178 full professors in 2020, only 334 were women (15.3\%).

Figure 42: Structure of academic staff (FTE), 2020, by sex and academic position (\% $)^{53}$


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistical Yearbook (Employees and wage resources).

A comparison over time shows that at the lowest levels of an academic career, i.e., lecturers and assistants, men have accounted for most of the increase in staff numbers of the last 10 years. This was an increase of 4.1 percentage points in the share of lecturers among academic staff from $39.5 \%$ to $43.6 \%$, while the ranks of assistants grew by 1.2 percentage points. This resulted in men predominating among assistants, accounting for $51.1 \%$ of all assistants in 2020 compared to $49.9 \%$ in 2010 . The opposite trend was observed for other academic

[^23]professions, but changes are happening at a slow pace. The proportion of women assistant professors was 40.9\% in 2020, compared to $39.8 \%$ in 2010, while the share of women associate professors increased by 2.9 percentage points from $23.9 \%$ in 2010 to $26.8 \%$ in 2020. The most significant difference was in the share of women full professors, who account for only one-sixth of the total number of professors. If the share of full professors who are women continues to grow at the current pace, i.e., 1.8 percentage points every 10 years, we will reach parity in 193 years in 2213. The changes, irrespective of the academic position, were at most within 3 percentage points and therefore cannot be considered significant. On the positive side, however, we can observe a slight tendency towards a closing of the gender gap, with an increase in the proportion of men among lecturers and assistants and concurrently an increase in the share of women in the positions of assistant professors, associate professors, and full professors.

Figure 43: The proportion of men and women (FTE) over the course of a typical academic career, 2010 and 2020 (\%) ${ }^{54}$


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistical Yearbook (Employees and wage resources).

[^24]
## Academic staff by discipline

The Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports does not collect data on academic staff by discipline but provides data by faculty for all accredited universities. The faculties in this chapter were hand-coded according to the Frascati Manual, ${ }^{55}$ an internationally recognised methodology for collecting and using R\&D statistics that provides detailed information on the classification of disciplines into disciplinary areas. The following text can therefore be seen as a general overview of the position of women and men among academics (FTE) by discipline, bearing in mind, however, that the assignment of academics to disciplines based on the name of the faculty where they work may be somewhat inaccurate. For example, Language Centres or Departments of Physical Education, which almost every faculty has, often have academics with a different area of expertise from that of the given faculty, and this may slightly distort the figures.

Figure 44: Structure of academic staff (FTE) by discipline, 2020 (\%)


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports Statistical Yearbook (Employees and wage resources).

The technical sciences have the highest share of academic staff (22.6\%), followed closely by the social sciences, with a difference of one-tenth of one percent ( $22.5 \%$ ). The natural sciences (17.1\%), humanities (16.1\%), and medical sciences ( $15.8 \%$ ) all fall within a range of $15 \%$ to $20 \%$. The agricultural sciences offer the fewest full-time positions to academics, accounting for just 5.9\% of academic staff.

Figure 45 presents the shares of women and men in academic posts by discipline. Closest to parity are the social sciences, where $45.5 \%$ of full-time positions were held by women academics in 2020. The medical sciences ( $44.0 \%$ ) and humanities ( $41.9 \%$ ) were similarly placed. At the opposite end were the technical sciences, which suffer from a lack of women on all levels, and where just $22.4 \%$ of full-time academics in 2020 were women. The situation was slightly better in the natural sciences, where $26.0 \%$ of academics were women. In the agricultural sciences, just over one-third or $36.8 \%$ of full-time academics were women.

Figure 45: Structure of academic staff (FTE) by sex and discipline, 2020 (\%) ${ }^{56}$


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistical Yearbook (Employees and wage resources).

[^25]
## Academic staff by position

In this section, as in the section on academic staff by discipline, we draw on data from the MEYS, which were manually coded according to the Frascati Manual ${ }^{57}$ and are expressed in the form of academic full-time equivalents (FTE). However, information on the structure of academics by position and discipline has only been collected by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports since 2017. For this reason, the years 2017 and 2020 are used for comparison.

As Figure 46 indicates, the higher the position in the academic hierarchy the smaller the proportion of women we find in such positions, with a decrease of around 10 percentage points at each level further up the hierarchy of positions. Overall, there were changes in gender representation in each academic position between 2017 and 2020, but in most cases these changes were only marginal increases or decreases of a few tenths of a percentage point. Women accounted for $56.4 \%$ of lecturers in 2020, a decrease of 2.5 percentage points from 2017 (58.9\%). Similarly, women assistants saw their representation fall from above 50.5\% in 2017 to 48.9\% in 2020. The proportion of full-time women assistant professors fell by a marginal 0.1 percentage points from $2017(41 \%)$ to $2020(40.9 \%)$. The only position category that saw growth in the number of women was that of associate professor. In 2020, 26.8\% of the people in this position were women, which was 1.3 percentage points more than in 2017 (25.5\%). The greatest gender inequality was observed in the position of full professor, only $15.3 \%$ of whom were women in 2020, a drop of 0.3 percentage points from 2017 (15.6\%). The biggest losses during transitions between the different stages in an academic career are found in the transition from assistant to associate professor (14.1 percentage points) and from associate to full professor (11.5 percentage points).

Figure 46: The trend in the proportion of men and women (FTE), 2017 and 2020, by academic position (\%), irrespective of discipline ${ }^{58}$


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistical Yearbook (Employees and wage resources).

Despite the increasing trend in the representation of women among academics, which is occurring in all disciplines, the rate of growth is very slow. It is mainly women associate professors and full professors who are underrepresented in all fields. It can be assumed that, unless efforts are made to increase their representation, parity will not be achieved for associate professors in at least one of the six disciplines surveyed for another 10 years; associate professors in the social sciences would be the first to achieve gender equality in 2030, and full professors would achieve parity in 54 years - also in the social sciences - but not until $2074 .{ }^{59}$ We will discuss the situation in each discipline in more detail in the next section.

In the natural sciences, the higher the academic rank, the wider the differences in representation and the smaller the proportion of women at that level. The highest percentage of women at the rank of lecturer, $44.3 \%$ of whom were women in 2020. However, there has been virtually no increase since 2017, with an increase of just 4 tenths of a percentage point from 43.9 \%. Women accounted for $33.8 \%$ of assistants in 2020, a decrease of 4.2 percentage points (38.0\%) from 2017. The representation of women among academic staff at the assistant, associate, and full professor level increased between 2017 and 2020, but these were minimal changes. The percentage of women among assistant professors in 2020 was $30.8 \%$ ( $30.4 \%$ in 2017), among associate professors it was $19.4 \%$ ( $16.9 \%$ in 2017), and among full professors

[^26]it was $11 \%$ (10.7\%). Although the share of women among full professors increased over the period under review, in practice their number decreased. In 2017, there were 46 women full professors, compared to 383 men full professors; in 2020, there were 45 women full professors and 366 men full professors. The percentage increase of 0.3 points for women was due to the fact that 17 male professors quit between 2017 and 2020. ${ }^{60}$ The largest decline of women in the ideal and the typical career path is found right at the beginning, during the transition from lecturer to assistant professor (a drop of 10.5 percentage points) and during the transition from assistant to associate professor (11.4 percentage points).

Figure 47: The trend in the proportion of men and women (FTE) in the natural sciences, 2017 and 2020, by academic position (\%) ${ }^{61}$


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistical Yearbook (Employees and wage resources).

The technical sciences are characterised by unequal gender representation in all the areas examined here, and, as Figure 48 indicates, the situation of academics is unfortunately no exception. There is horizontal segregation at the level of working contracts, and the concentration of women with the ambition to start an academic career in this field is low. The decline in the representation of women in the transition between career stages is relatively consistent throughout the career lengths studied - except for the transition from assistant professor to associate professor, where the decline is higher. On the bright side, the percentage of women lecturers has almost doubled since 2017, from $17.7 \%$ to $34.9 \%$ in 2020. The share of women assistant professors dropped 3.9 percentage points from $36.6 \%$ in 2017 to $32.4 \%$ in 2020 which means that more than two-thirds of assistant professors were men (67.6\%). The percentage of women working as associate professors in 2020 was $26.6 \%$ ( $27.3 \%$ in 2017) compared to $73.4 \%$ men. In the academic position of associate professor, the representation of women increased by 0.7 percentage points ( $15.5 \%$ in $2017 \mathrm{vs} 16.2 \%$ in 2020), and the same percentage increase was recorded for women full professors ( $9.3 \%$ in 2017 vs $10.0 \%$ in 2020).

Figure 48: The trend in the proportion of men and women (FTE) in the technical Sciences, 2017 and 2020, by academic position (\%) ${ }^{62}$


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistical Yearbook (Employees and wage resources).

[^27]In the medical sciences gender equality was recorded in three academic positions - lecturers, assistants, and assistant professors. Specifically, in the medical sciences 58.1\% of lecturers were women in 2020 (53.6\% in 2017), $55.5 \%$ of assistants were women in $2020(60.1 \%$ in 2017), and $51.4 \%$ of assistant professors were women in 2020 ( $50.6 \%$ ). Although parity in these positions is a good indicator, attention should be paid to avoiding the over-feminisation of the field and to maintain a balance of gender representation. Furthermore, there may be a glass ceiling effect at the associate professor and full professor levels. Despite the fact that more than half of the students and graduates of master's and doctoral programmes in the medical sciences are women, and women also predominate among medical researchers, ${ }^{63}$ there are very few women in the positions of associate and full professors, and their representation in these positions does not reflect their presence in the field. Specifically, 32.4\% of associate professors were women in 2020 ( $31.3 \%$ in 2017), which is less than one-third of the 466 total (151 women vs 315 men). The situation is similar for women full professors, who accounted for only 62 ( $16.2 \%$ ) of the total of 385 persons in 2020 - less than one-sixth - compared to $16.9 \%$ in 2017 . A slump in the ideal-typical trajectory of women academics in the medical sciences is observed during the transition from assistant professor to associate professor, where the share of women falls by 19.0 percentage points once the academic position of associate professor is reached. The decline in the proportion of women observed between the position of lecturer to full professor is 41.9 percentage points.

Figure 49: The trend in the proportion of men and women (FTE) in the medical sciences, 2017 and 2020, by academic position (\%) ${ }^{64}$

Medical Sciences


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistical Yearbook (Employees and wage resources).

In Figure 50, describing the agricultural sciences, it is worth mentioning that the outlier situation in this field, where $100 \%$ of lecturers are women, exists because in 2017 there were only 2 women (100\%) and no men (0 \%) working as lecturers in the agricultural sciences, which is a very small number compared to other disciplines. ${ }^{65}$ Therefore, while this figure may seem surprising, the situation became more equal in 2020, with 2 men ( $30.9 \%$ ) and 4 women ( $69.1 \%$ ) working as lecturers. In other academic positions, women's representation increased between 0.7 and 2.9 percentage points between 2017 and 2020. More than three-fifths of assistant professors in the agricultural sciences were women in 2020 ( $60.2 \%$ ), compared to $58.8 \%$ in 2017 , while women accounted for $42.6 \%$ of assistant professors in 2020 ( $40.0 \%$ in 2017), $24.3 \%$ of associate professors ( $21.4 \%$ in 2017) , and $18.3 \%$ of full professors (17.6\% in 2017). Despite the growth trend, the rate of increase is very slow. Associate professors come closest to gender equality and could reach parity in 2029 if the rise were to continue at the same rate, i.e., 2.6 percentage points every 3 years. The agricultural sciences see the biggest decline out of all disciplines in women's representation across the career stages that make up the ideal pathway to a professorship. During the transition from lecturer to full professor, the proportion of women declines by 50.8 percentage points. The biggest losses are in the transitions between assistant and associate professor (17.6 percentage points) and between assistant professor and associate professor (19 percentage points).

[^28]Figure 50: The trend in the proportion of men and women (FTE) in the agricultural sciences, 2017 and 2020, by academic position (\%) ${ }^{66}$
Agricultural Scieces


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistical Yearbook (Employees and wage resources).

A good example for other disciplines is the social sciences, which registered the smallest gender differences at every position in the academic hierarchy. However, at higher levels of the academic hierarchy, the differences are also larger than would be desirable. Women made up 57.0\% of lecturers in 2020 ( $60.9 \%$ in 2017), so the overrepresentation of women is decreasing over time. Women accounted for $52.1 \%$ of assistants defined as FTEs (47.9\% in 2017), and 48.5\% of assistant professors (50.0\% in 2017). The proportion of women among associate professors increased by 3.1 percentage points between 2017 and 2020, from $37.4 \%$ to $40.5 \%$. The biggest decline in the share of women in academia occurs in the transition from associate to full professor. The gap between these two academic grades was 17 percentage points in 2020, resulting in a slowly growing share of women among full professors. In 2017, there were 65 women full professors ( $23.0 \%$ ) and 219 men ( $77.0 \%$ ); in 2020, there were 67 women ( $23.5 \%$ ) and 218 men full professors ( $76.5 \%$ ). Despite the marginal growth, the largest share of women full professors out of all the fields studied is in the social sciences, yet they still make up less than one-quarter of the total number of full professors. ${ }^{67}$

Figure 51: The trend in the proportion of men and women (FTE) in the social sciences, 2017 and 2020, by academic position (\%) ${ }^{68}$

Social Sciences


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistical Yearbook (Employees and wage resources)

[^29]Last but not least, we look at the humanities. Figure 52 shows that this field - like the agricultural sciences - suffers from strong vertical segregation, as the higher the academic position, the smaller the share of women. The total decline in the proportion of women between the lowest and the highest career levels is 47.2 percentage points. The decline in the share of women here is relatively even; the difference between the lowest and highest academic positions ranges between disciplines from 14.3 percentage points to 10.2 percentage points. The humanities have the highest number of women working as lecturers, with 158 ( $69.1 \%$ ) in 2020 compared to 165 ( $73.6 \%$ ) in 2017. ${ }^{69}$ Women made up the majority of assistants in 2020 (54.8\%), a slight decrease from $55.2 \%$ in 2017. On a positive note, the numbers of assistant professors are slowly approaching parity, with $44.5 \%$ women and $55.5 \%$ men in 2020, compared to $43.3 \%$ women in 2017 . Associate professors follow a similar trend but are now only approaching a one-third share of women in this position ( $32.1 \%$ in 2020 versus $30.4 \%$ ) rather than parity. In conclusion, the humanities also have a long way to go to achieve greater equality in academic positions. In 2020, only $21.9 \%$ of women were full professors ( $22.2 \%$ in 2017 ) compared to $78.1 \%$ of men - four-fifths of full professors were men.

Figure 52: The trend in the proportion of men and women (FTE) in the humanities, 2017 and 2020, by academic position (\%) ${ }^{70}$

Humanities


Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistical Yearbook (Employees and wage resources).

[^30]
## Wages

The gender pay gap shows the percentage by which the average monthly salary of women and men academics differs. In 2020, men on average earned a higher salary than women in all academic positions and this difference ranged from $8.6 \%$ to $12.3 \%$. The most pronounced gap was between men and women in the position of associate professor, with men earning an average of CZK 73,508, while women earned CZK 64,484, which is CZK 9,024 less. The smallest difference was at the full professor level, where salaries are generally the highest. The average monthly wage of women full professors was CZK 84,815, while their male colleagues earned CZK 8,009 more with an average salary of CZK 92,824. Women assistant professors earned on average CZK 6,371 less than men assistants, women assistants made CZK 3,679 less than their male counterparts, and women lecturers made CZK 4,749 less than men lecturers.
Given that it was not possible to include data on all salary components, such as personal bonuses, because this data is not collected by MEYS, it can be assumed that the actual differences in the salaries of academic staff are more substantial. Moreover, since 2010, when information on the pay gap for academics was first published, the gender pay gap has grown wider at every level except for lecturers. ${ }^{71}$

Figure 53: The gender pay gap (GPG, \%) in gross average monthly wages for academic staff in 2020, by academic position ${ }^{72}$


[^31][^32]
## DECISION-MAKING POSITIONS

The distribution of women and men in decision-making positions in science and research was far from equal in 2020, with the vast majority of roles held by men. In 2020, the share of women in positions of leadership in research, higher education, and other R\&D institutions was just 9.3\%, down 5.6 percentage points from 2018 (14.9\%). Only $21.8 \%$ of women were in decision-making, strategic, and supervisory bodies, a decrease of 1.2 percentage points from $2018(23 \%)$. The situation is similar in advisory and expert bodies, where the share of women is slightly above one-quarter - $27.1 \%$ in 2020 compared to $28.1 \%$ in 2018. Despite efforts to increase the share of women in decision-making positions, the reverse has paradoxically happened, and their share is decreasing.

Table A: Proportion of women and men in management and decision-making bodies at public research institutions, 202073

|  | Management |  |  | Decision-making, strategic and supervisory bodies |  |  | Advisory and expert bodies |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | \% Women | Women | Men | \% Women | Women | Men | \% Women |
| Public and state universities | 2 | 26 | 7.1 | 513 | 1817 | 22.0 | - | - | - |
| Public research institutions | 7 | 67 | 9.5 | 245 | 945 | 20.6 | - | - | - |
| Czech Academy of Sciences | 1 | 0 | 100 | 61 | 250 | 19.6 | 84 | 294 | 22.2 |
| Czech Rectors' Conference | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 * | 32 * | 25.6 | 20 * | 74 * | 21.3 |
| Council of Czech Universities | 0 | 1 | 0 | 102 | 175 | 36.8 | 136 | 237 | 36.5 |
| Technology Agency of the Czech Republic | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 24 | 17.2 | 58 | 158 | 26.9 |
| Czech Science Foundation | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 22 | 18.5 | 14 | 78 | 15.2 |
| The Learned Society | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 154 | 7.8 | - | - | - |
| Total | 10 | 98 | 9.3 | 955 | 3419 | 21.8 | 312 | 841 | 27.1 |

* Data from 2021, as 2020 figures were not available. Source: Annual reports and websites of the given institutions.

Figure 54 illustrates the number of women in R\&D institutions. Four of them - the Czech Rectors' Conference, the Council of Universities, the Technology Agency of the Czech Republic, and the Learned Society of the Czech Republic - are headed exclusively by men, while only the Czech Academy of Sciences and the Czech Science Foundation are headed by women. In public and state universities and public research institutions, $7.1 \%$ and 9.5\% of the leadership is women. Overall, in 2020, $90.7 \%$ of leadership positions in research were occupied by men and only $9.3 \%$ by women.

Figure 54: Number of women and men in the management of public R\&D institutions, 202074


Source: Annual reports and websites of the given institutions.

[^33]In decision-making, strategic, and control bodies there is a greater share of women than in management positions. The two extreme ends in this area are the Council of Universities, where the share of women is the highest, exceeding one-third - 102 (36.8\%), and the Learned Society of the Czech Republic, which is at the other end with only 13 women ( $7.8 \%$ ). Overall, there are 955 women ( $21.8 \%$ ) and 3,419 ( $78.2 \%$ ) men in decision-making positions.

Figure 55: Number of women and men in decision-making, strategic, and supervisory bodies of public R\&D institutions, 202075


Source: Annual reports and websites of the given institutions.

Last but not least, we will focus on gender representation in advisory and expert bodies. The largest share of women is in the Council of Universities, of women are in the Council of Universities, with 136 women (36.5\%) and 237 men (64.5\%), and the smallest share is in the Czech Science Foundation, with 14 women ( $15.2 \%$ ) and 78 men ( $84.8 \%$ ) representatives. The Czech Academy of Sciences has 84 women ( $22.2 \%$ ) in its advisory body, the Technology Agency of the Czech Republic has 58 (26.9\%) in its advisory body, and the Czech Rectors' Conference has $20(21.3 \%)$. Despite the fact that parity in advisory and expert bodies is far from a reality, out of all the research and development institutions it is these bodies that come closest to parity.

Figure 56: Number of women and men in the advisory and expert bodies of public R\&D institutions, $2020^{76}$


Source: Annual reports and websites of the given institutions.

[^34]
## SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING PROFESSIONALS

Science and engineering are another area in which gender inequality is a major problem. This has already been described in the previous chapters on students, graduates, and academics in the natural and technical sciences. In this section, we take a closer look at the shares of women and men in science and engineering occupations, as well as the gender pay gap, using data collected by the Czech Statistical Office as part of the Labour Force Survey (LFS).

In 2019 - data for 2020 were not available on the CZSO website at the time the 2020 Monitoring Report was published - a total of 143,700 professionals worked in science and engineering. Of these, 39,500 were women ( $27.5 \%$ ) compared to 104,200 men ( $72.5 \%$ ). Although in absolute terms we can observe a slight gradual increase in women in this field over time, ${ }^{77}$ the differences are not very significant in relative terms. In 2011, 20.9\% of the science and engineering workforce was represented by women; in 2019, their share was $27.5 \%$. This is an increase of 6.6 percentage points. If the increase in women's representation continues at the same rate as in the last 8 years, then gender equality in science and engineering could be expected in 2048.

Figure 57: Proportion of men and women (\%) among science and engineering professionals, 2011-201978


Source: CZSO - Labour Force Survey (LFS).

In addition, among science and engineering professionals there are differences in average gross monthly salaries not only by gender but also by age. Women are generally at a disadvantage compared to men, and in 2020 the largest pay gaps were in the 25-29 age group (difference of CZK 7,017 ) and the $35-44$ age group (CZK 10,072), where the GPG of women compared to men was $16.0 \%$.

The biggest GPG has long been in the 35-44 and 45-54 age categories, but it has narrowed slightly since 2015. In the 35-44 age group it was $16.0 \%$ in 2020 (compared to $19.2 \%$ in 2015), while in the $45-54$ age category women earned $13.3 \%$ less than men in 2020 (compared to $20.4 \%$ in 2015). There were only slight fluctuations for women aged 30-34, with the figures for $2015(11.7 \%)$ and $2020(11.8 \%)$ being almost identical. The situation is getting worse for women professionals aged 25-29, whose average monthly salary was $15.9 \%$ lower than of their male counterparts in 2020; in 2015, the income gap was less than half as large (7.8\%). ${ }^{79}$

[^35]Figure 58: Gender pay gap (GPG, \%) in gross average monthly wages among science and engineering professionals in 2020, by age group


Source: CZSO - Labour Force Survey (LFS).

## THE GENDER GAP IN PATENTS

Data from the Industrial Property Office and the Czech Statistical Office, which rank patents in effect in the Czech Republic by the gender of the applicant, indicate that 53 patents ( $10.2 \%$ ) out of the total of 525 patents granted in 2020 were granted to women. Since 2011, when the share of patents granted to women first crossed the 10\% line, the figure has not changed much, fluctuating between $9 \%$ and $11 \%$. The figures from recent years therefore do not suggest that there will be more growth in the coming years the way there was between 2005 and 2010.

Figure 59: The trend in the proportion (\%) of patents granted to women from 2005 to $2020^{80}$


Source: Industrial Property Office and CZSO, 2021

Figures 60 and 61: The trend in the proportion (\%) of patents granted to women working at public universities and public research institutions from 2005 to $2020^{81}$


Looking at different sectors, we find that the situation is similar for both public universities and businesses. Except for 2005 (6.9\%) and 2010 (4.3\%), when women obtained less than $10 \%$ of all patents granted in the field, in other years the percentage of patents granted to women ranged between $11 \%$ and $13 \%$. The most patents obtained by women in the public universities was in 2009 (16.0\%). In contrast, public research institutions, which include many of the scientific institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences, have the highest number of patents obtained by women of all the sectors surveyed. In 2020 the share of patents earned by women at the Czech Academy of Sciences was $14.6 \%$, which is just half the figure in the previous two years $-28.5 \%$ of patents were granted to women in 2018 and 31.3\% in 2019.

[^36]Figures 62 and 63: The trend in the proportion (\%) of patents granted to women working in the commercial sector and to women as private individuals from 2005 to $2020(\%)^{82}$

Commercial sector


Source: Industrial Property Office and CZSO, 2021.

Private individuals


Source: Industrial Property Office and CZSO, 2021.

The situation is worse in the private than in the public sector. In the commercial sector, women were granted only $7.8 \%$ of patents in 2020. Nevertheless, the number of patents granted to women exceeded the $10 \%$ threshold in $2011(12.7 \%)$ and $2012(11.0 \%)$. In the case of patents granted to private individuals, this figure was exceeded only once - in 2014 (10.8\%). In 2020, women as private individuals were granted only $8.8 \%$ of all patents.

[^37]
## Researchers

The European Statistical Office (Eurostat) publishes data on the number and structure of R\&D workers in the member states of the European Union and in countries in the European Free Trade Area (EFTA). The data are regularly collected from the national statistical offices of each country. As the data are issued retrospectively and some member states release them with a significant delay, data for 2020 are not available for all the analyses in this chapter.

On a European scale, the Czech Republic had the lowest share of women researchers among all EU member states in 2019, at $27.2 \%$. The highest proportion of women among researchers was in Lithuania, where women accounted for more than half (50.6\%) of researchers. Only 6 countries were below the EU average of $32.9 \%$ Belgium, Austria, Hungary, Germany, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, and the Czech Republic.
One explanation for the disparity in the representation of women researchers in Europe is that low overall spending in this area translates into low salaries, resulting in an outflow of men who prefer higher paid jobs in other sectors of the labour market. ${ }^{83}$ Another reason may be the different orientation of research, where a greater orientation towards STEM fields (68.4\% of researchers in the Czech Republic work in STEM fields) may significantly affect the overall situation of women in research. However, this theory could be further explored.

Figure 64: Proportion (\%) of women among researchers in the European Union, 2019 (\%)


Source: Eurostat - Share of women researchers by sector of performance.

Compared to 2009, the share of women among researchers increased in most European countries, but the Czech Republic was not one of these countries, as its share dropped by 1.7 percentage points. However, countries such as Austria (+2.0\%), the Netherlands (+2.0\%), Germany (+3.1\%), and Luxembourg (+6.2\%), which together with the Czech Republic ranked last in the table in 2009, saw relatively large increases. Despite these efforts, all of these countries were still below the EU-27 average in 2019 - see Figure 64. On the other hand, Lithuania, Latvia, and Bulgaria, which were in the top three positions of countries with the most women researchers in 2009, saw a slight decline between 2009 and 2019, but even with this decline they were still the top three countries.

[^38]Figure 65: Change in the proportion of women researchers between 2009 and 2019 in EU countries, irrespective of research sector (\%)


Source: Eurostat - Share of women researchers by sector of performance.

## Researchers by sector

In the Czech Republic, the share of women researchers working in the business sector in 2019 was among the lowest in the EU (13.2\%). However, neighbouring countries are not doing too well in European terms either - only $14.8 \%$ of researchers in the business sector are women in Germany, 17.7\% in Austria, $15.9 \%$ in Slovakia, and $17.6 \%$ in Hungary, all of which are below the EU-27 average of $21.3 \%$. Looking at the EFTA countries, Japan is at the bottom with $10.2 \%$. At the other end of the ranking is Montenegro, where $41.8 \%$ of researchers in the business sector were women, followed by Serbia with $39.1 \%$. In the EU context, the best performers are Latvia (37.1\%), Bulgaria (35.6\%), and Lithuania (34.1\%).

Figure 66: Proportion (\%) of women researchers in the business sector, EU countries and EFTA, 2019


Source: Eurostat - Share of women researchers by sector of performance.

The differences in the representation of women among researchers working in the government sector are large, ranging from $19.5 \%$ to $66 \%$. Estonia was the leader with $66 \%$ of women, followed by Serbia ( $61 \%$ ) and Montenegro and Portugal, both with $60.5 \%$. At $40.2 \%$, the Czech Republic ranked below the EU-27 average of $44.2 \%$ in 2019. Among the EU member states, Luxembourg (37.8\%), Germany (37.2\%), Malta (29.4\%), and Belgium (28.7\%) were doing worse than the Czech Republic, while from EFTA countries, it was Switzerland (39.2\%), Turkey (32.9\%), and South Korea (27.2\%). Overall, Japan had the lowest share of women researchers in the government sector with 19.5\%.

Figure 67: Proportion (\%) of women among researchers in the government sector, EU countries and EFTA, 2019


[^39]As Figure 68 shows, the situation was similar for women researchers working in the higher education sector. The $35.3 \%$ of women researchers in this sector in the Czech Republic was below the EU-27 average of $43 \%$ in 2019. Lithuania (54.8\%), Bulgaria (53.9\%), and Latvia (53\%) had the highest proportion of women researchers, and South Korea (33.1\%) and Japan (27.8\%) had the lowest.

Figure 68: Proportion (\%) of women among researchers in the higher education sector, EU countries and EFTA, 2019


[^40]
## Science and engineering professionals

In European terms, the Czech Republic has a solid position in the representation of women among science and engineering professionals. ${ }^{84}$ In 2020, 29.5\% of women were employed in these roles in the Czech Republic, which was slightly above the EU-27 average of $29.4 \%$. The closest to parity are Portugal ( $41.7 \%$ ) and Sweden ( $40.1 \%$ ), where the share of women exceeded the $40 \%$ line in 2020. In Estonia (37.7\%), Lithuania (37.4\%), France (34.7\%), Cyprus (34.6\%), Greece (33.8\%), and Latvia (33.6\%), the proportion of women was higher than one-third. At the very bottom of the ranking are Hungary (24.9\%), Finland (23.3\%), the Netherlands (22.5\%), and Romania (20.9\%), where women make up less than a quarter of the workforce among science and engineering professionals.

Figure 69: Proportion (\%) of women among science and engineering professionals (HC) in the EU member states, 2020


Source: Science and engineering professionals - international comparison.

[^41]
## APPENDIX: TIME SERIES

EMPLOYEES IN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ..... 58
Tab. 1: Employees in research and development (HC) ..... 58
Tab. 2: Employees in research and development (FTE) ..... 58
IDEAL AND TYPICAL CAREER PATH IN RESEARCH ..... 59
Tab. 3: Students and graduates of master's and doctoral programmes and researchers (HC) ..... 59
Tab. 4: Students and graduates of master's and doctoral programmes and researchers (HC) in the natural sciences ..... 59
Tab. 5: Students and graduates of master's and doctoral programmes and researchers (HC) in the technical sciences ..... 60
Tab. 6: Students and graduates of master's and doctoral programmes and researchers (HC) in the agricultural sciences ..... 60
Tab. 7: Students and graduates of master's and doctoral programmes and researchers (HC) in the medical sciences ..... 61
Tab. 8: Students and graduates of master's and doctoral programmes and researchers (HC) in the social sciences ..... 61
Tab. 9: Students and graduates of master's and doctoral programmes and researchers (HC) in the humanities ..... 62
RESEARCHERS BY DISCIPLINE ..... 63
Tab. 10: Researchers by discipline (HC) ..... 63
Tab. 11: Researchers by discipline (FTE) ..... 63
RESEARCHERS BY SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINE AND SECTOR ..... 64
Tab. 12: Researchers in the natural sciences by sector (HC) ..... 64
Tab. 13: Researchers in the natural sciences by sector (FTE) ..... 64
Tab. 14: Researchers in the technical sciences by sector (HC) ..... 65
Tab. 15: Researchers in the technical sciences by sector (FTE) ..... 65
Tab. 16: Researchers in the agricultural sciences by sector (HC) ..... 66
Tab. 17: Researchers in the agricultural sciences by sector (FTE) ..... 66
Tab. 18: Researchers in the medical sciences by sector (HC) ..... 67
Tab. 19: Researchers in the medical sciences by sector (FTE) ..... 67
Tab. 20: Researchers in the social sciences (HC) ..... 68
Tab. 21: Researchers in the social sciences by sector (FTE) ..... 68
Tab. 22: Researchers in the humanities (HC) ..... 69
Tab. 23: Researchers in the humanities (FTE) ..... 69
RESEARCHERS BY SECTOR ..... 70
Tab. 24: Researchers by sector (HC) ..... 70
Tab. 25: Researchers in the business sector (HC) ..... 70
Tab. 26: Researchers in the government sector (HC) ..... 71
Tab. 27: Researchers in the university sector (HC) ..... 71
Tab. 28: Researchers by sector (FTE) ..... 72
ACADEMICS ..... 73
Tab. 29: Academics by position (FTE) ..... 73
Tab. 30: Academics by discipline (FTE)* ..... 73
Tab. 31: Academics by position in the natural sciences (FTE) * ..... 74
Tab. 32: Academics by position in the technical sciences (FTE)* ..... 74
Tab. 33: Academics by position in the medical sciences (FTE) * ..... 74
Tab. 34: Academics by position in the agricultural sciences (FTE) * ..... 75
Tab. 35: Academics by position in the social sciences (FTE) * ..... 75
Tab. 36: Academics by position in the humanities (FTE) * ..... 75
Tab. 37: Average gross monthly wage (CZK)* of academics ..... 76
DECISION-MAKERS ..... 77
Tab. 38: Proportion of women in public research institutions in 2020 (HC) ..... 77
Tab. 39: Proportion of women on the management and advisory boards of the Czech Academy of Sciences in 2020 (HC). ..... 77
Tab. 40: Proportion of women in the Czech Rectors' Conference in 2020 (HC) ..... 77
Tab. 41: Proportion of women in the Council of Czech Universities in 2020 (HC) ..... 77
Tab. 42: Proportion of women in the Technological Agency of the Czech Republic in 2020 (HC) ..... 78
Tab. 43: Proportion of women in the Czech Science Foundation in 2020 (HC) ..... 78
Tab. 44: Proportion of women in the Learned Society of the Czech Republic in 2020 (HC) ..... 78
SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING PROFESSIONALS. ..... 79
Tab. 45: Science and engineering professionals* and their average gross monthly wage (CZK) ..... 79
PATENTS ..... 79
Tab. 46: Patents granted by gender ..... 79
EMPLOYEES IN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

|  | Research employees |  |  |  | Technical employees |  |  |  | Other employees |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men(\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) |
| 2020 | 17922 | 47201 | 27.6 | 72.4 | 10548 | 25603 | 29.2 | 70.8 | 7651 | 9049 | 45.8 | 54.2 | 36191 | 81854 | 30.7 | 69.3 |
| 2019 | 17313 | 46377 | 27.2 | 72.8 | 10533 | 26275 | 28.6 | 71.4 | 7536 | 9041 | 45.5 | 54.5 | 35382 | 81693 | 30.3 | 69.7 |
| 2018 | 16461 | 45505 | 26.6 | 73.4 | 10524 | 24093 | 30.1 | 69.9 | 7457 | 9406 | 44.3 | 55.7 | 34442 | 79005 | 30.4 | 69.6 |
| 2017 | 16005 | 43784 | 26.8 | 73.2 | 9543 | 22649 | 29.6 | 70.4 | 7027 | 8724 | 44.6 | 55.4 | 32576 | 75158 | 30.2 | 69.8 |
| 2016 | 14971 | 41206 | 26.6 | 73.4 | 9225 | 20690 | 30.8 | 69.2 | 6072 | 7710 | 44.1 | 55.9 | 30268 | 69606 | 30.3 | 69.7 |
| 2015 | 15252 | 41352 | 26.9 | 73.1 | 9538 | 20053 | 32.2 | 67.8 | 6332 | 7601 | 45.4 | 54.6 | 31122 | 69006 | 31.1 | 68.9 |
| 2014 | 14815 | 39679 | 27.2 | 72.8 | 9146 | 20330 | 31.0 | 69.0 | 6159 | 7225 | 46.0 | 54.0 | 30120 | 67234 | 30.9 | 69.1 |
| 2013 | 14537 | 36917 | 28.3 | 71.7 | 8906 | 18710 | 32.2 | 67.8 | 6454 | 7189 | 47.3 | 52.7 | 29897 | 62816 | 32.2 | 67.8 |
| 2012 | 13102 | 34579 | 27.5 | 72.5 | 8700 | 18176 | 32.4 | 67.6 | 5944 | 7058 | 45.7 | 54.3 | 27746 | 59813 | 31.7 | 68.3 |
| 2011 | 12936 | 32966 | 28.2 | 71.8 | 8604 | 16423 | 34.4 | 65.6 | 5192 | 6161 | 45.7 | 54.3 | 26732 | 55550 | 32.5 | 67.5 |
| 2010 | 12198 | 31220 | 28.1 | 71.9 | 8194 | 15473 | 34.6 | 65.4 | 5030 | 5789 | 46.5 | 53.5 | 25422 | 52482 | 32.6 | 67.4 |
| 2009 | 12437 | 30656 | 28.9 | 71.1 | 8503 | 14781 | 36.5 | 63.5 | 4333 | 5078 | 46.0 | 54.0 | 25273 | 50515 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| 2008 | 12613 | 31627 | 28.5 | 71.5 | 7865 | 13652 | 36.6 | 63.4 | 4243 | 4501 | 48.5 | 51.5 | 24721 | 49780 | 33.2 | 66.8 |
| 2007 | 12034 | 30504 | 28.3 | 71.7 | 8413 | 13231 | 38.9 | 61.1 | 4395 | 4503 | 49.4 | 50.6 | 24842 | 48238 | 34.0 | 66.0 |
| 2006 | 11295 | 28381 | 28.5 | 71.5 | 8099 | 13239 | 38.0 | 62.0 | 4000 | 4147 | 49.1 | 50.9 | 23394 | 45767 | 33.8 | 66.2 |
| 2005 | 10827 | 26715 | 28.8 | 71.2 | 7817 | 11835 | 39.8 | 60.2 | 4220 | 3965 | 51.6 | 48.4 | 22864 | 42515 | 35.0 | 65.0 |

Source: CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.

|  | Research employees |  |  |  | Technical employees |  |  |  | Other employees |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) |
| 2020 | 10665 | 33541 | 24.1 | 75.9 | 7255 | 18691 | 27.6 | 72.4 | 5240 | 5566 | 48.5 | 51.5 | 23160 | 57799 | 28.6 | 71.4 |
| 2019 | 10154 | 32347 | 23.9 | 76.1 | 7406 | 18340 | 28.8 | 71.2 | 5259 | 5740 | 47.8 | 52.2 | 22819 | 56426 | 28.8 | 71.2 |
| 2018 | 9543 | 31655 | 23.2 | 76.8 | 6911 | 16408 | 29.6 | 70.4 | 4978 | 5474 | 47.6 | 52.4 | 21432 | 53538 | 28.6 | 71.4 |
| 2017 | 9060 | 30121 | 23.1 | 76.9 | 5918 | 14909 | 28.4 | 71.6 | 4612 | 5116 | 47.4 | 52.6 | 19590 | 50146 | 28.1 | 71.9 |
| 2016 | 8610 | 28728 | 23.1 | 76.9 | 5813 | 13609 | 29.9 | 70.1 | 4237 | 4786 | 47.0 | 53.0 | 18660 | 47123 | 28.4 | 71.6 |
| 2015 | 8923 | 29158 | 23.4 | 76.6 | 6102 | 13248 | 31.5 | 68.5 | 4391 | 4611 | 48.8 | 51.2 | 19416 | 47017 | 29.2 | 70.8 |
| 2014 | 8701 | 27338 | 24.1 | 75.9 | 6065 | 13781 | 30.6 | 69.4 | 4154 | 4404 | 48.5 | 51.5 | 18920 | 45523 | 29.4 | 70.6 |
| 2013 | 8401 | 25870 | 24.5 | 75.5 | 5921 | 13012 | 31.3 | 68.7 | 4191 | 4581 | 47.8 | 52.2 | 18513 | 43463 | 29.9 | 70.1 |
| 2012 | 8212 | 25006 | 24.7 | 75.3 | 5832 | 12576 | 31.7 | 68.3 | 4090 | 4615 | 47.0 | 53.0 | 18134 | 42197 | 30.1 | 69.9 |
| 2011 | 7696 | 22985 | 25.1 | 74.9 | 5485 | 11624 | 32.1 | 67.9 | 3591 | 4315 | 45.4 | 54.6 | 16772 | 38924 | 30.1 | 69.9 |
| 2010 | 7490 | 21799 | 25.6 | 74.4 | 5141 | 10830 | 32.2 | 67.8 | 3369 | 3723 | 47.5 | 52.5 | 16000 | 36352 | 30.6 | 69.4 |
| 2009 | 7490 | 21269 | 26.0 | 74.0 | 5395 | 10610 | 33.7 | 66.3 | 2938 | 3259 | 47.4 | 52.6 | 15823 | 35138 | 31.0 | 69.0 |
| 2008 | 7559 | 22226 | 25.4 | 74.6 | 5259 | 9874 | 34.8 | 65.2 | 2888 | 3002 | 49.0 | 51.0 | 15706 | 35102 | 30.9 | 69.1 |
| 2007 | 7093 | 20785 | 25.4 | 74.6 | 5641 | 9789 | 36.6 | 63.4 | 2916 | 2967 | 49.6 | 50.4 | 15650 | 33541 | 31.8 | 68.2 |
| 2006 | 6652 | 19615 | 25.3 | 74.7 | 5672 | 10168 | 35.8 | 64.2 | 2731 | 2891 | 48.6 | 51.4 | 15055 | 32674 | 31.5 | 68.5 |
| 2005 | 6349 | 17820 | 26.3 | 73.7 | 5672 | 8620 | 39.7 | 60.3 | 2633 | 2795 | 48.5 | 51.5 | 14654 | 29235 | 33.4 | 66.6 |

IDEAL AND TYPICAL CAREER PATH IN RESEARCH

|  | Master's students |  |  | Master's graduates |  |  | Doctoral students |  |  | Doctoral graduates |  |  | Researchers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women(\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) |
| 2020 | 59417 | 38679 | 60.6 | 16320 | 11051 | 59.6 | 9369 | 11679 | 44.5 | 814 | 981 | 45.3 | 17992 | 47201 | 27.6 |
| 2019 | 58430 | 38305 | 60.4 | 16502 | 11567 | 58.8 | 9153 | 11211 | 44.9 | 992 | 1261 | 44.0 | 17313 | 46377 | 27.2 |
| 2018 | 59748 | 39412 | 60.3 | 17728 | 12224 | 59.2 | 9326 | 11488 | 44.8 | 1027 | 1293 | 44.3 | 16461 | 45505 | 26.6 |
| 2017 | 62270 | 40873 | 60.4 | 18308 | 12803 | 58.8 | 9742 | 11853 | 45.1 | 955 | 1384 | 40.8 | 16005 | 43784 | 26.8 |
| 2016 | 64365 | 42763 | 60.1 | 19303 | 13327 | 59.2 | 10150 | 12486 | 44.8 | 994 | 1289 | 43.5 | 14971 | 41206 | 26.6 |
| 2015 | 65572 | 43981 | 59.9 | 20629 | 13977 | 59.6 | 10161 | 12166 | 45.5 | 1048 | 1313 | 44.4 | 15252 | 41352 | 26.9 |
| 2014 | 69199 | 45809 | 60.2 | 21343 | 14041 | 60.3 | 10560 | 13093 | 44.6 | 920 | 1230 | 42.8 | 14815 | 39679 | 27.2 |
| 2013 | 71700 | 46856 | 60.5 | 22359 | 14570 | 60.5 | 10755 | 13375 | 44.6 | 1018 | 1332 | 43.3 | 14537 | 36917 | 28.3 |
| 2012 | 73848 | 47581 | 60.8 | 22656 | 15028 | 60.1 | 10710 | 13502 | 44.2 | 1093 | 1507 | 42.0 | 13102 | 34579 | 27.5 |
| 2011 | 75076 | 48705 | 60.7 | 22434 | 15181 | 59.6 | 10840 | 14193 | 43.3 | 1032 | 1337 | 43.6 | 12936 | 32966 | 28.2 |
| 2010 | 74801 | 49304 | 60.3 | 21146 | 14508 | 59.3 | 10881 | 14398 | 43.0 | 855 | 1301 | 39.7 | 12198 | 31220 | 28.1 |
| 2009 | 73820 | 48977 | 60.1 | 19692 | 13537 | 59.3 | 10566 | 14340 | 42.4 | 886 | 1421 | 38.4 | 12437 | 30656 | 28.9 |
| 2008 | 71077 | 46458 | 60.5 | 17561 | 13296 | 56.9 | 9921 | 14006 | 41.5 | 876 | 1425 | 38.1 | 12613 | 31627 | 28.5 |
| 2007 | 68932 | 45788 | 60.1 | 15656 | 12130 | 56.3 | 9416 | 13978 | 40.2 | 836 | 1390 | 37.6 | 12034 | 30504 | 28.3 |
| 2006 | 67707 | 45757 | 59.7 | 14306 | 11486 | 55.5 | 9015 | 13716 | 39.7 | 724 | 1286 | 36.0 | 11295 | 28381 | 28.5 |
| 2005 | 66954 | 48294 | 58.1 | 12957 | 10703 | 54.8 | 8377 | 13378 | 38.5 | 669 | 1240 | 35.0 | 10827 | 26715 | 28.8 |

Source: MEYS - Performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic; CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.
Tab. 4: Students and graduates of master's and doctoral programmes and researchers $(H C)$ in the natural science

|  | Master's students |  |  | Master's graduates |  |  | Doctoral students |  |  | Doctoral graduates |  |  | Researchers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women(\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) |
| 2020 | 2577 | 1601 | 61.7 | 863 | 465 | 65.0 | 2313 | 2190 | 51.4 | 220 | 234 | 48.5 | 5020 | 15195 | 24.8 |
| 2019 | 2370 | 1368 | 63.4 | 838 | 435 | 65.8 | 2092 | 2010 | 51.0 | 271 | 292 | 48.1 | 4950 | 14432 | 25.5 |
| 2018 | 2369 | 1286 | 64.8 | 950 | 490 | 66.0 | 2201 | 2053 | 51.7 | 245 | 286 | 46.1 | 4665 | 14572 | 24.2 |
| 2017 | 2407 | 1299 | 64.9 | 908 | 489 | 65.0 | 2196 | 2124 | 50.8 | 269 | 294 | 47.8 | 4564 | 13647 | 25.1 |
| 2016 | 2470 | 1410 | 63.7 | 919 | 525 | 63.6 | 2258 | 2158 | 51.1 | 249 | 245 | 50.4 | 4213 | 12433 | 25.3 |
| 2015 | 2468 | 1469 | 62.7 | 905 | 520 | 63.5 | 2277 | 2172 | 48.4 | 233 | 248 | 48.4 | 4222 | 12154 | 25.8 |
| 2014 | 2473 | 1525 | 61.9 | 913 | 482 | 65.4 | 2335 | 2187 | 51.6 | 254 | 234 | 52.0 | 4143 | 11971 | 25.7 |
| 2013 | 2485 | 1455 | 63.1 | 930 | 550 | 62.8 | 2423 | 2146 | 53.0 | 239 | 244 | 49.5 | 3943 | 10628 | 27.1 |
| 2012 | 2434 | 1446 | 62.7 | 928 | 561 | 62.3 | 2312 | 2118 | 52.2 | 234 | 264 | 47.0 | 3694 | 9582 | 27.8 |
| 2011 | 2487 | 1537 | 61.8 | 920 | 528 | 63.5 | 2246 | 2108 | 51.6 | 255 | 256 | 49.9 | 3432 | 8956 | 27.7 |
| 2010 | 2418 | 1523 | 61.4 | 887 | 551 | 61.7 | 2196 | 2084 | 51.3 | 219 | 255 | 46.2 | 2731 | 7524 | 26.6 |
| 2009 | 2415 | 1499 | 61.7 | 866 | 492 | 63.8 | 2186 | 2068 | 51.4 | 221 | 243 | 47.6 | 2623 | 6837 | 27.7 |
| 2008 | 2352 | 1429 | 62.2 | 697 | 463 | 60.1 | 2083 | 2063 | 50.2 | 203 | 274 | 42.6 | 2835 | 7406 | 27.7 |
| 2007 | 2090 | 1322 | 61.3 | 720 | 479 | 60.1 | 1993 | 2108 | 48.6 | 213 | 233 | 47.8 | 2523 | 7069 | 26.3 |
| 2006 | 1910 | 1341 | 58.8 | 640 | 528 | 54.8 | 1975 | 2183 | 47.5 | 206 | 265 | 43.7 | 2519 | 7216 | 25.9 |
| 2005 | 1882 | 1537 | 55.0 | 602 | 509 | 54.2 | 1850 | 2125 | 46.5 | 185 | 266 | 41.0 | 2432 | 6656 | 26.8 |

Tab. 5: Students and graduates of master's and doctoral programmes and researchers $(\mathrm{HC})$ in the technical sciences

|  | Master's students |  |  | Master's graduates |  |  | Doctoral students |  |  | Doctoral graduates |  |  | Researchers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) |
| 2020 | 4757 | 11445 | 29.4 | 2143 | 4507 | 32.2 | 1541 | 4240 | 26.7 | 127 | 322 | 28.3 | 3587 | 20781 | 14.7 |
| 2019 | 5314 | 12048 | 30.6 | 2157 | 4687 | 31.5 | 1574 | 4140 | 27.5 | 160 | 445 | 26.4 | 3288 | 20895 | 13.6 |
| 2018 | 5760 | 12902 | 30.9 | 2268 | 4927 | 31.5 | 1596 | 4243 | 27.3 | 182 | 505 | 26.5 | 3144 | 20191 | 13.5 |
| 2017 | 6017 | 13580 | 30.7 | 2279 | 5318 | 30.0 | 1612 | 4488 | 26.4 | 140 | 533 | 20.8 | 2931 | 19252 | 13.2 |
| 2016 | 6095 | 14447 | 29.7 | 2293 | 5433 | 29.7 | 1642 | 4880 | 25.2 | 153 | 499 | 23.5 | 2695 | 18410 | 12.8 |
| 2015 | 6021 | 15026 | 28.6 | 2359 | 5737 | 29.1 | 1599 | 4406 | 26.7 | 192 | 528 | 26.7 | 2999 | 19093 | 13.6 |
| 2014 | 6049 | 15693 | 27.8 | 2347 | 5850 | 28.6 | 1795 | 5291 | 25.3 | 175 | 548 | 24.2 | 2882 | 17780 | 13.9 |
| 2013 | 6213 | 16210 | 27.7 | 2397 | 5994 | 28.6 | 1817 | 5433 | 25.1 | 164 | 490 | 25.1 | 2779 | 16475 | 14.4 |
| 2012 | 6336 | 16447 | 27.8 | 2408 | 5988 | 28.7 | 1812 | 5459 | 24.9 | 169 | 577 | 22.7 | 2349 | 16114 | 12.7 |
| 2011 | 6345 | 16725 | 27.5 | 2401 | 6337 | 27.5 | 1796 | 5705 | 23.9 | 148 | 480 | 23.6 | 2178 | 14746 | 12.9 |
| 2010 | 6223 | 17153 | 26.6 | 2162 | 5917 | 26.8 | 1796 | 5836 | 23.5 | 144 | 484 | 22.9 | 2258 | 14487 | 13.5 |
| 2009 | 6044 | 16949 | 26.3 | 1834 | 5528 | 24.9 | 1775 | 5725 | 23.7 | 177 | 567 | 23.8 | 2499 | 14425 | 14.8 |
| 2008 | 5032 | 15572 | 24.4 | 2088 | 6122 | 25.4 | 1725 | 5564 | 23.7 | 168 | 557 | 23.2 | 2629 | 15124 | 14.8 |
| 2007 | 4912 | 15836 | 23.7 | 1768 | 5445 | 24.5 | 1734 | 5615 | 23.6 | 166 | 552 | 23.1 | 2530 | 14121 | 15.2 |
| 2006 | 5006 | 16226 | 23.6 | 1612 | 4987 | 24.4 | 1640 | 5545 | 22.8 | 125 | 510 | 19.7 | 1953 | 12316 | 13.7 |
| 2005 | 5769 | 18464 | 23.8 | 1345 | 4407 | 23.4 | 1554 | 5548 | 21.9 | 101 | 471 | 17.7 | 1998 | 11315 | 15.0 |

Source: MEYS - Performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic; CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.
Tab. 6: Students and graduates of master's and doctoral programmes and researchers ( HC ) in the agricultural sciences

|  | Master's students |  |  | Master's graduates |  |  | Doctoral students |  |  | Doctoral graduates |  |  | Researchers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) |
| 2020 | 2511 | 1245 | 66.9 | 737 | 409 | 64.3 | 424 | 438 | 49.2 | 37 | 26 | 58.7 | 1222 | 1447 | 45.8 |
| 2019 | 2451 | 1193 | 67.3 | 750 | 427 | 63.7 | 420 | 387 | 52.0 | 55 | 55 | 50.0 | 1135 | 1197 | 48.7 |
| 2018 | 2576 | 1253 | 67.3 | 826 | 457 | 64.4 | 402 | 382 | 51.3 | 53 | 52 | 50.5 | 1014 | 1305 | 43.7 |
| 2017 | 2706 | 1357 | 66.6 | 763 | 460 | 62.4 | 402 | 359 | 52.8 | 60 | 48 | 55.6 | 1076 | 1529 | 41.3 |
| 2016 | 2762 | 1392 | 66.5 | 727 | 470 | 60.7 | 431 | 381 | 53.1 | 56 | 49 | 53.3 | 968 | 1440 | 40.2 |
| 2015 | 2663 | 1376 | 65.9 | 785 | 434 | 64.4 | 448 | 387 | 57.8 | 63 | 46 | 57.8 | 907 | 1405 | 39.2 |
| 2014 | 2732 | 1354 | 66.9 | 755 | 458 | 62.2 | 464 | 360 | 56.3 | 73 | 69 | 51.4 | 937 | 1431 | 39.6 |
| 2013 | 2814 | 1346 | 67.6 | 786 | 476 | 62.3 | 441 | 389 | 53.1 | 69 | 68 | 50.4 | 894 | 1478 | 37.7 |
| 2012 | 2834 | 1345 | 67.8 | 765 | 464 | 62.2 | 450 | 409 | 52.4 | 100 | 86 | 53.8 | 783 | 1385 | 36.1 |
| 2011 | 2738 | 1349 | 67.0 | 800 | 432 | 64.9 | 543 | 514 | 51.4 | 83 | 76 | 52.2 | 914 | 1352 | 40.3 |
| 2010 | 2723 | 1310 | 67.5 | 780 | 453 | 63.3 | 548 | 526 | 51.0 | 63 | 70 | 47.4 | 995 | 1600 | 38.3 |
| 2009 | 2777 | 1341 | 67.4 | 738 | 478 | 60.7 | 516 | 533 | 49.2 | 44 | 68 | 39.3 | 1076 | 1651 | 39.5 |
| 2008 | 2767 | 1355 | 67.1 | 684 | 452 | 60.2 | 448 | 500 | 47.3 | 67 | 69 | 49.3 | 1160 | 1751 | 39.8 |
| 2007 | 2749 | 1475 | 65.1 | 708 | 461 | 60.6 | 419 | 502 | 45.5 | 61 | 101 | 37.7 | 1124 | 1844 | 37.9 |
| 2006 | 2785 | 1573 | 63.9 | 609 | 472 | 56.3 | 440 | 499 | 46.9 | 56 | 77 | 42.1 | 1041 | 1631 | 39.0 |
| 2005 | 2688 | 1722 | 61.0 | 474 | 383 | 55.3 | 431 | 507 | 45.9 | 59 | 76 | 43.7 | 1061 | 1649 | 39.2 |

Tab. 7: Students and graduates of master's and doctoral programmes and researchers (HC) in the medical sciences

|  | Master's students |  |  | Master's graduates |  |  | Doctoral students |  |  | Doctoral graduates |  |  | Researchers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) |
| 2020 | 14091 | 6476 | 68.5 | 2440 | 965 | 71.7 | 1522 | 1429 | 51.6 | 118 | 101 | 53.9 | 3981 | 4281 | 48.2 |
| 2019 | 13397 | 6276 | 68.1 | 2313 | 860 | 72.9 | 1492 | 1375 | 52.0 | 124 | 98 | 55.9 | 3721 | 4116 | 47.5 |
| 2018 | 12798 | 6134 | 67.6 | 2483 | 859 | 74.3 | 1379 | 1285 | 51.8 | 139 | 86 | 61.8 | 3436 | 3725 | 48.0 |
| 2017 | 13116 | 6094 | 68.3 | 2526 | 906 | 73.6 | 1476 | 1291 | 53.3 | 130 | 110 | 54.2 | 3471 | 3736 | 48.2 |
| 2016 | 13181 | 6162 | 68.1 | 2402 | 904 | 72.7 | 1519 | 1319 | 53.5 | 114 | 110 | 50.9 | 3116 | 3410 | 47.7 |
| 2015 | 13028 | 6067 | 68.2 | 2407 | 795 | 75.2 | 1518 | 1352 | 56.1 | 124 | 97 | 56.1 | 3265 | 3340 | 49.4 |
| 2014 | 12963 | 5931 | 68.6 | 2458 | 844 | 74.4 | 1499 | 1310 | 53.4 | 127 | 134 | 48.7 | 3179 | 3358 | 48.6 |
| 2013 | 13072 | 5875 | 69.0 | 2325 | 772 | 75.1 | 1484 | 1345 | 52.5 | 139 | 133 | 51.1 | 3250 | 3335 | 49.4 |
| 2012 | 12707 | 5751 | 68.8 | 2395 | 834 | 74.2 | 1520 | 1366 | 52.7 | 112 | 114 | 49.6 | 2866 | 2794 | 50.6 |
| 2011 | 12542 | 5794 | 68.4 | 2314 | 793 | 74.5 | 1460 | 1392 | 51.2 | 120 | 134 | 47.2 | 3179 | 3356 | 48.6 |
| 2010 | 12054 | 5590 | 68.3 | 2273 | 790 | 74.2 | 1465 | 1428 | 50.6 | 97 | 122 | 44.3 | 3201 | 3399 | 48.5 |
| 2009 | 11788 | 5424 | 68.5 | 2347 | 718 | 76.6 | 1454 | 1478 | 49.6 | 109 | 134 | 44.9 | 3352 | 3646 | 47.9 |
| 2008 | 11742 | 5222 | 69.2 | 1938 | 629 | 75.5 | 1349 | 1531 | 46.8 | 93 | 132 | 41.3 | 3058 | 3289 | 48.2 |
| 2007 | 11432 | 5106 | 69.1 | 1771 | 620 | 74.1 | 1243 | 1490 | 45.5 | 97 | 136 | 41.6 | 2868 | 3263 | 46.8 |
| 2006 | 11164 | 5016 | 69.0 | 1674 | 636 | 72.5 | 1154 | 1455 | 44.2 | 72 | 107 | 40.2 | 2752 | 3030 | 47.6 |
| 2005 | 10594 | 4742 | 69.1 | 1522 | 675 | 69.3 | 1032 | 1353 | 43.3 | 73 | 110 | 39.9 | 2521 | 2942 | 46.1 |

Source: MEYS - Performance indicators of public and private universities in the Czech Republic; CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.
Tab. 8: Students and graduates of master's and doctoral programmes and researchers ( HC ) in the social sciences

|  | Master's students |  |  | Master's graduates |  |  | Doctoral students |  |  | Doctoral graduates |  |  | Researchers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) |
| 2020 | 31031 | 15616 | 66.5 | 8772 | 4021 | 68.6 | 2016 | 1997 | 50.2 | 198 | 180 | 52.4 | 2507 | 3223 | 43.8 |
| 2019 | 30346 | 15073 | 66.8 | 9242 | 4153 | 69.0 | 2053 | 1926 | 51.6 | 237 | 225 | 51.3 | 2576 | 3441 | 42.8 |
| 2018 | 31378 | 15377 | 67.1 | 9989 | 4393 | 69.5 | 2141 | 2069 | 50.9 | 238 | 239 | 49.9 | 2649 | 3534 | 42.8 |
| 2017 | 32893 | 16028 | 67.2 | 10464 | 4641 | 69.3 | 2335 | 2099 | 52.7 | 217 | 249 | 46.6 | 2503 | 3484 | 41.8 |
| 2016 | 34368 | 16816 | 67.1 | 11528 | 4961 | 69.9 | 2424 | 2222 | 52.2 | 241 | 216 | 52.7 | 2507 | 3435 | 42.2 |
| 2015 | 35730 | 17375 | 67.3 | 12824 | 5392 | 70.4 | 2404 | 2268 | 50.9 | 249 | 240 | 50.9 | 2390 | 3225 | 42.6 |
| 2014 | 39308 | 18544 | 67.9 | 13728 | 5677 | 70.7 | 2497 | 2333 | 51.7 | 254 | 240 | 51.4 | 2376 | 3196 | 42.6 |
| 2013 | 41227 | 19199 | 68.2 | 14302 | 5671 | 71.6 | 2587 | 2368 | 52.2 | 260 | 270 | 49.1 | 2364 | 3117 | 43.1 |
| 2012 | 43418 | 19723 | 68.8 | 14521 | 6134 | 70.3 | 2620 | 2471 | 51.5 | 319 | 282 | 53.1 | 1862 | 2596 | 41.8 |
| 2011 | 44680 | 20476 | 68.6 | 14563 | 5955 | 71.0 | 2834 | 2789 | 50.4 | 253 | 250 | 50.3 | 1991 | 2720 | 42.3 |
| 2010 | 45174 | 20878 | 68.4 | 13686 | 5731 | 70.5 | 2895 | 2877 | 50.2 | 213 | 226 | 48.5 | 1342 | 1958 | 40.7 |
| 2009 | 44675 | 20838 | 68.2 | 12722 | 5349 | 70.4 | 2765 | 2905 | 48.8 | 212 | 276 | 43.4 | 1437 | 2068 | 41.0 |
| 2008 | 43309 | 19960 | 68.5 | 11092 | 4754 | 70.0 | 2583 | 2762 | 48.3 | 220 | 246 | 47.2 | 1711 | 2247 | 43.2 |
| 2007 | 41907 | 19129 | 68.7 | 9685 | 4210 | 69.7 | 2398 | 2694 | 47.1 | 194 | 249 | 43.8 | 1783 | 2489 | 41.7 |
| 2006 | 41046 | 18610 | 68.8 | 8798 | 4052 | 68.5 | 2274 | 2550 | 47.1 | 177 | 212 | 45.5 | 1879 | 2516 | 42.8 |
| 2005 | 40343 | 18718 | 68.3 | 7932 | 3934 | 66.8 | 2096 | 2431 | 46.3 | 162 | 212 | 43.3 | 1741 | 2565 | 40.4 |

Tab. 9: Students and graduates of master's and doctoral programmes and researchers $(\mathrm{HC})$ in the humanities

|  | Master's students |  |  | Master's graduates |  |  | Doctoral students |  |  | Doctoral graduates |  |  | Researchers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) |
| 2020 | 4450 | 2296 | 66.0 | 1365 | 684 | 66.6 | 1553 | 1385 | 52.9 | 114 | 118 | 49.1 | 1675 | 2274 | 42.4 |
| 2019 | 4552 | 2347 | 66.0 | 1525 | 682 | 69.1 | 1522 | 1373 | 52.6 | 145 | 146 | 49.8 | 1642 | 2296 | 41.7 |
| 2018 | 4867 | 2460 | 66.4 | 1581 | 729 | 68.4 | 1607 | 1456 | 52.5 | 170 | 125 | 57.6 | 1553 | 2179 | 41.6 |
| 2017 | 5131 | 2515 | 67.1 | 1671 | 686 | 70.9 | 1721 | 1492 | 53.6 | 139 | 150 | 48.1 | 1461 | 2135 | 40.6 |
| 2016 | 5489 | 2536 | 68.4 | 1691 | 777 | 68.5 | 1876 | 1526 | 55.1 | 181 | 170 | 51.6 | 1473 | 2079 | 41.5 |
| 2015 | 5662 | 2668 | 68.0 | 1700 | 748 | 69.4 | 1915 | 1581 | 54.8 | 187 | 154 | 54.8 | 1469 | 2135 | 40.8 |
| 2014 | 5674 | 2762 | 67.3 | 1819 | 783 | 69.9 | 1970 | 1612 | 55.0 | 145 | 152 | 48.8 | 1299 | 1941 | 40.1 |
| 2013 | 5889 | 2771 | 68.0 | 1929 | 797 | 70.8 | 2003 | 1694 | 54.2 | 147 | 127 | 53.6 | 1307 | 1885 | 40.9 |
| 2012 | 6119 | 2869 | 68.1 | 1940 | 746 | 72.2 | 1996 | 1679 | 54.3 | 159 | 184 | 46.4 | 1548 | 2078 | 42.7 |
| 2011 | 6284 | 2824 | 69.0 | 1804 | 768 | 70.1 | 1961 | 1685 | 53.8 | 173 | 141 | 55.1 | 1243 | 1835 | 40.4 |
| 2010 | 6209 | 2850 | 68.5 | 1685 | 739 | 69.5 | 1981 | 1647 | 54.6 | 119 | 133 | 45.2 | 1671 | 2253 | 42.6 |
| 2009 | 6121 | 2926 | 67.7 | 1445 | 712 | 67.0 | 1870 | 1631 | 53.4 | 123 | 133 | 48.0 | 1450 | 2028 | 41.7 |
| 2008 | 5875 | 2920 | 66.8 | 1294 | 644 | 66.8 | 1733 | 1586 | 52.2 | 125 | 147 | 46.0 | 1220 | 1810 | 40.3 |
| 2007 | 5842 | 2920 | 66.7 | 1251 | 668 | 65.2 | 1629 | 1569 | 50.9 | 105 | 119 | 46.9 | 1206 | 1718 | 41.2 |
| 2006 | 5796 | 2991 | 66.0 | 1110 | 674 | 62.2 | 1532 | 1484 | 50.8 | 88 | 115 | 43.3 | 1150 | 1672 | 40.8 |
| 2005 | 5678 | 3111 | 64.6 | 1173 | 704 | 62.5 | 1414 | 1414 | 50.0 | 89 | 105 | 45.9 | 1074 | 1589 | 40.3 |

RESEARCHERS BY DISCIPLINE

Source: CZSO - Research and Development Indicators.

|  | Natural Sciences |  |  | Technical Sciences |  |  | Agricultural Sciences |  |  | Medical Sciences |  |  | Social Sciences |  |  | Humanities |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men Women (\%) |  | Women | Men Women (\%) |  | Women | Men Women (\%) |  | Women | Men Women (\%) |  | Women | Men Women (\%) |  | Women | Men Women (\%) |  |
| 2020 | 3792 | 11741 | 24.4 | 2437 | 16336 | 13.0 | 801 | 1003 | 44.4 | 1630 | 1608 | 50.3 | 1017 | 1393 | 42.2 | 989 | 1461 | 40.4 |
| 2019 | 3626 | 10988 | 24.8 | 2264 | 16092 | 12.3 | 705 | 805 | 46.7 | 1533 | 1588 | 49.1 | 1100 | 1428 | 43.5 | 926 | 1447 | 39.0 |
| 2018 | 3362 | 11218 | 23.1 | 2082 | 15162 | 12.1 | 620 | 777 | 44.4 | 1391 | 1494 | 48.2 | 1204 | 1629 | 42.5 | 884 | 1375 | 39.1 |
| 2017 | 3210 | 10668 | 23.1 | 1983 | 14665 | 11.9 | 660 | 809 | 44.9 | 1332 | 1248 | 51.6 | 1083 | 1493 | 42.0 | 792 | 1239 | 39.0 |
| 2016 | 3009 | 9887 | 23.3 | 1747 | 14105 | 11.0 | 625 | 806 | 43.7 | 1320 | 1174 | 52.9 | 1128 | 1570 | 41.8 | 780 | 1186 | 39.7 |
| 2015 | 3075 | 9605 | 24.3 | 1985 | 14708 | 11.9 | 578 | 821 | 41.3 | 1352 | 1265 | 51.7 | 1117 | 1430 | 43.9 | 816 | 1328 | 38.1 |
| 2014 | 2998 | 9220 | 24.5 | 2122 | 13544 | 13.5 | 492 | 782 | 38.6 | 1190 | 1183 | 50.1 | 1124 | 1465 | 43.4 | 777 | 1143 | 40.5 |
| 2013 | 2837 | 8090 | 26.0 | 1967 | 13349 | 12.8 | 471 | 794 | 37.2 | 1303 | 1189 | 52.3 | 1060 | 1390 | 43.3 | 763 | 1059 | 41.9 |
| 2012 | 2689 | 7400 | 26.7 | 1850 | 12958 | 12.5 | 407 | 789 | 34.0 | 1292 | 1177 | 52.3 | 980 | 1415 | 40.9 | 992 | 1267 | 43.9 |
| 2011 | 2425 | 6458 | 27.3 | 1713 | 11982 | 12.5 | 553 | 754 | 42.3 | 1358 | 1345 | 50.2 | 971 | 1379 | 41.3 | 678 | 1068 | 38.8 |
| 2010 | 1966 | 5618 | 25.9 | 1656 | 11553 | 12.5 | 590 | 884 | 40.0 | 1446 | 1388 | 51.0 | 737 | 1031 | 41.7 | 1034 | 1325 | 43.8 |
| 2009 | 2006 | 5182 | 27.9 | 1821 | 11528 | 13.6 | 615 | 833 | 42.5 | 1370 | 1383 | 49.8 | 807 | 1140 | 41.4 | 870 | 1204 | 41.9 |
| 2008 | 2162 | 5716 | 27.4 | 1888 | 11982 | 13.6 | 636 | 895 | 41.5 | 1291 | 1349 | 48.9 | 855 | 1160 | 42.4 | 727 | 1124 | 39.3 |
| 2007 | 1952 | 5460 | 26.3 | 1767 | 10918 | 13.9 | 624 | 961 | 39.4 | 1263 | 1365 | 48.1 | 796 | 1104 | 41.9 | 691 | 978 | 41.4 |
| 2006 | 1960 | 5671 | 25.7 | 1336 | 9547 | 12.3 | 592 | 882 | 40.2 | 1210 | 1289 | 48.4 | 862 | 1199 | 41.8 | 693 | 1027 | 40.3 |
| 2005 | 1785 | 5132 | 25.8 | 1356 | 8384 | 13.9 | 583 | 879 | 39.9 | 1160 | 1327 | 46.6 | 803 | 1125 | 41.6 | 662 | 972 | 40.5 |

RESEARCHERS BY SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINE AND SECTOR

|  | Business sector |  |  |  | Government sector |  |  |  | University sector |  |  |  | Private non-profit sector |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) |
| 2020 | 1163 | 6537 | 15.1 | 84.9 | 2263 | 4222 | 34.9 | 65.1 | 1576 | 4397 | 26.4 | 73.6 | 18 | 39 | 31.4 | 68.6 |
| 2019 | 1143 | 6379 | 15.2 | 84.8 | 2113 | 4017 | 34.5 | 65.5 | 1676 | 4012 | 29.5 | 70.5 | 18 | 24 | 43.6 | 56.5 |
| 2018 | 1034 | 6647 | 13.5 | 86.5 | 2053 | 4081 | 33.5 | 66.5 | 1563 | 3819 | 29.0 | 71.0 | 15 | 25 | 37.5 | 62.5 |
| 2017 | 984 | 6238 | 13.6 | 86.4 | 2173 | 3899 | 35.8 | 64.2 | 1385 | 3477 | 28.5 | 71.5 | 22 | 34 | 39.0 | 61.0 |
| 2016 | 978 | 5670 | 14.7 | 85.3 | 1927 | 3705 | 34.2 | 65.8 | 1297 | 3028 | 30.0 | 70.0 | 11 | 30 | 26.5 | 73.5 |
| 2015 | 934 | 5253 | 15.1 | 84.9 | 1830 | 3727 | 32.9 | 67.1 | 1433 | 3139 | 31.3 | 68.7 | 25 | 35 | 41.7 | 58.3 |
| 2014 | 922 | 4950 | 15.7 | 84.3 | 1823 | 3656 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 1373 | 3332 | 29.2 | 70.8 | 25 | 33 | 43.1 | 56.9 |
| 2013 | 862 | 3833 | 18.4 | 81.6 | 1717 | 3517 | 32.8 | 67.2 | 1352 | 3249 | 29.4 | 70.6 | 12 | 29 | 29.3 | 70.7 |
| 2012 | 879 | 3133 | 21.9 | 78.1 | 1571 | 3323 | 32.1 | 67.9 | 1232 | 3087 | 28.5 | 71.5 | 12 | 39 | 23.5 | 76.5 |
| 2011 | 616 | 2576 | 19.3 | 80.7 | 1503 | 3321 | 31.2 | 68.8 | 1301 | 3006 | 30.2 | 69.8 | 12 | 52 | 18.8 | 81.3 |
| 2010 | 525 | 2202 | 19.3 | 80.7 | 1409 | 3350 | 29.6 | 70.4 | 781 | 1923 | 28.9 | 71.1 | 15 | 48 | 23.8 | 76.2 |
| 2009 | 536 | 1955 | 21.5 | 78.5 | 1480 | 3143 | 32.0 | 68.0 | 592 | 1702 | 25.8 | 74.2 | 15 | 38 | 28.3 | 71.7 |
| 2008 | 461 | 1916 | 19.4 | 80.6 | 1804 | 3687 | 32.9 | 67.1 | 563 | 1789 | 23.9 | 76.1 | 7 | 14 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| 2007 | 356 | 2022 | 15.0 | 85.0 | 1678 | 3585 | 31.9 | 68.1 | 484 | 1449 | 25.0 | 75.0 | 5 | 13 | 27.8 | 72.2 |
| 2006 | 324 | 1933 | 14.4 | 85.6 | 1526 | 3477 | 30.5 | 69.5 | 664 | 1793 | 27.0 | 73.0 | 5 | 13 | 27.8 | 72.2 |
| 2005 | 359 | 1981 | 15.3 | 84.7 | 1440 | 3320 | 30.3 | 69.7 | 625 | 1341 | 31.8 | 68.2 | 8 | 14 | 36.4 | 63.6 |


| Tab. 1 | chers | natu | sciences by | ector (F) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | : CZSO - | arch and | d Developme | Indicators |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Busine | ess sector |  |  | overnm | nent sector |  |  | Univers | sity sector |  |  | te non | -profit secto |  |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) |
| 2020 | 989 | 5522 | 15.2 | 84.8 | 1766 | 3312 | 34.8 | 65.2 | 1020 | 2889 | 26.1 | 73.9 | 17 | 18 | 49.0 | 51.0 |
| 2019 | 978 | 5390 | 15.4 | 84.6 | 1600 | 3145 | 33.7 | 66.3 | 1031 | 2439 | 29.7 | 70.3 | 17 | 14 | 56.3 | 43.7 |
| 2018 | 879 | 5696 | 13.4 | 86.6 | 1548 | 3166 | 32.8 | 67.2 | 923 | 2339 | 28.3 | 71.7 | 12 | 16 | 42.3 | 57.8 |
| 2017 | 817 | 5373 | 13.2 | 86.8 | 1631 | 3187 | 33.8 | 66.2 | 743 | 2082 | 26.3 | 73.7 | 19 | 26 | 42.7 | 57.3 |
| 2016 | 806 | 4836 | 14.3 | 85.7 | 1454 | 2954 | 33.0 | 67.0 | 739 | 2073 | 26.3 | 73.7 | 9 | 24 | 27.2 | 72.8 |
| 2015 | 736 | 4515 | 14.0 | 86.0 | 1406 | 2914 | 32.5 | 67.5 | 913 | 2142 | 29.9 | 70.1 | 20 | 34 | 37.0 | 63.0 |
| 2014 | 747 | 4204 | 15.1 | 84.9 | 1405 | 2868 | 32.9 | 67.1 | 829 | 2121 | 28.1 | 71.9 | 17 | 27 | 38.6 | 61.4 |
| 2013 | 686 | 3184 | 17.7 | 82.3 | 1282 | 2704 | 32.2 | 67.8 | 860 | 2174 | 28.3 | 71.7 | 9 | 28 | 24.3 | 75.7 |
| 2012 | 715 | 2563 | 21.8 | 78.2 | 1154 | 2674 | 30.1 | 69.9 | 806 | 2131 | 27.4 | 72.6 | 14 | 32 | 30.4 | 69.6 |
| 2011 | 492 | 1997 | 19.8 | 80.2 | 1140 | 2547 | 30.9 | 69.1 | 787 | 1883 | 29.5 | 70.5 | 7 | 31 | 18.4 | 81.6 |
| 2010 | 419 | 1694 | 19.8 | 80.2 | 1079 | 2651 | 28.9 | 71.1 | 458 | 1238 | 27.0 | 73.0 | 10 | 35 | 22.2 | 77.8 |
| 2009 | 445 | 1520 | 22.6 | 77.4 | 1178 | 2542 | 31.7 | 68.3 | 373 | 1096 | 25.4 | 74.6 | 11 | 24 | 31.4 | 68.6 |
| 2008 | 383 | 1597 | 19.3 | 80.7 | 1386 | 2918 | 32.2 | 67.8 | 389 | 1191 | 24.6 | 75.4 | 4 | 10 | 28.6 | 71.4 |
| 2007 | 318 | 1786 | 15.1 | 84.9 | 1331 | 2799 | 32.2 | 67.8 | 301 | 869 | 25.7 | 74.3 | 3 | 6 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| 2006 | 295 | 1734 | 14.5 | 85.5 | 1159 | 2705 | 30.0 | 70.0 | 503 | 1223 | 29.1 | 70.9 | 4 | 8 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| 2005 | 326 | 1797 | 15.4 | 84.6 | 1093 | 2572 | 29.8 | 70.2 | 360 | 748 | 32.5 | 67.5 | 6 | 15 | 28.6 | 71.4 |

Tab. 14: Researchers in the technical sciences by sector (HC)

|  | Business sector |  |  |  | Government sector |  |  |  | University sector |  |  |  | Private non-profit sector |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) |
| 2020 | 1759 | 15464 | 10.2 | 89.6 | 108 | 270 | 28.6 | 71.4 | 1696 | 5014 | 25.3 | 74.7 | 24 | 33 | 42.2 | 57.8 |
| 2019 | 1623 | 15271 | 9.6 | 90.4 | 106 | 272 | 28.0 | 72.0 | 1547 | 5334 | 22.5 | 77.5 | 13 | 18 | 41.7 | 58.3 |
| 2018 | 1496 | 14555 | 9.3 | 90.7 | 116 | 265 | 30.4 | 69.6 | 1529 | 5357 | 22.2 | 77.8 | 3 | 14 | 17.6 | 82.4 |
| 2017 | 1382 | 13852 | 9.1 | 90.9 | 128 | 309 | 29.3 | 70.7 | 1410 | 5060 | 21.8 | 78.2 | 11 | 31 | 26.2 | 73.8 |
| 2016 | 1177 | 13014 | 8.3 | 91.7 | 123 | 278 | 30.7 | 69.3 | 1384 | 5098 | 21.4 | 78.6 | 11 | 20 | 35.5 | 64.5 |
| 2015 | 1413 | 13670 | 9.4 | 90.6 | 118 | 328 | 26.5 | 73.5 | 1459 | 5084 | 22.3 | 77.7 | 9 | 11 | 45.0 | 55.0 |
| 2014 | 1539 | 12732 | 10.8 | 89.2 | 90 | 256 | 26.0 | 74.0 | 1237 | 4766 | 20.6 | 79.4 | 15 | 26 | 36.6 | 63.4 |
| 2013 | 1402 | 11996 | 10.5 | 89.5 | 101 | 247 | 29.0 | 71.0 | 1271 | 4202 | 23.2 | 76.8 | 5 | 31 | 13.9 | 86.1 |
| 2012 | 1057 | 11299 | 8.6 | 91.4 | 90 | 247 | 26.7 | 73.3 | 1199 | 4538 | 20.9 | 79.1 | 3 | 30 | 9.1 | 90.9 |
| 2011 | 1065 | 10585 | 9.1 | 90.9 | 98 | 225 | 30.3 | 69.7 | 1011 | 3907 | 20.6 | 79.4 | 4 | 29 | 12.1 | 87.9 |
| 2010 | 880 | 9747 | 8.3 | 91.7 | 80 | 211 | 27.5 | 72.5 | 1296 | 4507 | 22.3 | 77.7 | 1 | 22 | 4.3 | 95.7 |
| 2009 | 984 | 9678 | 9.2 | 90.8 | 77 | 252 | 23.4 | 76.6 | 1435 | 4488 | 24.2 | 75.8 | 3 | 7 | 30.0 | 70.0 |
| 2008 | 1086 | 10195 | 9.6 | 90.4 | 102 | 283 | 26.5 | 73.5 | 1435 | 4591 | 23.8 | 76.2 | 6 | 55 | 9.8 | 90.2 |
| 2007 | 999 | 9319 | 9.7 | 90.3 | 83 | 233 | 26.3 | 73.7 | 1444 | 4534 | 24.2 | 75.8 | 4 | 36 | 10.0 | 90.0 |
| 2006 | 824 | 8207 | 9.1 | 90.9 | 95 | 241 | 28.3 | 71.7 | 1031 | 3853 | 21.1 | 78.9 | 3 | 15 | 16.7 | 83.3 |
| 2005 | 819 | 6834 | 10.7 | 89.3 | 96 | 239 | 28.7 | 71.3 | 1080 | 4224 | 20.4 | 79.6 | 3 | 18 | 14.3 | 85.7 |


|  | Business sector |  |  |  | Government sector |  |  |  | University sector |  |  |  | Private non-profit sector |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) |
| 2020 | 1474 | 13329 | 10.0 | 90.0 | 88 | 227 | 27.9 | 72.1 | 865 | 2764 | 23.8 | 76.2 | 10 | 15 | 39.1 | 60.9 |
| 2019 | 1317 | 12917 | 9.3 | 90.7 | 96 | 228 | 29.7 | 70.3 | 844 | 2936 | 22.3 | 77.7 | 7 | 11 | 37.9 | 62.1 |
| 2018 | 1242 | 12188 | 9.3 | 90.7 | 87 | 225 | 27.8 | 72.2 | 751 | 2733 | 21.5 | 78.5 | 3 | 15 | 14.5 | 85.5 |
| 2017 | 1154 | 11740 | 9.0 | 91.0 | 77 | 238 | 24.5 | 75.5 | 745 | 2664 | 21.9 | 78.1 | 6 | 23 | 22.0 | 78.0 |
| 2016 | 984 | 11176 | 8.1 | 91.9 | 94 | 266 | 26.0 | 74.0 | 666 | 2655 | 20.0 | 80.0 | 3 | 7 | 31.5 | 68.5 |
| 2015 | 1212 | 11774 | 9.3 | 90.7 | 87 | 260 | 25.1 | 74.9 | 683 | 2662 | 20.4 | 79.6 | 4 | 12 | 25.0 | 75.0 |
| 2014 | 1335 | 10610 | 11.2 | 88.8 | 82 | 210 | 28.1 | 71.9 | 696 | 2697 | 20.5 | 79.5 | 9 | 27 | 25.0 | 75.0 |
| 2013 | 1228 | 10513 | 10.5 | 89.5 | 75 | 217 | 25.7 | 74.3 | 661 | 2596 | 20.3 | 79.7 | 3 | 22 | 12.0 | 88.0 |
| 2012 | 945 | 9890 | 8.7 | 91.3 | 53 | 240 | 18.1 | 81.9 | 848 | 2804 | 23.2 | 76.8 | 4 | 24 | 14.3 | 85.7 |
| 2011 | 951 | 9290 | 9.3 | 90.7 | 66 | 199 | 24.9 | 75.1 | 693 | 2475 | 21.9 | 78.1 | 3 | 17 | 15.0 | 85.0 |
| 2010 | 793 | 8553 | 8.5 | 91.5 | 52 | 212 | 19.7 | 80.3 | 810 | 2769 | 22.6 | 77.4 | 2 | 19 | 9.5 | 90.5 |
| 2009 | 899 | 8587 | 9.5 | 90.5 | 55 | 234 | 19.0 | 81.0 | 865 | 2697 | 24.3 | 75.7 | 2 | 11 | 15.4 | 84.6 |
| 2008 | 955 | 9096 | 9.5 | 90.5 | 91 | 243 | 27.2 | 72.8 | 840 | 2623 | 24.3 | 75.7 | 3 | 20 | 13.0 | 87.0 |
| 2007 | 888 | 8096 | 9.9 | 90.1 | 72 | 200 | 26.5 | 73.5 | 805 | 2613 | 23.6 | 76.4 | 1 | 9 | 10.0 | 90.0 |
| 2006 | 705 | 7127 | 9.0 | 91.0 | 78 | 207 | 27.4 | 72.6 | 552 | 2209 | 20.0 | 80.0 | 1 | 5 | 16.7 | 83.3 |
| 2005 | 727 | 6086 | 10.7 | 89.3 | 70 | 185 | 27.5 | 72.5 | 559 | 2104 | 21.0 | 79.0 | 1 | 8 | 11.1 | 88.9 |

Tab. 16: Researchers in the agricultural sciences by sector (HC)

|  | Business sector |  |  |  | Government sector |  |  |  | University sector |  |  |  | Private non-profit sector |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) |
| 2020 | 198 | 221 | 47.2 | 52.8 | 366 | 356 | 50.7 | 49.3 | 656 | 865 | 43.1 | 56.9 | 2 | 5 | 28.6 | 71.4 |
| 2019 | 187 | 213 | 46.9 | 53.1 | 363 | 353 | 50.7 | 49.3 | 583 | 629 | 48.1 | 51.9 | 2 | 2 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 2018 | 160 | 221 | 42.0 | 58.0 | 320 | 344 | 48.2 | 51.8 | 532 | 738 | 41.9 | 58.1 | 2 | 2 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 2017 | 134 | 210 | 39.0 | 61.0 | 356 | 356 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 584 | 962 | 37.8 | 62.2 | 2 | 1 | 66.7 | 33.3 |
| 2016 | 127 | 223 | 36.3 | 63.7 | 332 | 347 | 48.9 | 51.1 | 507 | 869 | 36.8 | 63.2 | 2 | 1 | 66.7 | 33.3 |
| 2015 | 132 | 219 | 37.6 | 62.4 | 332 | 363 | 47.8 | 52.2 | 441 | 822 | 34.9 | 65.1 | 2 | 1 | 66.7 | 33.3 |
| 2014 | 128 | 198 | 39.3 | 60.7 | 224 | 281 | 44.4 | 55.6 | 583 | 946 | 38.1 | 61.9 | 2 | 6 | 25.0 | 75.0 |
| 2013 | 101 | 175 | 36.6 | 63.4 | 189 | 249 | 43.2 | 56.8 | 604 | 1050 | 36.5 | 63.5 | - | - | - |  |
| 2012 | 170 | 303 | 35.9 | 64.1 | 142 | 232 | 38.0 | 62.0 | 470 | 846 | 35.7 | 64.3 | 1 | 4 | 20.0 | 80.0 |
| 2011 | 204 | 251 | 44.8 | 55.2 | 308 | 330 | 48.3 | 51.7 | 400 | 766 | 34.3 | 65.7 | 1 | 5 | 16.7 | 83.3 |
| 2010 | 190 | 270 | 41.3 | 58.7 | 289 | 310 | 48.2 | 51.8 | 515 | 1015 | 33.7 | 66.3 | 1 | 5 | 16.7 | 83.3 |
| 2009 | 224 | 285 | 44.0 | 56.0 | 266 | 266 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 586 | 1091 | 34.9 | 65.1 | - | - | - |  |
| 2008 | 226 | 294 | 43.5 | 56.5 | 292 | 299 | 49.4 | 50.6 | 638 | 1145 | 35.8 | 64.2 | 4 | 13 | 23.5 | 76.5 |
| 2007 | 201 | 297 | 40.4 | 59.6 | 304 | 347 | 46.7 | 53.3 | 615 | 1192 | 34.0 | 66.0 | 4 | 8 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| 2006 | 239 | 300 | 44.3 | 55.7 | 301 | 334 | 47.4 | 52.6 | 499 | 984 | 33.6 | 66.4 | 2 | 13 | 13.3 | 86.7 |
| 2005 | 228 | 315 | 42.0 | 58.0 | 280 | 348 | 44.6 | 55.4 | 553 | 987 | 35.9 | 64.1 | - | - | - |  |


|  | Business sector |  |  |  | Government sector |  |  |  | University sector |  |  |  | Private non-profit sector |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) |
| 2020 | 140 | 143 | 49.4 | 50.6 | 261 | 338 | 43.5 | 56.5 | 399 | 516 | 43.6 | 56.4 | 1 | 5 | 21.4 | 78.6 |
| 2019 | 123 | 141 | 46.5 | 53.5 | 284 | 301 | 48.5 | 51.5 | 299 | 36 é | 45.3 | 54.7 | 1 | 3 | 16.0 | 84.0 |
| 2018 | 109 | 141 | 44.7 | 56.3 | 262 | 292 | 47.3 | 52.7 | 248 | 342 | 42.1 | 57.9 | 0 | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2017 | 101 | 124 | 44.9 | 55.1 | 299 | 304 | 49.6 | 50.4 | 259 | 379 | 40.6 | 59.4 | 1 | 1 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 2016 | 92 | 134 | 40.8 | 59.2 | 283 | 321 | 46.8 | 53.2 | 250 | 349 | 41.7 | 58.3 | , | 2 | 21.1 | 78.9 |
| 2015 | 91 | 132 | 40.8 | 59.2 | 284 | 335 | 45.9 | 54.1 | 202 | 353 | 36.4 | 63.6 | 1 | 2 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| 2014 | 95 | 132 | 41.9 | 58.1 | 160 | 239 | 40.1 | 59.9 | 235 | 405 | 36.7 | 63.3 | 2 | 6 | 25.0 | 75.0 |
| 2013 | 69 | 111 | 38.3 | 61.7 | 162 | 228 | 41.5 | 58.5 | 240 | 451 | 34.7 | 65.3 | 0 | 4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2012 | 127 | 212 | 37.5 | 62.5 | 127 | 207 | 38.0 | 62.0 | 152 | 367 | 29.3 | 70.7 | 1 | 4 | 20.0 | 80.0 |
| 2011 | 134 | 176 | 43.2 | 56.8 | 276 | 285 | 49.2 | 50.8 | 141 | 289 | 32.8 | 67.2 | 2 | 4 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| 2010 | 133 | 193 | 40.8 | 59.2 | 265 | 276 | 49.0 | 51.0 | 190 | 411 | 31.6 | 68.4 | 1 | 4 | 20.0 | 80.0 |
| 2009 | 167 | 222 | 42.9 | 57.1 | 257 | 198 | 56.5 | 43.5 | 191 | 405 | 32.0 | 68.0 | 0 | 7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2008 | 179 | 224 | 44.4 | 55.6 | 226 | 240 | 48.5 | 51.5 | 229 | 425 | 35.0 | 65.0 | 1 | 6 | 14.3 | 85.7 |
| 2007 | 145 | 223 | 39.4 | 60.6 | 239 | 277 | 46.3 | 53.7 | 239 | 454 | 34.5 | 65.5 | 1 | 7 | 12.5 | 87.5 |
| 2006 | 177 | 218 | 44.8 | 55.2 | 231 | 278 | 45.4 | 54.6 | 185 | 377 | 32.9 | 67.1 | 0 | 8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2005 | 153 | 220 | 41.0 | 59.0 | 218 | 290 | 42.9 | 57.1 | 211 | 367 | 36.5 | 63.5 | 0 | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Tab. 18: Researchers in the medical sciences by sector (HC)

|  | Business sector |  |  |  | Government sector |  |  |  | University sector |  |  |  | Private non-profit sector |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) |
| 2020 | 370 | 319 | 53.7 | 46.3 | 745 | 505 | 59.6 | 40.4 | 2858 | 3450 | 45.3 | 54.7 | 8 | 7 | 53.3 | 46.7 |
| 2019 | 316 | 270 | 53.9 | 46.1 | 782 | 582 | 57.3 | 42.7 | 2617 | 3258 | 44.5 | 55.5 | 6 | 6 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 2018 | 315 | 306 | 50.7 | 49.3 | 775 | 543 | 58.8 | 41.2 | 2344 | 2874 | 44.9 | 55.1 | 2 | 2 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 2017 | 340 | 281 | 54.8 | 45.2 | 715 | 534 | 57.2 | 42.8 | 2413 | 2919 | 45.3 | 54.7 | 3 | 2 | 60.0 | 40.0 |
| 2016 | 316 | 275 | 53.5 | 46.5 | 697 | 464 | 60.0 | 40.0 | 2103 | 2671 | 44.1 | 55.9 | - | - | - |  |
| 2015 | 313 | 242 | 56.4 | 43.6 | 769 | 594 | 56.4 | 43.6 | 2183 | 2504 | 46.6 | 53.4 | - | - | - |  |
| 2014 | 249 | 237 | 51.2 | 48.8 | 674 | 634 | 51.5 | 48.5 | 2556 | 2487 | 47.6 | 52.4 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2013 | 246 | 240 | 50.7 | 49.3 | 802 | 554 | 59.1 | 40.9 | 2200 | 2541 | 46.4 | 53.6 | 1 | 0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 2012 | 235 | 272 | 46.3 | 53.7 | 768 | 518 | 59.7 | 40.3 | 1861 | 2001 | 48.2 | 51.8 | 2 | 3 | 40.0 | 60.0 |
| 2011 | 272 | 234 | 43.8 | 46.2 | 740 | 605 | 55.0 | 45.0 | 2152 | 2514 | 46.1 | 53.9 | 15 | 3 | 83.3 | 16.7 |
| 2010 | 330 | 239 | 58.0 | 42.0 | 729 | 596 | 55.0 | 45.0 | 2141 | 2561 | 45.5 | 54.5 | 1 | 3 | 25.0 | 75.0 |
| 2009 | 131 | 198 | 41.5 | 58.5 | 819 | 671 | 55.0 | 45.0 | 2392 | 2772 | 46.3 | 53.7 | - | - | - |  |
| 2008 | 157 | 197 | 44.3 | 55.7 | 783 | 633 | 55.3 | 44.7 | 2118 | 2458 | 46.3 | 53.7 | - | - | - |  |
| 2007 | 155 | 187 | 45.3 | 54.7 | 709 | 673 | 51.3 | 48.7 | 2003 | 2401 | 45.5 | 54.5 | 1 | 1 | 50.5 | 50.0 |
| 2006 | 150 | 238 | 38.7 | 61.3 | 729 | 652 | 52.8 | 47.2 | 1871 | 2139 | 46.7 | 53.3 | 2 | 2 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 2005 | 144 | 180 | 44.4 | 55.6 | 709 | 601 | 54.1 | 45.9 | 1666 | 2160 | 43.5 | 56.5 | 2 | 0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |


|  | Business sector |  |  |  | Government sector |  |  |  | University sector |  |  |  | Private non-profit sector |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) |
| 2020 | 310 | 262 | 54.2 | 45.8 | 355 | 211 | 72.7 | 37.3 | 961 | 1133 | 45.9 | 54.1 | 4 | 2 | 67.7 | 33.3 |
| 2019 | 272 | 243 | 52.8 | 47.2 | 407 | 281 | 59.1 | 40.9 | 851 | 1062 | 44.5 | 55.5 | 3 | 2 | 60.0 | 40.0 |
| 2018 | 243 | 276 | 46.9 | 53.1 | 400 | 261 | 60.6 | 39.4 | 745 | 956 | 43.8 | 56.2 | 2 | 2 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 2017 | 272 | 246 | 52.5 | 47.5 | 379 | 233 | 61.9 | 38.1 | 677 | 767 | 46.9 | 53.1 | 3 | 2 | 60.0 | 40.0 |
| 2016 | 255 | 230 | 52.6 | 47.4 | 411 | 249 | 62.3 | 37.7 | 654 | 695 | 48.5 | 51.5 | - | - | - | - |
| 2015 | 254 | 204 | 55.5 | 44.5 | 439 | 271 | 61.8 | 38.2 | 659 | 790 | 45.5 | 54.5 | - | - | - |  |
| 2014 | 186 | 213 | 46.6 | 53.4 | 340 | 247 | 57.9 | 42.1 | 658 | 723 | 47.6 | 52.4 | 6 | 0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 2013 | 203 | 199 | 50.5 | 49.5 | 463 | 276 | 62.7 | 37.3 | 622 | 714 | 46.6 | 53.4 | 15 | 0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 2012 | 215 | 245 | 46.7 | 53.3 | 449 | 266 | 62.8 | 37.2 | 601 | 665 | 47.5 | 52.5 | 28 | 1 | 96.6 | 3.4 |
| 2011 | 228 | 201 | 53.1 | 46.9 | 430 | 311 | 58.0 | 42.0 | 672 | 832 | 44.7 | 55.3 | 27 | 2 | 93.1 | 6.9 |
| 2010 | 256 | 201 | 56.0 | 44.0 | 397 | 297 | 57.2 | 42.8 | 768 | 888 | 46.4 | 53.6 | 23 | 2 | 92.0 | 8.0 |
| 2009 | 125 | 172 | 42.1 | 57.9 | 434 | 309 | 58.4 | 41.6 | 810 | 901 | 47.3 | 52.7 | 1 | 1 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 2008 | 142 | 181 | 44.0 | 56.0 | 420 | 328 | 56.1 | 43.9 | 728 | 839 | 46.5 | 53.5 | 2 | 1 | 66.7 | 33.3 |
| 2007 | 136 | 159 | 46.1 | 53.9 | 392 | 327 | 54.5 | 45.5 | 733 | 877 | 45.5 | 54.5 | 2 | 2 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 2006 | 136 | 190 | 41.7 | 58.3 | 382 | 362 | 51.3 | 48.7 | 690 | 736 | 48.4 | 51.6 | 1 | 1 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 2005 | 132 | 144 | 47.8 | 52.2 | 351 | 335 | 51.2 | 48.8 | 676 | 849 | 44.3 | 55.7 | 1 | 0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |

Tab. 20: Researchers in the social sciences (HC)

|  | Business sector |  |  |  | Government sector |  |  |  | University sector |  |  |  | Private non-profit sector |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) |
| 2020 | 147 | 338 | 30.4 | 69.6 | 211 | 257 | 45.1 | 54.9 | 2094 | 2560 | 45.0 | 55.0 | 55 | 69 | 44.5 | 55.5 |
| 2019 | 138 | 324 | 29.9 | 70.1 | 328 | 309 | 51.5 | 48.5 | 2039 | 2738 | 42.7 | 57.3 | 70 | 70 | 50.1 | 49.9 |
| 2018 | 147 | 390 | 27.3 | 72.7 | 421 | 363 | 53.7 | 46.3 | 2030 | 2710 | 42.8 | 57.2 | 51 | 71 | 41.9 | 58.1 |
| 2017 | 147 | 406 | 26.6 | 73.4 | 366 | 338 | 52.0 | 48.0 | 1940 | 2669 | 42.1 | 57.9 | 50 | 71 | 41.3 | 58.7 |
| 2016 | 260 | 636 | 29.0 | 71.0 | 307 | 280 | 52.3 | 47.7 | 1887 | 2462 | 43.4 | 56.6 | 53 | 57 | 48.3 | 51.7 |
| 2015 | 95 | 266 | 26.3 | 73.7 | 253 | 287 | 46.9 | 53.1 | 1988 | 2612 | 43.2 | 56.8 | 55 | 60 | 47.8 | 52.2 |
| 2014 | 138 | 379 | 26.7 | 73.3 | 268 | 270 | 49.8 | 50.2 | 1914 | 2481 | 43.5 | 56.5 | 56 | 66 | 45.9 | 54.1 |
| 2013 | 51 | 219 | 18.9 | 81.1 | 256 | 240 | 51.6 | 48.4 | 2002 | 2596 | 43.5 | 56.5 | 55 | 62 | 47.0 | 53.0 |
| 2012 | 65 | 197 | 24.8 | 75.2 | 257 | 275 | 48.3 | 51.7 | 1492 | 2075 | 41.8 | 58.2 | 48 | 49 | 49.5 | 50.5 |
| 2011 | 39 | 134 | 22.5 | 77.5 | 256 | 252 | 50.4 | 49.6 | 1656 | 2270 | 42.2 | 57.8 | 40 | 64 | 38.5 | 61.5 |
| 2010 | 39 | 70 | 35.8 | 64.2 | 218 | 241 | 47.5 | 52.5 | 1038 | 1592 | 39.5 | 60.5 | 47 | 55 | 46.1 | 53.9 |
| 2009 | 87 | 159 | 35.4 | 64.6 | 216 | 253 | 46.1 | 53.9 | 1083 | 1589 | 40.5 | 59.5 | 51 | 67 | 43.2 | 56.8 |
| 2008 | 74 | 102 | 42.0 | 58.0 | 257 | 276 | 48.2 | 51.8 | 1366 | 1855 | 42.4 | 57.6 | 14 | 14 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 2007 | 66 | 110 | 37.5 | 62.5 | 298 | 312 | 48.9 | 51.1 | 1405 | 2043 | 40.7 | 59.3 | 14 | 24 | 36.8 | 63.2 |
| 2006 | 54 | 83 | 39.4 | 60.6 | 377 | 375 | 50.1 | 49.9 | 1431 | 2021 | 41.5 | 58.5 | 17 | 37 | 31.5 | 68.5 |
| 2005 | 54 | 113 | 32.3 | 67.7 | 337 | 311 | 52.0 | 48.0 | 1330 | 2121 | 38.5 | 61.5 | 20 | 20 | 50.0 | 50.0 |


|  | Business sector |  |  |  | Government sector |  |  |  | University sector |  |  |  | Private non-profit sector |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) |
| 2020 | 107 | 247 | 30.2 | 69.8 | 172 | 195 | 47.0 | 53.0 | 692 | 894 | 43.6 | 56.4 | 45 | 57 | 54.2 | 55.8 |
| 2019 | 101 | 225 | 30.9 | 69.1 | 263 | 229 | 53.5 | 46.5 | 687 | 926 | 42.6 | 57.4 | 49 | 48 | 50.6 | 49.4 |
| 2018 | 107 | 264 | 28.9 | 71.1 | 274 | 256 | 51.8 | 48.2 | 776 | 1050 | 42.5 | 57.5 | 46 | 59 | 43.8 | 56.2 |
| 2017 | 100 | 277 | 26.5 | 73.5 | 249 | 229 | 52.1 | 47.9 | 688 | 927 | 42.6 | 57.4 | 47 | 60 | 43.9 | 56.1 |
| 2016 | 188 | 479 | 28.2 | 71.8 | 213 | 200 | 51.7 | 48.3 | 682 | 844 | 44.7 | 55.3 | 45 | 48 | 48.4 | 51.6 |
| 2015 | 69 | 173 | 28.5 | 71.5 | 229 | 214 | 51.7 | 48.3 | 772 | 992 | 43.8 | 56.2 | 47 | 51 | 48.0 | 52.0 |
| 2014 | 104 | 265 | 28.2 | 71.8 | 213 | 219 | 49.3 | 50.7 | 757 | 921 | 45.1 | 54.9 | 50 | 60 | 45.5 | 54.5 |
| 2013 | 32 | 141 | 18.5 | 81.5 | 205 | 205 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 775 | 992 | 43.9 | 56.1 | 49 | 51 | 49.0 | 51.0 |
| 2012 | 38 | 108 | 26.0 | 74.0 | 215 | 225 | 48.9 | 51.1 | 680 | 1037 | 39.6 | 60.4 | 46 | 45 | 50.5 | 49.5 |
| 2011 | 25 | 81 | 23.6 | 76.4 | 231 | 283 | 44.9 | 55.1 | 682 | 961 | 41.5 | 58.5 | 32 | 54 | 37.2 | 62.8 |
| 2010 | 29 | 45 | 39.2 | 60.8 | 249 | 267 | 48.3 | 51.7 | 415 | 668 | 38.3 | 61.7 | 44 | 50 | 46.8 | 53.2 |
| 2009 | 49 | 91 | 35.0 | 65.0 | 208 | 221 | 48.5 | 51.5 | 504 | 774 | 39.4 | 60.6 | 46 | 54 | 46.0 | 54.0 |
| 2008 | 41 | 51 | 44.6 | 55.4 | 257 | 241 | 51.6 | 48.4 | 543 | 855 | 38.8 | 61.2 | 14 | 12 | 53.8 | 46.2 |
| 2007 | 37 | 58 | 38.9 | 61.1 | 295 | 267 | 52.5 | 47.5 | 447 | 759 | 37.1 | 62.9 | 17 | 20 | 45.9 | 54.1 |
| 2006 | 24 | 55 | 30.4 | 69.6 | 311 | 325 | 48.9 | 51.1 | 516 | 798 | 39.3 | 60.7 | 11 | 21 | 34.4 | 65.6 |
| 2005 | 25 | 82 | 23.4 | 76.6 | 271 | 250 | 52.0 | 48.0 | 495 | 779 | 38.9 | 61.1 | 13 | 14 | 48.1 | 51.9 |

Tab. 22: Researchers in the humanities ( HC )

|  | Business sector |  |  |  | Government sector |  |  |  | University sector |  |  |  | Private non-profit sector |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) |
| 2020 | 2 | 3 | 40.0 | 60.0 | 791 | 986 | 44.5 | 55.5 | 879 | 1280 | 40.7 | 59.3 | 3 | 5 | 35.0 | 65.0 |
| 2019 | - | - | - | - | 662 | 932 | 41.5 | 58.5 | 976 | 1357 | 41.8 | 58.2 | 4 | 7 | 30.0 | 70.0 |
| 2018 | 3 | 2 | 60.0 | 40.0 | 635 | 891 | 41.6 | 58.4 | 912 | 1279 | 51.6 | 58.4 | 3 | 7 | 27.6 | 72.4 |
| 2017 | 3 | 1 | 75.0 | 25.0 | 570 | 825 | 40.9 | 59.1 | 886 | 1305 | 40.4 | 59.6 | 2 | 4 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| 2016 | 3 | 2 | 60.0 | 40.0 | 580 | 825 | 41.3 | 58.7 | 886 | 1250 | 41.5 | 58.5 | 4 | 2 | 66.7 | 33.3 |
| 2015 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 545 | 759 | 41.8 | 58.2 | 923 | 1375 | 40.2 | 59.8 | 1 | 0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 2014 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 546 | 788 | 40.9 | 59.1 | 752 | 1152 | 39.5 | 60.5 | 1 | 0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 2013 | 0 | 0 | - |  | 568 | 730 | 43.8 | 56.2 | 737 | 1153 | 39.0 | 61.0 | 2 | 2 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 2012 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 565 | 713 | 44.2 | 55.8 | 972 | 1361 | 41.7 | 58.3 | 11 | 4 | 73.3 | 26.7 |
| 2011 | 3 | 6 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 570 | 726 | 44.0 | 56.0 | 664 | 1085 | 38.0 | 62.0 | 7 | 18 | 28.0 | 72.0 |
| 2010 | 2 | 9 | 18.2 | 81.8 | 576 | 688 | 45.6 | 54.4 | 1077 | 1531 | 41.3 | 58.7 | 16 | 25 | 39.0 | 61.0 |
| 2009 | 1 | 10 | 9.1 | 90.9 | 593 | 742 | 44.4 | 55.6 | 851 | 1264 | 40.2 | 59.8 | 5 | 12 | 29.4 | 70.6 |
| 2008 | 1 | 17 | 5.6 | 94.4 | 624 | 776 | 44.6 | 55.4 | 591 | 1001 | 37.1 | 62.9 | 4 | 16 | 20.0 | 80.0 |
| 2007 | 1 | 11 | 8.3 | 91.7 | 607 | 712 | 46.0 | 54.0 | 598 | 991 | 37.6 | 62.4 | 0 | 4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2006 | 2 | 19 | 9.5 | 90.5 | 593 | 749 | 44.2 | 55.8 | 554 | 901 | 38.1 | 61.9 | 1 | 3 | 25.0 | 75.0 |
| 2005 | 18 | 24 | 42.9 | 57.1 | 591 | 758 | 43.8 | 56.2 | 459 | 797 | 36.5 | 63.5 | 6 | 10 | 37.5 | 62.5 |


|  | Business sector |  |  |  | Government sector |  |  |  | University sector |  |  |  | Private non-profit sector |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) |
| 2020 | 1 | 1 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 520 | 724 | 41.8 | 58.2 | 466 | 732 | 38.9 | 61.1 | 1 | 4 | 27.6 | 72.4 |
| 2019 | - | - | - | - | 462 | 673 | 40.7 | 59.3 | 461 | 768 | 37.5 | 62.5 | 3 | 5 | 37.0 | 63.0 |
| 2018 | 2 | 1 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 439 | 669 | 39.6 | 60.4 | 439 | 698 | 38.6 | 61.4 | 4 | 7 | 35.7 | 64.3 |
| 2017 | 2 | 1 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 440 | 642 | 40.7 | 59.3 | 349 | 594 | 37.0 | 63.0 | 1 | 2 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| 2016 | 2 | 2 | 49.2 | 50.8 | 420 | 634 | 39.8 | 60.2 | 357 | 549 | 39.4 | 60.6 | 2 | 1 | 66.7 | 33.3 |
| 2015 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 368 | 586 | 38.6 | 61.4 | 447 | 742 | 37.6 | 62.4 | 1 | 0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 2014 | 1 | 1 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 389 | 606 | 39.1 | 60.9 | 387 | 536 | 41.9 | 58.1 | 1 | 0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 2013 | 1 | 0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 386 | 523 | 42.5 | 57.5 | 375 | 534 | 41.3 | 58.7 | 1 | 2 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| 2012 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 352 | 492 | 41.7 | 58.3 | 636 | 772 | 45.2 | 54.8 | 4 | 3 | 57.1 | 42.9 |
| 2011 | 2 | 4 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 342 | 502 | 40.5 | 59.5 | 328 | 547 | 37.5 | 62.5 | 6 | 15 | 28.6 | 71.4 |
| 2010 | 2 | 7 | 22.2 | 77.8 | 361 | 470 | 43.4 | 56.6 | 665 | 834 | 44.4 | 55.6 | 6 | 13 | 31.6 | 68.4 |
| 2009 | 1 | 10 | 9.1 | 90.9 | 373 | 490 | 43.2 | 56.8 | 491 | 697 | 41.3 | 58.7 | 5 | 7 | 41.7 | 58.3 |
| 2008 | 1 | 15 | 6.3 | 93.8 | 391 | 547 | 41.7 | 58.3 | 331 | 549 | 37.6 | 62.4 | 4 | 13 | 23.5 | 76.5 |
| 2007 | 0 | 8 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 433 | 524 | 45.2 | 54.8 | 258 | 444 | 36.8 | 63.2 | 0 | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2006 | 1 | 11 | 8.3 | 91.7 | 424 | 531 | 44.4 | 55.6 | 267 | 484 | 35.6 | 64.4 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2005 | 7 | 16 | 30.4 | 69.6 | 387 | 544 | 41.6 | 58.4 | 214 | 400 | 34.9 | 65.1 | 54 | 13 | 80.6 | 19.4 |

RESEARCHERS BY SECTOR

|  | Business sector |  |  |  | Government sector |  |  |  | University sector |  |  |  | Private non-profit sector |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) |
| 2020 | 3639 | 22882 | 13.7 | 86.3 | 4484 | 6596 | 40.5 | 59.5 | 9759 | 17566 | 35.7 | 64.3 | 109 | 157 | 41.0 | 59.0 |
| 2019 | 3407 | 22457 | 13.2 | 86.8 | 4354 | 6465 | 40.2 | 59.8 | 9438 | 17328 | 35.3 | 64.7 | 114 | 127 | 47.2 | 52.8 |
| 2018 | 3155 | 22120 | 12.5 | 87.5 | 4320 | 6487 | 40.0 | 60.0 | 8910 | 16777 | 34.7 | 65.3 | 76 | 121 | 38.7 | 61.3 |
| 2017 | 2990 | 20988 | 12.5 | 87.5 | 4308 | 6261 | 40.8 | 59.2 | 8618 | 16392 | 34.5 | 65.5 | 89 | 143 | 38.4 | 61.6 |
| 2016 | 2861 | 19820 | 12.6 | 87.4 | 3966 | 5899 | 40.2 | 59.8 | 8064 | 15378 | 34.4 | 65.6 | 81 | 110 | 42.4 | 57.6 |
| 2015 | 2887 | 19651 | 12.8 | 87.2 | 3847 | 6058 | 38.8 | 61.2 | 8427 | 15536 | 35.2 | 64.8 | 92 | 107 | 46.2 | 53.8 |
| 2014 | 2975 | 18497 | 13.9 | 86.1 | 3625 | 5885 | 38.1 | 61.9 | 8115 | 15164 | 34.9 | 65.1 | 100 | 132 | 43.1 | 56.9 |
| 2013 | 2662 | 16462 | 13.9 | 86.1 | 3633 | 5537 | 39.6 | 60.4 | 8166 | 14791 | 35.6 | 64.4 | 75 | 127 | 37.1 | 62.9 |
| 2012 | 2405 | 15204 | 13.7 | 86.3 | 3393 | 5308 | 39.0 | 61.0 | 7226 | 13908 | 34.2 | 65.8 | 77 | 129 | 37.4 | 62.6 |
| 2011 | 2198 | 13786 | 13.8 | 86.2 | 3475 | 5459 | 38.9 | 61.1 | 7184 | 13548 | 34.7 | 65.3 | 79 | 172 | 31.5 | 68.5 |
| 2010 | 1967 | 12536 | 13.6 | 86.4 | 3301 | 5396 | 38.0 | 62.0 | 6848 | 13129 | 34.3 | 65.7 | 82 | 159 | 34.0 | 66.0 |
| 2009 | 1973 | 12285 | 13.8 | 86.2 | 3451 | 5326 | 39.3 | 60.7 | 6939 | 12906 | 35.0 | 65.0 | 73 | 138 | 34.6 | 65.4 |
| 2008 | 2005 | 12721 | 13.6 | 86.4 | 3862 | 5954 | 39.3 | 60.7 | 6711 | 12839 | 34.3 | 65.7 | 35 | 113 | 23.6 | 76.4 |
| 2007 | 1777 | 11945 | 13.0 | 87.0 | 3679 | 5862 | 38.6 | 61.4 | 6549 | 12610 | 34.2 | 65.8 | 29 | 87 | 25.0 | 75.0 |
| 2006 | 1594 | 10781 | 12.9 | 87.1 | 3621 | 5828 | 38.3 | 61.7 | 6050 | 11691 | 34.1 | 65.9 | 29 | 82 | 26.1 | 73.9 |
| 2005 | 1622 | 9447 | 14.7 | 85.3 | 3454 | 5576 | 38.3 | 61.7 | 5713 | 11630 | 32.9 | 67.1 | 38 | 62 | 38.0 | 62.0 |


|  | Business sector |  |  |  | Public enterprises |  |  |  | Private domestic businesses |  |  |  | Internationally controlled private businesses |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) |
| 2020 | 3639 | 22882 | 13.7 | 86.3 | 128 | 834 | 13.3 | 86.7 | 1869 | 9407 | 16.6 | 83.4 | 1642 | 12641 | 11.5 | 88.5 |
| 2019 | 3407 | 22457 | 13.2 | 86.8 | 134 | 859 | 13.5 | 86.5 | 1726 | 9299 | 15.7 | 84.3 | 1548 | 12299 | 11.2 | 88.8 |
| 2018 | 3155 | 22120 | 12.5 | 87.5 | 133 | 760 | 14.9 | 85.1 | 1578 | 8859 | 15.1 | 84.9 | 1444 | 12501 | 10.4 | 89.6 |
| 2017 | 2990 | 20988 | 12.5 | 87.5 | 133 | 775 | 14.6 | 85.4 | 1447 | 8266 | 14.9 | 85.1 | 1410 | 11947 | 10.6 | 89.4 |
| 2016 | 2861 | 19820 | 12.6 | 87.4 | 110 | 694 | 13.7 | 86.3 | 1338 | 7766 | 14.7 | 85.3 | 1413 | 7766 | 15.4 | 84.6 |
| 2015 | 2887 | 19651 | 12.8 | 87.2 | 120 | 782 | 13.4 | 86.6 | 1365 | 7869 | 14.8 | 85.2 | 1401 | 11000 | 11.3 | 88.7 |
| 2014 | 2975 | 18497 | 13.9 | 86.1 | 107 | 808 | 11.7 | 88.3 | 1416 | 8305 | 14.6 | 85.4 | 1452 | 9385 | 13.4 | 86.6 |
| 2013 | 2662 | 16462 | 13.9 | 86.1 | 92 | 756 | 10.9 | 89.1 | 1359 | 7707 | 15.0 | 85.0 | 1212 | 7998 | 13.2 | 86.8 |
| 2012 | 2405 | 15204 | 13.7 | 86.3 | 129 | 761 | 14.5 | 85.5 | 1215 | 7100 | 14.6 | 85.4 | 1061 | 7343 | 12.6 | 87.4 |
| 2011 | 2198 | 13786 | 13.8 | 86.2 | 127 | 819 | 13.4 | 86.6 | 1170 | 6479 | 15.3 | 84.7 | 902 | 6488 | 12.2 | 87.8 |
| 2010 | 1967 | 12536 | 13.6 | 86.4 | 132 | 869 | 13.2 | 86.8 | 1097 | 6055 | 15.3 | 84.7 | 738 | 5613 | 11.6 | 88.4 |
| 2009 | 1973 | 12285 | 13.8 | 86.2 | 134 | 898 | 13.0 | 87.0 | 1005 | 5464 | 15.5 | 84.5 | 835 | 5923 | 12.3 | 87.7 |
| 2008 | 2005 | 12721 | 13.6 | 86.4 | 158 | 942 | 14.4 | 85.6 | 945 | 5325 | 15.1 | 84.9 | 902 | 6454 | 12.3 | 87.7 |
| 2007 | 1777 | 11945 | 13.0 | 87.0 | 131 | 1065 | 10.9 | 89.1 | 963 | 5684 | 14.5 | 85.5 | 684 | 5196 | 11.6 | 88.4 |
| 2006 | 1594 | 10781 | 12.9 | 87.1 | 159 | 1180 | 11.9 | 88.1 | 920 | 5404 | 14.6 | 85.4 | 515 | 4196 | 10.9 | 89.1 |
| 2005 | 1622 | 9447 | 14.7 | 85.3 | 232 | 1181 | 16.4 | 83.6 | 868 | 4874 | 15.1 | 84.9 | 522 | 3392 | 13.3 | 86.7 |


Tab. 26: Researchers in the government sector (HC)

|  | Government sector |  |  | Czech Academy of Sciences |  |  | Other public research institutions |  |  | Libraries, archives, and museums |  |  | Medical facilities |  |  | Women | Other |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) |  | Men | n (\%) |
| 2020 | 4484 | 6596 | 40.5 | 2521 | 4410 | 36.4 | 537 | 697 | 43.5 | 487 | 511 | 48.8 | 656 | 450 | 59.3 | 283 | 528 | 34.9 |
| 2019 | 4354 | 6465 | 40.2 | 2342 | 4261 | 35.5 | 539 | 683 | 44.1 | 442 | 483 | 47.8 | 653 | 484 | 57.4 | 378 | 554 | 40.6 |
| 2018 | 4320 | 6487 | 40.0 | 2263 | 4319 | 34.4 | 530 | 673 | 44.1 | 424 | 463 | 47.8 | 654 | 458 | 58.8 | 449 | 574 | 43.9 |
| 2017 | 4308 | 6261 | 40.8 | 2487 | 4255 | 36.9 | 510 | 633 | 44.6 | 359 | 396 | 47.5 | 579 | 440 | 56.8 | 373 | 537 | 41.0 |
| 2016 | 3966 | 5899 | 40.2 | 2216 | 4024 | 35.5 | 494 | 614 | 44.6 | 378 | 381 | 49.8 | 547 | 374 | 59.4 | 331 | 506 | 39.5 |
| 2015 | 3847 | 6058 | 38.8 | 2092 | 4070 | 34.0 | 470 | 630 | 42.7 | 351 | 383 | 47.8 | 637 | 496 | 56.2 | 297 | 479 | 38.3 |
| 2014 | 3625 | 5885 | 38.1 | 2054 | 3875 | 34.6 | 376 | 585 | 39.1 | 315 | 355 | 47.0 | 530 | 527 | 50.1 | 350 | 543 | 39.2 |
| 2013 | 3633 | 5537 | 39.6 | 1913 | 3691 | 34.1 | 470 | 639 | 42.4 | 343 | 350 | 49.5 | 591 | 377 | 61.0 | 316 | 480 | 39.7 |
| 2012 | 3393 | 5308 | 39.0 | 1744 | 3501 | 33.3 | 431 | 600 | 41.8 | 314 | 380 | 45.2 | 564 | 358 | 61.2 | 340 | 469 | 42.0 |
| 2011 | 3475 | 5459 | 38.9 | 1692 | 3559 | 32.2 | 529 | 656 | 44.6 | 360 | 397 | 47.5 | 537 | 375 | 58.9 | 357 | 472 | 43.1 |
| 2010 | 3301 | 5396 | 38.0 | 1557 | 3461 | 31.0 | 486 | 621 | 43.9 | 386 | 400 | 49.1 | 528 | 385 | 57.8 | 344 | 529 | 39.4 |
| 2009 | 3451 | 5326 | 39.3 | 1601 | 3269 | 32.9 | 522 | 630 | 45.3 | 374 | 425 | 46.8 | 608 | 449 | 57.5 | 346 | 553 | 38.5 |
| 2008 | 3862 | 5954 | 39.3 | 2043 | 3910 | 34.3 | 529 | 658 | 44.6 | 404 | 444 | 47.6 | 602 | 416 | 59.1 | 284 | 526 | 35.1 |
| 2007 | 3679 | 5862 | 38.6 | 1931 | 3815 | 33.6 | 509 | 652 | 43.8 | 407 | 408 | 49.9 | 534 | 467 | 53.3 | 298 | 520 | 36.4 |
| 2006 | 3621 | 5828 | 38.3 | 1828 | 3776 | 32.6 | 510 | 646 | 44.1 | 396 | 402 | 49.6 | 558 | 436 | 56.2 | 329 | 568 | 36.7 |
| 2005 | 3454 | 5576 | 38.3 | 1733 | 3602 | 32.5 | 493 | 645 | 43.3 | 359 | 399 | 47.3 | 572 | 445 | 56.2 | 297 | 485 | 38.0 |


|  | University sector |  |  |  | Public and state universities |  |  |  | University hospitals |  |  |  | Private universities |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) |
| 2020 | 9759 | 17566 | 35.7 | 64.3 | 8493 | 16017 | 34.7 | 65.3 | 1047 | 1221 | 46.2 | 53.8 | 219 | 328 | 40.0 | 60.0 |
| 2019 | 9438 | 17328 | 35.3 | 64.7 | 8269 | 15793 | 34.4 | 65.6 | 948 | 1177 | 44.6 | 55.4 | 221 | 358 | 38.2 | 61.8 |
| 2018 | 8910 | 16777 | 34.7 | 65.3 | 7717 | 15261 | 33.6 | 66.4 | 961 | 1183 | 44.8 | 55.2 | 232 | 333 | 41.1 | 58.9 |
| 2017 | 8618 | 16392 | 34.5 | 65.5 | 7424 | 14952 | 33.2 | 66.8 | 958 | 1099 | 46.6 | 53.4 | 236 | 341 | 40.9 | 59.1 |
| 2016 | 8064 | 15378 | 34.4 | 65.6 | 7071 | 14064 | 33.5 | 66.5 | 783 | 1055 | 42.6 | 57.4 | 210 | 259 | 44.8 | 55.2 |
| 2015 | 8427 | 15536 | 35.2 | 64.8 | 7151 | 14036 | 33.8 | 66.2 | 1032 | 1181 | 46.6 | 53.4 | 244 | 319 | 43.3 | 56.7 |
| 2014 | 8115 | 15164 | 34.9 | 65.1 | 6890 | 13777 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 981 | 1014 | 49.2 | 50.8 | 244 | 373 | 39.5 | 60.5 |
| 2013 | 8166 | 14791 | 35.6 | 64.4 | 6960 | 13217 | 34.5 | 65.5 | 952 | 1123 | 45.9 | 54.1 | 254 | 451 | 36.0 | 64.0 |
| 2012 | 7226 | 13908 | 34.2 | 65.8 | 6253 | 12661 | 33.1 | 66.9 | 737 | 884 | 45.5 | 54.5 | 236 | 363 | 39.4 | 60.6 |
| 2011 | 7184 | 13548 | 34.7 | 65.3 | 6102 | 12205 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 892 | 1020 | 46.7 | 53.3 | 190 | 323 | 37.0 | 63.0 |
| 2010 | 6848 | 13129 | 34.3 | 65.7 | 5825 | 11806 | 33.0 | 67.0 | 847 | 1059 | 44.4 | 55.6 | 176 | 264 | 40.0 | 60.0 |
| 2009 | 6939 | 12906 | 35.0 | 65.0 | 5721 | 11459 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 1022 | 1178 | 46.5 | 53.5 | 196 | 269 | 42.2 | 57.8 |
| 2008 | 6711 | 12839 | 34.3 | 65.7 | 5755 | 11697 | 33.0 | 67.0 | 816 | 895 | 47.7 | 52.3 | 140 | 247 | 36.2 | 63.8 |
| 2007 | 6549 | 12610 | 34.2 | 65.8 | 5513 | 11383 | 32.6 | 67.4 | 892 | 983 | 47.6 | 52.4 | 144 | 244 | 37.1 | 62.9 |
| 2006 | 6050 | 11691 | 34.1 | 65.9 | 5268 | 10710 | 33.0 | 67.0 | 710 | 826 | 46.2 | 53.8 | 72 | 155 | 31.7 | 68.3 |
| 2005 | 5713 | 11630 | 32.9 | 67.1 | 5008 | 10713 | 31.9 | 68.1 | 633 | 791 | 44.4 | 55.6 | 72 | 126 | 36.4 | 63.6 |

Tab. 28: Researchers by sector (FTE)

|  | Business sector |  |  |  | Government sector |  |  |  | University sector |  |  |  | Private non-profit sector |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) |
| 2020 | 3020 | 19506 | 13.4 | 86.6 | 3162 | 5007 | 38.7 | 61.3 | 4404 | 8928 | 23.0 | 67.0 | 78 | 101 | 43.7 | 56.3 |
| 2019 | 2790 | 18916 | 12.9 | 87.1 | 3111 | 4857 | 39.0 | 61.0 | 4172 | 8491 | 22.9 | 67.1 | 80 | 83 | 49.1 | 50.9 |
| 2018 | 2583 | 18566 | 12.2 | 87.8 | 3010 | 4869 | 38.2 | 61.8 | 3882 | 8119 | 22.3 | 67.7 | 67 | 101 | 39.8 | 60.2 |
| 2017 | 2445 | 17761 | 12.1 | 87.9 | 3075 | 4833 | 38.9 | 61.1 | 3462 | 7413 | 31.8 | 68.2 | 78 | 114 | 40.5 | 59.5 |
| 2016 | 2328 | 16857 | 12.1 | 87.9 | 2876 | 4624 | 38.3 | 61.7 | 3347 | 7165 | 31.8 | 68.2 | 60 | 82 | 42.1 | 57.9 |
| 2015 | 2362 | 16799 | 12.3 | 87.7 | 2813 | 4580 | 38.0 | 62.0 | 3676 | 7681 | 32.4 | 67.6 | 72 | 98 | 42.4 | 57.6 |
| 2014 | 2468 | 15424 | 13.8 | 86.2 | 2588 | 4391 | 37.1 | 62.9 | 3562 | 7403 | 32.5 | 67.5 | 83 | 121 | 40.7 | 59.3 |
| 2013 | 2218 | 14149 | 13.6 | 86.4 | 2572 | 4153 | 38.2 | 61.8 | 3534 | 7462 | 32.1 | 67.9 | 77 | 107 | 41.8 | 58.2 |
| 2012 | 2040 | 13018 | 13.5 | 86.5 | 2351 | 4103 | 36.4 | 63.6 | 3722 | 7776 | 32.4 | 67.6 | 99 | 109 | 47.6 | 52.4 |
| 2011 | 1832 | 11750 | 13.5 | 86.5 | 2485 | 4126 | 37.6 | 62.4 | 3303 | 6986 | 32.1 | 67.9 | 77 | 123 | 38.5 | 61.5 |
| 2010 | 1633 | 10694 | 13.2 | 86.8 | 2403 | 4174 | 36.5 | 63.5 | 3306 | 6809 | 32.7 | 67.3 | 86 | 122 | 41.3 | 58.7 |
| 2009 | 1686 | 10603 | 13.7 | 86.3 | 2505 | 3993 | 38.6 | 61.4 | 3235 | 6569 | 33.0 | 67.0 | 64 | 104 | 38.1 | 61.9 |
| 2008 | 1702 | 11164 | 13.2 | 86.8 | 2771 | 4517 | 38.0 | 62.0 | 3059 | 6482 | 32.1 | 67.9 | 27 | 62 | 30.3 | 69.7 |
| 2007 | 1525 | 10330 | 12.9 | 87.1 | 2761 | 4393 | 38.6 | 61.4 | 2783 | 6017 | 31.6 | 68.4 | 24 | 46 | 34.3 | 65.7 |
| 2006 | 1338 | 9335 | 12.5 | 87.5 | 2585 | 4407 | 37.0 | 63.0 | 2713 | 5828 | 31.8 | 68.2 | 17 | 45 | 27.4 | 72.6 |
| 2005 | 1370 | 8346 | 14.1 | 85.9 | 2388 | 4176 | 36.4 | 63.6 | 2514 | 5248 | 32.4 | 67.6 | 76 | 51 | 59.8 | 40.2 |

ACADEMICS

|  | Lecturers |  |  |  | Assistants |  |  |  | Assistant professors |  |  |  | Associate professors |  |  |  | Full professors |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Nomen (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Men (\%) |
| 2020 | 515 | 398 | 56.4 | 43.6 | 664 | 695 | 48.9 | 51.1 | 4007 | 5782 | 40.9 | 59.1 | 1143 | 3125 | 26.8 | 73.2 | 334 | 1844 | 15.3 | 84.7 |
| 2019 | 508 | 365 | 58.2 | 41.8 | 629 | 638 | 49.7 | 50.3 | 3940 | 5685 | 40.9 | 59.1 | 1103 | 3096 | 26.2 | 73.8 | 335 | 1815 | 15.6 | 84.4 |
| 2018 | 471 | 329 | 58.9 | 41.1 | 611 | 601 | 50.4 | 49.5 | 3963 | 5713 | 41.0 | 59.0 | 1072 | 3056 | 26.0 | 74.0 | 330 | 1814 | 15.4 | 84.6 |
| 2017 | 455 | 318 | 58.9 | 41.1 | 632 | 621 | 50.5 | 49.5 | 3943 | 5663 | 41.0 | 59.0 | 1049 | 3066 | 25.5 | 74.5 | 333 | 1802 | 15.6 | 84.4 |
| 2016 | 450 | 321 | 58.3 | 41.7 | 655 | 686 | 48.8 | 51.2 | 3943 | 5667 | 41.0 | 59.0 | 1036 | 3054 | 25.3 | 74.7 | 332 | 1825 | 15.4 | 84.6 |
| 2015 | 457 | 299 | 60.4 | 39.6 | 634 | 685 | 48.1 | 51.9 | 3759 | 5470 | 40.7 | 59.3 | 954 | 2828 | 25.2 | 74.8 | 313 | 1739 | 15.3 | 84.7 |
| 2014 | 367 | 251 | 59.4 | 40.6 | 576 | 619 | 48.2 | 51.8 | 3396 | 4577 | 42.6 | 57.4 | 849 | 2376 | 26.3 | 73.7 | 274 | 1501 | 15.4 | 84.6 |
| 2013 | 319 | 218 | 59.4 | 40.6 | 598 | 627 | 48.8 | 51.2 | 3399 | 4653 | 42.2 | 57.8 | 822 | 2332 | 26.1 | 73.9 | 273 | 1503 | 15.4 | 84.6 |
| 2012 | 329 | 219 | 60.0 | 40.0 | 633 | 670 | 48.6 | 51.4 | 3443 | 4837 | 41.6 | 58.4 | 824 | 2386 | 25.7 | 74.3 | 268 | 1528 | 14.9 | 85.1 |
| 2011 | 431 | 292 | 59.6 | 40.4 | 989 | 1029 | 49.0 | 51.0 | 4667 | 6980 | 40.1 | 59.9 | 1040 | 3265 | 24.2 | 75.8 | 352 | 2135 | 14.2 | 85.8 |
| 2010 | 499 | 326 | 60.5 | 39.5 | 1101 | 1098 | 50.1 | 49.9 | 4669 | 7048 | 39.8 | 60.2 | 1034 | 3289 | 23.9 | 76.1 | 342 | 2184 | 13.5 | 86.5 |
| 2009 | 463 | 310 | 59.9 | 40.1 | 1158 | 1237 | 48.4 | 51.6 | 4652 | 7150 | 39.4 | 60.6 | 959 | 3191 | 23.1 | 76.9 | 298 | 2126 | 12.3 | 87.7 |
| 2008 | 463 | 310 | 59.9 | 40.1 | 1158 | 1237 | 48.4 | 51.6 | 4652 | 7150 | 39.4 | 60.6 | 959 | 3191 | 23.1 | 76.9 | 298 | 2126 | 12.3 | 87.7 |
| 2007 | 459 | 298 | 60.6 | 39.4 | 1059 | 1170 | 47.5 | 52.5 | 4495 | 6897 | 39.5 | 60.5 | 940 | 3100 | 23.3 | 76.7 | 263 | 2070 | 11.3 | 88.7 |
| 2006 | 352 | 295 | 54.4 | 45.6 | 968 | 1112 | 46.5 | 53.5 | 4270 | 6551 | 39.5 | 60.5 | 917 | 3083 | 22.9 | 77.1 | 258 | 1980 | 11.5 | 88.5 |
| 2005 | 274 | 223 | 55.1 | 44.9 | 851 | 978 | 46.5 | 53.5 | 4249 | 6416 | 39.8 | 60.2 | 881 | 3052 | 22.4 | 77.6 | 240 | 1944 | 11.0 | 89.0 |

Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistical Yearbook (Employees and wage resources).

|  | Natural Sciences |  |  | Technical Sciences |  |  | Agricultural Sciences |  |  | Medical Sciences |  |  | Social Sciences |  |  | Humanities |  |  | Not specified, Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | (\%) | Women | Men | (\%) | Women | Men | n (\%) | Women | Men | (\%) | Women | Men | n (\%) | Women | Men | n (\%) |  |
| 2020 | 762 | 2173 | 26.0 | 865 | 3000 | 22.4 | 373 | 639 | 36.8 | 1188 | 1509 | 44.0 | 1751 | 2097 | 45.5 | 1158 | 1604 | 41.9 |  |
| 2019 | 701 | 2094 | 25.1 | 848 | 2870 | 22.5 | 332 | 616 | 35.0 | 1155 | 1605 | 41.9 | 1670 | 1993 | 45.6 | 1158 | 1605 | 41.9 |  |
| 2018 | 445 | 1415 | 23.9 | 1059 | 2815 | 27.3 | 205 | 624 | 39.6 | 1123 | 1569 | 41.7 | 1746 | 2555 | 40.6 | 1198 | 1715 | 41.1 |  |
| 2017 | 484 | 1466 | 24.8 | 1102 | 3679 | 23.1 | 286 | 520 | 35.5 | 1120 | 1459 | 43.4 | 2060 | 2598 | 44.2 | 1191 | 1687 | 41.6 | 883.4 |
| 2016 | 414 | 1326 | 23.8 | 1096 | 3694 | 22.9 | 276 | 506 | 35.3 | 1088 | 1424 | 43.3 | 2046 | 2579 | 44.2 | 1144 | 1647 | 41.0 | 730.1 |
| 2015 | 565 | 1775 | 24.1 | 1254 | 4491 | 21.8 | 315 | 531 | 37.2 | 2265 | 3178 | 41.6 | 2030 | 2482 | 45.0 | 1339 | 2011 | 40.0 |  |

Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistical Yearbook (Employees and wage resources). Calculations made according to the Frascati Manual (OECD).
Tab. 31: Academics by position in the natural sciences (FTE) *

|  | Lecturers |  |  | Assistants |  |  | Assistant professors |  |  | Associate professors |  |  | Full professors |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) |
| 2020 | 69 | 87 | 44.3 | 27 | 54 | 33.8 | 386 | 870 | 30.8 | 144 | 601 | 19.4 | 45 | 366 | 11.0 |
| 2019 | 70 | 93 | 43.1 | 23 | 41 | 35.7 | 386 | 863 | 30.9 | 138 | 646 | 17.7 | 45 | 396 | 10.2 |
| 2018 | 70 | 90 | 43.8 | 19 | 28 | 41.1 | 364 | 828 | 30.6 | 134 | 629 | 17.5 | 44 | 395 | 10.0 |
| 2017 | 69 | 88 | 43.9 | 18 | 30 | 38.0 | 365 | 835 | 30.4 | 125 | 616 | 16.9 | 46 | 383 | 10.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | * Data collection started in 2017. <br> Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistical Yearbook (Employees and wage resources). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tab. 32: Academics by position in the technical sciences (FTE)* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Lecturers |  |  | Assistants |  |  | Assistant professors |  |  | Associate professors |  |  | Full professors |  |  |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) |
| 2020 | 22 | 40 | 34.9 | 90 | 187 | 32.4 | 544 | 1505 | 26.6 | 153 | 789 | 16.2 | 49 | 441 | 10.0 |
| 2019 | 19 | 39 | 32.7 | 88 | 173 | 33.8 | 543 | 1464 | 27.1 | 152 | 788 | 16.2 | 47 | 436 | 9.7 |
| 2018 | 6 | 19 | 25.2 | 89 | 160 | 35.7 | 577 | 1533 | 27.4 | 148 | 784 | 15.9 | 46 | 430 | 9.6 |
| 2017 | 4 | 18 | 17.7 | 92 | 161 | 36.3 | 567 | 1507 | 27.3 | 143 | 781 | 15.5 | 44 | 430 | 9.3 |

Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistical Yearbook (Employees and wage resources).
Tab. 33: Academics by position in the medical sciences (FTE) *

|  | Lecturers |  |  | Assistants |  |  | Assistant professors |  |  | Associate professors |  |  | Full professors |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) |
| 2020 | 88 | 63 | 58.1 | 166 | 133 | 55.5 | 693 | 656 | 51.4 | 151 | 315 | 32.4 | 62 | 323 | 16.2 |
| 2019 | 82 | 59 | 58.3 | 161 | 111 | 59.2 | 670 | 658 | 50.5 | 149 | 316 | 32.0 | 62 | 320 | 16.3 |
| 2018 | 76 | 59 | 56.3 | 152 | 92 | 62.3 | 655 | 649 | 50.2 | 146 | 314 | 31.7 | 63 | 315 | 16.7 |
| 2017 | 78 | 68 | 53.6 | 138 | 92 | 60.1 | 655 | 640 | 50.6 | 145 | 319 | 31.3 | 64 | 313 | 16.9 |

Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistical Yearbook (Employees and wage resources).
Tab. 34: Academics by position in the agricultural sciences (FTE) *

|  | Lecturers |  |  | Assistants |  |  | Assistant professors |  |  | Associate professors |  |  | Full professors |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) |
| 2020 | 4 | 2 | 69.1 | 58 | 38 | 60.2 | 193 | 260 | 42.6 | 51 | 158 | 24.3 | 22 | 96 | 18.3 |
| 2019 | 3 | 0 | 90.8 | 44 | 32 | 57.8 | 178 | 247 | 41.9 | 47 | 156 | 23.0 | 20 | 97 | 16.8 |
| 2018 | 2 | 0 | 100.0 | 43 | 30 | 59.1 | 177 | 249 | 41.5 | 43 | 152 | 22.1 | 22 | 101 | 17.8 |
| 2017 | 2 | 0 | 100.0 | 42 | 30 | 58.8 | 172 | 258 | 40.0 | 43 | 159 | 21.4 | 22 | 102 | 17.6 |

Source: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports - Statistical Yearbook (Employees and wage resources).

[^42]Tab. 37: Average gross monthly wage (CZK)* of academics

|  | Lecturers |  |  | Assistants |  |  | Assistant professors |  |  | Associate professors |  |  | Full professors |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | GPG (\%) | Women | Men | GPG (\%) | Women | Men | GPG (\%) | Women | Men | GPG (\%) | Women | Men | GPG (\%) |
| 2020 | 37695 | 42443 | 11.2 | 36932 | 40611 | 9.1 | 45892 | 52163 | 12.2 | 64484 | 73508 | 12.8 | 84815 | 92824 | 8.6 |
| 2019 | 37553 | 43417 | 11.5 | 36287 | 40270 | 9.9 | 45155 | 50876 | 11.2 | 63991 | 72218 | 11.4 | 83540 | 91486 | 8.7 |
| 2018 | 34783 | 38640 | 10.0 | 33265 | 36530 | 8.9 | 41586 | 47233 | 12.0 | 59694 | 67541 | 11.6 | 78091 | 84350 | 7.4 |
| 2017 | 31643 | 35405 | 10.6 | 29446 | 32588 | 9.6 | 37552 | 42482 | 11.6 | 53300 | 60746 | 12.3 | 72983 | 77629 | 6.0 |
| 2016 | 30128 | 34236 | 12.0 | 27976 | 30424 | 8.0 | 35212 | 39858 | 11.7 | 50794 | 56966 | 10.8 | 68791 | 72750 | 5.4 |
| 2015 | 30575 | 33919 | 9.9 | 27877 | 29662 | 6.0 | 34876 | 39310 | 11.3 | 50648 | 56942 | 11.1 | 69435 | 73049 | 4.9 |
| 2014 | 28354 | 33068 | 14.3 | 26198 | 27688 | 5.4 | 32959 | 36403 | 9.5 | 48674 | 54146 | 10.1 | 66978 | 70016 | 4.3 |
| 2013 | 27487 | 30814 | 10.8 | 25361 | 27336 | 7.2 | 31603 | 35468 | 10.9 | 47279 | 52071 | 9.2 | 64414 | 67344 | 4.4 |
| 2012 | 26139 | 29033 | 10.0 | 24642 | 25929 | 5.0 | 31215 | 34078 | 8.4 | 45569 | 49414 | 7.8 | 61778 | 65062 | 5.0 |
| 2011 | 24684 | 27540 | 10.4 | 23232 | 25867 | 10.2 | 29464 | 32967 | 10.6 | 43677 | 47427 | 7.9 | 58156 | 62057 | 6.3 |
| 2010 | 24319 | 27409 | 11.3 | 23415 | 24603 | 4.8 | 29877 | 31793 | 6.0 | 43451 | 46230 | 6.0 | 58661 | 60329 | 2.8 |
| 2009 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| 2008 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| 2007 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| 2006 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| 2005 | - | - | $-$ | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |

DECISION-MAKERS
Tab. 38: Proportion of women in public research institutions in 2020 (HC)

|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Director | 7 | 67 | 9.5 |
| Deputy director | - | - | - |
| Council | 155 | 627 | 19.8 |
| Supervisory board | 90 | 318 | 22.3 |
| Total | 245 | 1012 | 19.5 |
| Source: 2020 annual reports. |  |  |  |

Tab. 39: Proportion of women on the management and advisory boards of the Czech Academy of Sciences in 2020 (HC)

|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Chair | 1 | 0 | 100.0 |
| Academic council | 6 | 11 | 35.3 |
| Academic assembly | 50 | 207 | 19.5 |
| Supervisory board | 1 | 7 | 12.5 |
| Research board | 4 | 25 | 13.8 |
| Management of the CAS in total | 62 | 250 | 19.9 |
| Other advisory boards (commission, councils) | 84 | 294 | 22.2 |
| Total CAS | 146 | 544 | 21.2 |

Source: www.avcr.cz
Tab. 44: Proportion of women in the Learned Society of the Czech Republic in $2020(\mathrm{HC})$

|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Chair | 0 | 1 | 0.0 |
| Council | 2 | 5 | 28.6 |
| Regular members | 7 | 84 | 7.7 |
| Foreign members | 3 | 47 | 6.0 |
| Emeritus members | 1 | 17 | 5.5 |
| Total | 13 | 154 | 7.8 |

Source: www.learned.cz/cz/.
Tab. 42: Proportion of women in the Technological Agency of the Czech Republic in $2020(\mathrm{HC})$

|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Chair | 0 | 1 | 0.0 |
| Board | 1 | 4 | 20.0 |
| Research board | 1 | 12 | 7.7 |
| Controlling body | 3 | 7 | 30.0 |
| Management of TACR in total | 5 | 25 | 16.7 |
| Programme's council, expert commissions | 58 | 158 | 26.9 |
| Total | 63 | 160 | 28.3 |

Source: 2020 Technological Agency Annual Report, www.tacr.cz.
Tab. 43: Proportion of women in the Czech Science Foundation in 2020 (HC)

|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Chair | 1 | 0 | 100.0 |
| Board | 2 | 3 | 40.0 |
| Research board | 1 | 11 | 8.3 |
| Controlling body | 1 | 8 | 11.1 |
| Management of CSF in total | 5 | 22 | 18.5 |
| Evaluation panels | 82 | 328 | 20.0 |
| Commission | 0 | 5 | 0.0 |
| Total | 87 | 355 | 19.7 |

Source: 2020 Czech Science Foundation Annual Report.
SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING PROFESSIONALS
Tab. 45: Science and engineering professionals* and their average gross monthly wage (CZK)

|  | Total |  |  | Age: 25-29 |  |  | Age: 30-34 |  |  | Age: 35-44 |  |  | Age: 45-44 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) |
| 2020 | - | - | - | 37145 | 44162 | 15.9 | 46589 | 52834 | 11.8 | 52854 | 62926 | 16.0 | 53196 | 61346 | 13.3 |
| 2019 | 39500 | 104200 | 27.5 | 35749 | 42912 | 16.7 | 44883 | 51828 | 13.4 | 49933 | 60483 | 17.4 | 49276 | 60238 | 18.2 |
| 2018 | 36800 | 106300 | 25.6 | 34272 | 38945 | 12.0 | 41510 | 47956 | 13.4 | 45656 | 54842 | 16.7 | 45489 | 55019 | 17.3 |
| 2017 | 34400 | 105300 | 24.4 | 31693 | 36432 | 13.0 | 38432 | 45207 | 15.0 | 42613 | 52566 | 18.9 | 42209 | 51134 | 17.5 |
| 2016 | 30900 | 100000 | 23.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2015 | 26900 | 91600 | 22.4 | 29768 | 32290 | 7.8 | 36885 | 41764 | 11.7 | 38453 | 47618 | 19.2 | 36689 | 46113 | 20.4 |
| 2014 | 25400 | 85500 | 21.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2013 | 23300 | 79700 | 24.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2012 | 21600 | 74700 | 21.4 | - | - |  | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |


|  | Total |  |  | Public universities |  |  | Public research institutions |  |  | Commercial sector |  |  | Private individuals |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) | Women | Men | Women (\%) |
| 2020 | 53 | 486 | 10.2 | 19 | 130 | 12.9 | 7 | 40 | 14.6 | 20 | 234 | 7.8 | 5 | 47 | 8.8 |
| 2019 | 60 | 459 | 11.5 | 17 | 114 | 13.3 | 20 | 43 | 31.1 | 17 | 216 | 7.1 | 4 | 56 | 7.0 |
| 2018 | 55 | 463 | 10.5 | 15 | 123 | 10.7 | 11 | 29 | 28.5 | 22 | 217 | 9.2 | 5 | 60 | 7.8 |
| 2017 | 55 | 549 | 9.1 | 20 | 150 | 11.5 | 10 | 42 | 18.5 | 19 | 254 | 7.1 | 5 | 71 | 6.6 |
| 2016 | 60 | 606 | 9.0 | 27 | 187 | 12.7 | 8 | 48 | 14.5 | 18 | 277 | 6.2 | 6 | 67 | 8.0 |
| 2015 | 54 | 546 | 9.1 | 25 | 179 | 12.2 | 10 | 59 | 14.6 | 16 | 228 | 6.7 | 2 | 61 | 3.8 |
| 2014 | 50 | 436 | 10.2 | 20 | 140 | 12.7 | 7 | 48 | 12.5 | 16 | 185 | 7.9 | 6 | 50 | 10.8 |
| 2013 | 44 | 377 | 10.5 | 20 | 138 | 12.5 | 10 | 31 | 23.2 | 12 | 144 | 7.8 | 2 | 57 | 3.6 |
| 2012 | 44 | 378 | 10.4 | 16 | 123 | 11.3 | 8 | 38 | 18.2 | 18 | 147 | 11.0 | 1 | 57 | 1.7 |
| 2011 | 38 | 306 | 11.1 | 13 | 90 | 12.4 | 7 | 28 | 20.4 | 15 | 104 | 12.7 | 2 | 63 | 3.5 |
| 2010 | 22 | 278 | 7.4 | 3 | 62 | 4.3 | 9 | 29 | 23.5 | 5 | 112 | 4.6 | 4 | 53 | 6.3 |
| 2009 | 32 | 348 | 8.5 | 9 | 48 | 16.0 | 8 | 33 | 20.1 | 11 | 189 | 5.5 | 2 | 66 | 3.1 |
| 2008 | 19 | 232 | 7.5 | 2 | 17 | 11.2 | 6 | 20 | 21.8 | 9 | 139 | 6.0 | 2 | 43 | 4.4 |
| 2007 | 15 | 226 | 6.1 | 3 | 20 | 11.8 | 1 | 10 | 11.2 | 8 | 120 | 6.2 | 2 | 65 | 3.0 |
| 2006 | 19 | 247 | 7.0 | 2 | 14 | 11.0 | 5 | 8 | 37.8 | 9 | 141 | 5.9 | 3 | 78 | 3.9 |
| 2005 | 18 | 327 | 5.3 | 1 | 17 | 6.9 | 2 | 15 | 13.3 | 9 | 180 | 4.6 | 4 | 104 | 4.1 |
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