Differentiating Think-Tanks by Volume and Regularity of Research Output: An Eight-League Framework

Introduction:

The Eight Leagues:

L1: "Leading think-tanks"

L2: "Promising think-tanks"

L3: "Rising think-tanks"

L4: "New think-tanks"

L5: "Inactive think-tanks"

<u>L6: "Former think-tanks"</u>

L7: "Time-limited think-tanks"

L8: "Non-existent think-tanks"

Discussion:

Introduction:

Are all think-tanks of the same level?

No.

Just as companies are classified into small, medium, and large enterprises based on their number of employees or turnover [1],

restaurants are distinguished by the quality of their food [2],

hotels are categorised according to the quality of their services [3],

universities are ranked based on various criteria [4],

and football clubs compete in different leagues [5],

think-tanks, too, vary in calibre.

The purpose of this chapter is to define these different "calibres."

The aim is not to create a comprehensive ranking of every think-tank, like the "Shanghai Ranking of World Universities" [6],

but rather to propose a theoretical framework for categorising think-tanks.

In terms of the volume and consistency of research output, eight distinct categories emerge.

League 1 (L1): "Leading think-tanks" League 2 (L2): "Promising think-tanks" League 3 (L3): "Rising think-tanks" League 4 (L4): "New think-tanks"
League 5 (L5): "Inactive think-tanks"
League 6 (L6): "Former think-tanks"
League 7 (L7): "Time-limited think-tanks"
League 8 (L8): "Non-existent think-tanks"

Footnotes:

- [1] https://single-market-economy.ec.europa.eu/smes/sme-fundamentals/sme-definition_en
- [2] https://guide.michelin.com/us/en/restaurants/3-stars-michelin
- [3]

https://www.euronews.com/travel/2024/03/12/an-objective-anchor-in-the-sea-of-reviews-heres-how-hotel-star-ratings-work-and-why-they-m

- [4] https://www.shanghairanking.com/
- [5] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/English_football_league_system
- [6] https://www.shanghairanking.com/rankings/arwu/2024

The Eight Leagues:

The substance of their written publications is the only criterion taken into account.

L1: "Leading think-tanks"

They frequently publish substantial research reports.

L2: "Promising think-tanks"

They don't qualify for L1.

They frequently publish short analyses.

Notes:

- The top "student think-tanks" fall into this category, even though they could be considered for L1, as "students" are not regarded as real researchers.
- The best think-tanks with anonymous authors also fall into this category, even though they could qualify for L1, since "anonymous authors" are not considered real researchers

L3: "Rising think-tanks"

They don't qualify for L2.

The frequency and substance of their written research output are at a low level.

L4: "New think-tanks"

They are still in the project stage and don't have a long enough content history to determine which league they belong to.

L5: "Inactive think-tanks"

They haven't published anything in a while.

L6: "Former think-tanks"

Their closure has been officially confirmed.

L7: "Time-limited think-tanks"

From its outset, this type of think-tank is designed to last only a certain number of months or years.

(Think-tanks in this category can also belong to one of the other seven leagues.)

Notes:

- 1. It is "time-related," not "goal-related," regardless of the time required to achieve the goal.
- 2. The best examples of L7 think-tanks are temporary research platforms (usually set up for around 2 to 3 years) created through EU-funded research programs.

Examples:

- Fineprint, active from July 2017 to December 2022 (About Fineprint)
- PERITIA, active from 2020 to 2023.

L8: "Non-existent think-tanks"

These think-tanks exist in name only.

An L8 think-tank doesn't have its own website or social media accounts to host its work. Unlike an L4 think-tank, its name is not new — old mentions of it can easily be found on the internet.

Its work is distributed across various opinion platforms (social media accounts, newspapers, other think-tanks, etc.) by an individual claiming to be its founder or someone associated with this (non-existent) think-tank.

Discussion:

The criterion of 'written publications' is an arbitrary choice. Other criteria could be used to classify think-tanks by level.