

# early career

*Kristina Tietjen*

## Survey Data Analysis


**Note that numbers not all the same because respondents did not always answer every question**


### Results


In total, 162 researchers completed the online survey. Of these, almost xxxxx were male (53%) and xxxxx were female (48%); xxxx proportion either did not input their gender or selected other. This category only includes the responses from researchers who are currently in their PhD or are RAs.

Researchers from many different disciplines were represented in the survey. 56 percent of responses came from either the natural or physical sciences (Figure 4.2). The remaining responses were spread amongst the medical and life sciences (14%), engineering (4%), interdisciplinary research (8%), and social sciences and humanities (17%).


**Figures of number of responses by country (these are also saved as individual PDFs)**








**Countries with 10 or fewer responses**









Figure 1: Figure 4.1 Number of survey respondents by career stage






Figure 2: Figure 4.2 Survey responses by field of research




Figure 3: Figure 4.3 Respondents type of research describe in proportional amounts of fundamental use-inspired and applied research. Researchers were questioned about the percentage of funding allocated to Fundamental Use-inspired or Applied research in the past and in their current research.






Figure 4: Figure 4.3 (different layout) Respondents type of research describe in proportal amounts of fundamental, use-inspired and applied research. Reseachers were questioned about the percentage of funding allocated to Fundamental, Use-inspired or Applied research in the past and in their current research.




Figure 5: Figure 4.4a&b Change in research type proportions and the reasons. Researchers were asked to answer yes, no, or can't comment on if their type of research had changed in the last 10 years and to select what reasons for the change applied to them.




Figure 6: Figure 4.5 View of change in proportion of research. Researchers were asked how they viewed the change in the type of research they conduct/supervise.




Figure 7: Figure 4.6 Current vs past level of partnership outside of academia. Researchers indicated the level of partnership that their current and past (10 years ago) research program had outside of academia).




Figure 8: Figure 4.7a&b Did it change and reasons for change in level of external research partnerships over the past decade.




Figure 9: Figure 4.8 View of change in external partnerships. Researchers were asked how they viewed the change in the level of partnership with external groups.

## Number of research grant applications




Figure 10: Fig. 4.9 Number of research grant applications by research category in 2006-2010 and 2011-2015.




Figure 11: Fig 4.10 Research grant application success over the past 10 years. Researchers were asked to estimate the percentage of their research grant applications that were successful, in 2006-2010 and in 2011-2015. Respondents also had the choice to answer No need for applications for this research type.






Figure 12: Fig 4.11 Change in grant success rates over the past 10 years. Researchers were asked if they thought that grant success rates have changed in the past 10 years, for each research category.




Figure 13: Fig 4.12 Importance of practical application of research over the past 10 years. Researchers were asked how important it was to suggest practical applications of their research to ensure that the grant was successful, in 2006-2010 and in 2011-2015.




Figure 14: Fig 4.13 Importance of including partners from for-profit or non-governmental sectors in grant success. Researchers were asked how important it was to include external partnerships in their research to ensure that the grant was successful, in 2006-2010 and in 2011-2015.




Figure 15: Fig 4.15 Perceived importance of fundamental research to their government. Researchers were asked how important they thought fundamental research was to the their government. Responses were/were not significantly different between genders.




Figure 16: Fig 4.16 Perceived change in research priority by their government. Researchers were asked whether any types of research had become higher priority for the their government. Responses were/were not significantly different between genders.




Figure 17: Fig 4.17 Anticipated change in research funding in next five years. Researchers were asked whether the availability of research funding would change in the next five years.




Figure 18: Fig 4.18 Effect of change in research funding on research careers of next generation. Researchers were asked if they thought that changes in funding availability would influence the likelihood of the next generation pursuing careers in research. Responses were/were not significantly different between genders.