ANALYSIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES

As part of the diagnosis of compliance with the European Charter for Researchers at the Institute of Dendrology, Polish Academy of Sciences, a survey was carried out with questions addressed to researchers at all stages of their career development (R1–R4). The questionnaire was prepared both in an electronic and printed form, ensuring complete anonymity of the respondent, with an option of providing comments or suggestions for each of the statements.

The questionnaire was distributed to all employees and doctoral students hired at the Institute who conduct research and are subject to the assessment of researchers' activity (R1–R4). At present (as at February 2026), the Institute employs 46 researchers and 7 doctoral students. The personal details section included questions concerning gender (F – woman, M – man, NP – I don't want to say), age (up to 35 years and 35+ years), and position (researcher or research and technical employee, engineering employee, doctoral student).

Completed questionnaires were received from 33 individuals; however, one questionnaire (M, age 35+) did not contain answers to any of the questions, and another did not have the personal details section completed. Consequently, both questionnaires were excluded from the further detailed analysis of the results. The final analysis therefore covers the results from 31 questionnaires, including responses from 17 women (F), 10 men (M) and 4 persons who did not state their gender (NP) (Table 1).

In 8 questionnaires, in addition to selecting answers, respondents also provided additional comments.

The largest group of respondents who completed the questionnaire were over 35 years of age (**75%**; 12 women – F, 8 men – M, 3 persons – NP). Eight respondents were under 35 years of age (5F, 2M, 1NP), including one doctoral student.

Table 1. Number of respondents who completed the questionnaire, by age, position and declared gender

Age group	Up to 35 years	35+ years	Total
Women / doctoral students (F)	1	0	**1**
Women / research positions (F)	4	11	**15**
Women / engineering positions (F)	0	1	**1**
Men / doctoral students (M)	0	0	**0**
Men / research positions (M)	1	8	**9**
Men / engineering positions (M)	1	0	**1**
I don't want to say / research positions	1	3	**4**
Total	**8**	**23**	**31**

In the questionnaire, employees were asked 20 questions (topics formulated as statements), divided into the following pillars:

I – ethics, integrity, gender aspects and open science – 8 questions,

II – researchers' assessment, recruitment and career progression – 4 questions,

III – working conditions and practices – 4 questions,

IV – research careers and talent development – 4 questions,

in order to assess how employees evaluate the level of compliance with the European Charter for Researchers at the Institute of Dendrology PAS. The questionnaire results are discussed below, analysing responses to each of the questions.

Pillar I – ETHICS, INTEGRITY, GENDER AND OPEN SCIENCE

1. The questionnaire begins with a question concerning **ethics and research integrity.** Among the 31 respondents, 83.9% (26 persons, including 14F, 9M and 3NP) stated that they fully or partially agree with the statement that: (1) the Institute adheres to the recognised ethical practices and fundamental ethical principles appropriate to their discipline(s) as well as to ethical standards as documented in the different national, sectoral or institutional Codes of Ethics, and the research is conducted in compliance with ethical standards; (2) the Institute has implemented mechanisms for identifying, reporting and dealing with research misconduct; (3) the Institute has established, in compliance with national rules and regulations, appropriate procedures and an ombudsman-type person to deal with complaints/ appeals of researchers (disciplinary ombudsman and disciplinary committee) (**Table 2**).

2. All respondents answered the question concerning **freedom of scientific research.** Among the 31 respondents, almost all (96.8%; 30 persons, including 17F, 9M and 4NP) stated that they fully or partially agree with the statement that at the Institute: (1) The employee has an impact on the aim of their future research; (2) researchers at the Institute have the freedom of research aims, and the freedom to identify methods by which problems are solved; (3) the Institute enables dissemination of the results and, if appropriate and financially possible, supports commercialisation; (4) the Institute provides a stimulating environment for research and scientific development (cooperation options, research equipment, awards); (5) researchers have the right to publish the results of their research (**Table 3**).

3. All respondents answered the question concerning **open science, including citizen science.** Among the 31 respondents, all (100%; 17F, 10M and 4NP) stated that they fully or partially agree with the statement that: (1) the Institute ensures that its research activities are made known to society at large in such a way that they can be understood by non-specialists, thereby improving the public's understanding of science (popularisation of science); (2) the Institute encourages researchers to popularise science, cooperate with the socio-economic environment, and communicate research results in a reliable and understandable manner to audiences outside the scientific community (**Table 4**).

4. All respondents answered the question concerning **gender equality**. Among the 31 respondents, almost all – except one (96.8%, including 17F, 9M and 4NP) stated that they fully or partially agree with the statement that: (1) the Institute has internal regulations covering anti-discrimination; (2) the Institute does not discriminate against researchers in any way on the basis of gender, age, ethnic, national or social origin, religion or belief, sexual orientation, language, disability, political opinion, social or economic condition; (3) the Institute aims for a representative gender balance at all staff levels, including management, administration and lab head, as well as members of the appointed Committees; (4) the Institute implements measures aimed at achieving a work-life balance (**Table 5**).

5. All respondents answered the question concerning **embracing diversity**. Among the 31 respondents, 90.3% (28 persons, including 15F, 9M and 4NP) stated that: (1) the Institute ensures equal treatment of employees regardless of age, gender, origin, or other prejudices; (2) the Institute has adopted procedures for reporting cases of unequal treatment, discrimination, and mobbing (**Table 6**).

6. All respondents answered the question concerning **researchers, including professional attitude and accountability.** Among the 31 respondents, 87.1% (27 persons, including 15F, 8M and 4NP) stated that: (1) at the Institute the principle of intellectual property and joint data ownership in the case of

research carried out in collaboration with a supervisor(s) and/or other researchers is obeyed at the Institute; (2) research conducted at the Institute is of great social importance; (3) researchers are familiar with the strategic goals of the Institute, funding mechanisms and ethical rules governing research conduct (**Table 7**).

7. All respondents answered the question concerning **the free circulation of researchers.** Among the 31 respondents, 87.1% (27 persons, including 16F, 8M and 3NP) stated that: (1) the Institute recognises the value of geographical, intersectoral, inter- and trans-disciplinary and virtual mobility; (2) supports researchers coming to the Institute and stimulates mobility of researchers employed; (3) the institute has implemented administrative instruments enabling the transfer of projects and staff, including social security (**Table 8**).

8. All respondents answered the question concerning **the sustainability of research.** Among the 31 respondents, 67.7% (21 persons, including 12F, 7M and 2NP) stated that: (1) the Institute promotes a culture of sustainable research management and provides training and mentoring in this area; (2) research is conducted in accordance with the guidelines of the European Commission's MSCA Green Charter. The remaining respondents indicated a lack of knowledge in this area (25.8%; 8 persons, including 3F, 3M and 2NP) or disagreed with this statement (6.5%; 2F) (**Table 9**).

Pillar II – RESEARCHERS ASSESSMENT, RECRUITMENT AND PROGRESSION

9. Nearly all respondents answered the question concerning **researchers assessment**. Among the 30 respondents, 80.0% (24 persons, including 14F, 6M and 4NP) stated that: (1) the Institute has evaluation/appraisal systems for all researchers for assessing their professional performance that are in line with national regulations; (2) the Institute assesses qualifications in line with the needs of the position; (3) the Institute has procedures in appreciation of the substantive contribution of scientists in the form of awards; (4) the Institute rewards research related to open science and the impact of research results on society. The remaining respondents indicated a lack of knowledge in this area (10%; 3 persons, including 2F, 1M) or disagreed with this statement (10%; 3 persons, including 1F, 2M) (**Table 10**).

10. All respondents provided answers to the question concerning **recruitment, including deviations from the chronological order of CVs and professional experience.** Among the 31 respondents, 83.9% (26 persons, including 14F, 8M and 4NP) stated that: (1) the Institute ensures that the entry and admission standards for researchers depending on their career stage, are clearly specified; (2) the Institute ensures recruitment procedures which are open, efficient, transparent, supportive and internationally comparable, (3) as well as tailored to the type of positions advertised; (4) the Institute informs, prior to the selection, about the recruitment process and the selection criteria, the number of available positions and the career development prospects; (5) candidates are also informed after the selection process about the strengths and weaknesses of their applications (**Table 11**).

11. All respondents answered the question concerning **selection, including non-discrimination.** Among the 31 respondents, 87.1% (27 persons, including 15F, 8M and 4NP) stated that: (1) the Institute ensures that the selection committee brings together diverse expertise and competences; (2) has an adequate gender balance; (3) in the selection process, the Institute takes into consideration the whole range of experience of the candidates (research, teaching, innovative and outreach activity) (**Table 12**).

12. Almost all respondents answered the question concerning **career progression, including co-authorship and the recognition of mobility experience**. Among the 30 respondents, 80.0% (24 persons, including 12F, 8M and 4NP) stated that: (1) the Institute ensures appropriate assessment and evaluation of the academic and professional qualifications, including nonformal qualifications, of all researchers, in particular within the context of international and professional mobility; (2) procedures and good practice at the Institute ensure that each researcher has the right to be recognised and listed and/or quoted, in the context of their actual contributions, as co-authors of papers, patents, etc. The remaining respondents indicated a lack of knowledge in this area (13.3%; 4 persons, including 3F, 1M) or disagreed with this statement (6.7%; 2 persons, including 1F, 1M) (**Table 13**).

PILLAR 3 - WORKING CONDITIONS AND PRACTICES

13. All respondents answered the question concerning **working conditions, funding and salaries, such as research environment, complaints/ appeals, participation in organization governance, funding and salaries.** Among the 31 respondents, 93.5% (29 persons, including 15F, 10M and 4NP) stated that: (1) The Institute ensures, at each level of research career, financial conditions that are in line with national and institutional regulations; (2) the Institute ensures that the working conditions for researchers, including for disabled researchers, provide where appropriate the flexibility deemed essential for successful research performance; (3) they should aim to provide working conditions which allow both women and men researchers to combine family and work, children and career (flexible working hours, part-time working, tele-working and remote work); (4) there is a body at the Institute consisting of researchers at all stages of their career that holds regular meetings with the Directors (**Table 14**).

14. All respondents answered the question concerning **stability of employment**. Among the 31 respondents, 83.9% (26 persons, including 13F, 9M and 4NP) stated that: (1) the Institute ensures, whenever possible, stable employment conditions (employment contract), in line with national regulations.; (2) early-career researchers are informed about career opportunities within and outside academia, giving them a wide range of professional development options (**Table 15**).

15. All respondents answered the question concerning **contractual and legal obligations**. Among the 31 respondents, 87.1% (27 persons, including 15F, 8M and 4NP) stated that: (1) the Institute adopts safe working practices, including taking the necessary precautions for health and safety; (2) as well as for recovery from information technology disasters, e.g. by preparing proper back-up strategies; the Institute undertakes necessary steps to meet the requirements regarding data protection and confidentiality protection (**Table 16**).

16. Almost all respondents answered the question concerning **dissemination and exploitation of results, and also intellectual assets including intellectual property rights and public engagement.** Among the 30 respondents, 83.3% (25 persons, including 15F, 7M and 3NP) stated that: (1) according to the Intellectual Property Rights regulations, the Institute ensures that researchers at all career stages reap the benefits of the exploitation (if any) of their research and development results through legal protection and, in particular, through appropriate protection of Intellectual Property Rights, including copyrights. The remaining respondents indicated a lack of knowledge in this area (13.3%; 4 persons, including 1F, 2M and 1NP) or disagreed with this statement (3.3%; 1M) (**Table 17**).

Pillar 4 – RESEARCH CAREERS AND TALENT DEVELOPMENT

17. All respondents answered the question concerning **valuing diverse research.** Among the 31 respondents, 64.5% (20 persons, including 11F, 6M and 3NP) stated that: (1) career breaks or variations in the chronological order of CVs should be regarded as an evolution of a career, and consequently, as a potentially valuable contribution to the professional development of researchers towards a multidimensional career track. The remaining respondents indicated a lack of knowledge in this area (32.3%; 10 persons, including 1F, 4M and 1NP) or disagreed with this statement (3.2%; 1M) (**Table 18**).

18. All respondents answered the question concerning **career development and advice.** Among the 31 respondents, 87.1% (27 persons, including 15F, 9M and 3NP) stated that: (1) the Institute enables professional development and continuous improvement through access to measures for the continuing development of skills and competencies (workshops and trainings); (2) career advice is offered to researchers at all stages of their careers (**Table 19**).

19. All respondents answered the question concerning **continuous professional development, such as access to research training and continuous development.** Among the 31 respondents, 87.1% (27 persons, including 14F, 9M and 4NP) stated that: (1) the Institute considers teaching as an essential means for the structuring and dissemination of knowledge and therefore it is perceived a valuable option within the researchers' career paths; (2) the Institute enables updating and expanding researchers' skills and competencies by a variety of means i.e. formal training, workshops, conferences and e-learning; (3) the Institute ensures fair assessment of the skills acquired by employees, both during formal and informal training (**Table 20**).

20. All respondents answered the question concerning **supervision and mentoring, including relations with supervisors, and senior researchers support.** Among the 31 respondents, 61.3% (19 persons, including 14F, 9M and 4NP) stated that: (1) at the Institute there is a person is clearly identified to whom early-stage researchers can refer for the performance of their professional duties; (2) this person plays also an advisory role in terms of career development and fundraising for research; (3) the Institute has a strategy of career development for R1-R4 researchers that is in line with national regulations; (4) senior researchers play a multi-faceted role as supervisors, mentors, career advisors, leaders, project coordinators, managers or science communicators. The remaining respondents indicated a lack of knowledge in this area (22.6%; 7 persons, including 5F, 2M) or disagreed with this statement (16.1%; 5 persons, including 3F, 2M) (**Table 21**).

List of comments, remarks and suggestions included in the questionnaires:

Pillar I – ETHICS, INTEGRITY, GENDER AND OPEN SCIENCE

Ethics and integrity: 1) I don't know whether a designated person has been appointed – if so, I don't know who it is. As regards the ethics of conducted research, etc. – no comments.

Freedom of scientific research: 1) I am very glad that the Director covers the open access fees for scientific articles resulting from completed projects. The system of bonuses for publications is very motivating and the same for everyone.

Open science: 1) There are a great number of ideas concerning the popularisation of the results of our research; everything is prepared and carefully thought through by the Director, and clearly explained. Many of these ideas are really excellent, especially meetings with foresters, conferences, films and the Monday online lectures.

Gender equality: 1) Women constitute a majority at the Institute; 2) There are no problems in relations between the Directors and employees. Everyone is treated equally. Relations between employees are slightly worse, unpleasant behaviour occasionally occurs. I do not appreciate the behaviour of (here the name and surname of an employee were provided), who can strongly criticise the Institute's researchers and the Directors. However, this is marginal, because generally people are very kind. I experienced two difficult situations at the Institute and the Director resolved them immediately, after which the issue calmed down.

Embracing diversity: 1) At the Institute there are widely known signals concerning unequal treatment of employees, manifested, among other things, in obstacles to promotion, limited possibility of being employed in adequate positions and the lack of remuneration corresponding to qualifications and the actual contribution to the entity's activities. Such practices are humiliating and demotivating for employees. In my opinion, decisions in these areas are too often not based on clear and measurable criteria or on a transparent and objective assessment of activities and achievements. It is necessary to introduce transparent rules, documented justifications for personnel decisions and effective appeal mechanisms.

Free circulation of researchers 1) I strongly recommend (obviously depending on funding availability) that an abroad internship of at least 3 months should become mandatory as part of every doctoral student programme. This practice is already established in many other EU countries and it is fundamental for empowering the research skills of young researchers; **2)** I am very pleased that the Director helps to finance participation in conferences and covers both domestic and international travel. It was an excellent decision to finance participation for all interested persons in the Polish Botanical Society congress in Katowice. Thanks to this, it was possible to establish many important contacts.

Sustainability of research: 1) Employees have not been informed of the existence of the MSCA Green Charter, let alone trained in the areas and principles contained in it; 2) training – yes, but nothing else.

Pillar II – RESEARCHERS ASSESSMENT, RECRUITMENT AND PROGRESSION

Researchers' assessment: 1) 100% The assessment of employees by the Scientific Council is very clear and the requirements are very transparent. There are clear assessment criteria for individual scientific positions. Open competitions are a very good solution because the best candidate wins. The Directors respect not only professors but also younger post-doctoral researchers. The system of bonuses for achievements is very clear. The Director appreciates every form of engagement in work and grants special bonuses for commitment. I know people in other institutes and there are no bonuses there for publications or other activities, whereas at our Institute they have existed for many years. The Director always manages to find funds for them, although sometimes he says that they may not always be available;
2) In practice, decisions concerning the employment possibilities in particular positions are discretionary and the decision is up to the Director, with the lack of transparent rules. It is necessary to implement a transparent process; 3) It's possible that there are bonuses, but I am not aware of the procedures on the basis of which awards are granted; 4) There are no procedures or regulations on how to recognise substantive contributions and grant awards.

Recruitment: 1) Competitions are very clear and the criteria have remained the same for many years. Competitions are fair – if the criteria are not met, there is no chance that the committee will recommend employment. The composition of committees varies, but the Deputy Directors are always responsible for the work of the committees. I don't know whether information about strengths and weaknesses is sent to candidates; I have only heard that this should be done; it could probably be checked with the HR department; 2) at the Institute there is a serious problem of inconsistency between qualifications and positions held. It happens that persons with the Professor title are employed as Assistant Professors, even though they actively obtain funding for the Institute in the form of grants and are engaged in scientific supervision and junior staff he development. Such a practice may be perceived as unequal treatment and does not have a convincing substantive justification. In my opinion, this requires urgent clarification, the unification of rules and the introduction of transparent criteria for assigning positions and promotions;

3) There are no regulations with clearly specified requirements for particular positions.

Selection: 1) It's true. The Director appoints the members of the committee; there are people with different educational backgrounds and at different stages of their professional careers, as well as various genders. Self-presentation reports prepared by candidates for scientific positions provide an opportunity to present all their scientific achievements. The committee asks sensible questions; in my case the atmosphere was very pleasant, although I was nervous; 2) Unfortunately, there are practices that may be regarded as discriminatory or leading to unequal treatment. I expect the Directors to undertake determined corrective and preventive measures and to ensure real accountability and standards in this area.
Career progression: 1) As mentioned above – there is a lack of transparency in professional promotions. Currently there are no clear, widely communicated criteria for career advancement, which may give rise to a sense of injustice and reduce motivation. 2) As far as science popularisation is concerned, only the first author is taken into account.

PILLAR 3 - WORKING CONDITIONS AND PRACTICES

Working conditions: 1) I observe significant improvement in this area; 2) Doctoral students are neglected. They do not have access to most of the benefits available to doctoral students in other institutes; 3) Working conditions are very stable. Employment contracts are offered and fairly quickly they become permanent contracts. The Director appreciates employees' commitment. If he has doubts, he clarifies everything. Salaries are not high because this is the situation within the Polish Academy of Sciences, but they are higher than those of my acquaintances in the same positions. In addition, there are various bonuses for publications and special bonuses. The Director has explained several times how our salaries are figured out and calculated.

Salary supplements may also be obtained from grants; the Institute does not take this money, and I know that in other institutes the situation is sometimes different – often grant funds are simply used to finance basic salaries. This is not the case here. There are fixed working hours, but there are no problems changing them. Task-based work is an excellent idea; the Director agrees to it without difficulty, although he checks what has been done during that time, and if something is not satisfactory, he does not agree again. The Director often discusses current matters at meetings with all researchers, not only at meetings of heads of units; 4) Recently many positive changes have been introduced, including the possibility of task-based work, which has clearly improved working conditions; 5) I don't know what body is referred to in the last sentence; 6) There is no "body" composed of representatives of researchers at all stages of their careers.

Stability of employment: 1) Conditions are very stable and employment contracts are provided;

2) The Director's efforts to obtain additional funding for the Institute from the Ministry should be appreciated.
At the same time, a visible challenge remains in the area of personnel policy and the retention of key researchers. Recently several very good researchers have left the Institute and are successfully obtaining and implementing grants in other entities. In the context of the limited number of persons at the Institute who have the experience and competence necessary to successfully apply for grants, this phenomenon may weaken the development potential of the Institute. It is also worth noting the need to strengthen genuine engagement in grant-related activities among the entire staff, including those holding the best-paid positions, so that the undertaken activities translate into measurable results rather than merely symbolic actions.

Contractual and legal obligations: 1) Our occupational health and safety officer is extremely thorough and never overlooks anything. No one has ever required me to work in conditions that could be dangerous. When problems are reported, the administration deals with the matter immediately; 2) I have no knowledge of the possibility of creating backup copies of data at the Institute level.

Dissemination and exploitation of results: 1) Such regulations exist and recently we had to confirm that we were familiar with them and had read them.

Pillar 4 – RESEARCH CAREERS AND TALENT DEVELOPMENT

Career development and advice: 1) Recently, the Director has been organising many training sessions, which are very helpful. The best ones concerned workplace bullying and communication, as well as

artificial intelligence; 2) The Institute provides opportunities for training; however, I do not know anything about forms of career guidance beyond the standard scientific career path; 3) I have never been advised regarding my career development.

Continuous professional development: 1) There are many such training opportunities. At work it is also possible to participate in other free training courses that are not organised by the Institute, and this can be done during working hours without any problem.

Scientific supervision and mentoring: 1) Such a person is the supervisor (or former supervisor) or the head of the department. There is no problem in seeking assistance from other persons as well. One can learn a great deal from experienced researchers at the Institute. If any problem arises, it is also possible to approach the Director or the Deputy Directors directly and they are willing to help.

Pillar I – ETHICS, INTEGRITY, GENDER AND OPEN SCIENCE

Table 2. Statement 1: Ethics and research integrity:

Age and position	Up to 35							35+							Total
	doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		
Gender	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	
I definitely agree	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	2	0	0	17
I almost but not fully agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	1	0	9
I don't know	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	4
I do not agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	**1**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**8**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**31**

Table 3. Statement 2: Freedom of scientific research:

Age and position	Up to 35							35+							Total
	doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		
Gender	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	
I definitely agree	1	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	8	6	2	1	0	23
I almost but not fully agree	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	7
I don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
I do not agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**1**
Total	**1**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**8**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**31**

Table 4. Statement 3: Open science

Age and position	Up to 35							35+							Total
	doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		
Gender	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	
I definitely agree	1	0	4	1	1	0	1	0	0	10	8	3	1	0	30
I almost but not fully agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
I don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
I do not agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	**1**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**8**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**31**

Table 5. Statement 4: Gender equality

Age and position	Up to 35							35+							Total
	doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		
Gender	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	
I definitely agree	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	8	6	2	1	0	20
I almost but not fully agree	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	10
I don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
I do not agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	**1**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**8**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**31**

Table 6. Statement 5: Embracing diversity

Age and position	Up to 35							35+							Total
	doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		
Gender	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	
I definitely agree	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	7	4	3	1	0	18
I almost but not fully agree	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	10
I don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
I do not agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	**1**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**8**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**31**

Table 7. Statement 6: Researchers, including professional attitude and accountability

Age and position	Up to 35							35+							Total
	doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		
Gender	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	
I definitely agree	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	3	0	0	17
I almost but not fully agree	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	1	0	10
I don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
I do not agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Total	**1**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**8**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**31**

Table 8. Statement 7: Free circulation of researchers

Age and position	Up to 35							35+							Total
	doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		
Gender	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	
I definitely agree	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	7	4	2	1	0	17
I almost but not fully agree	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	10
I don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3
I do not agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	**1**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**8**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**31**

Table 9. Statement 8: Sustainability of research

Age and position	Up to 35							35+							Total
	doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		
Gender	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	
I definitely agree	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	2	0	0	15
I almost but not fully agree	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	6
I don't know	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	8
I do not agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Total	**1**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**8**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**31**

Table 10. Statement 9: Researchers' assessment:

Age and position	Up to 35							35+							Total
	doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		
Gender	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	
I definitely agree	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	2	1	0	18
I almost but not fully agree	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	6
I don't know	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
I do not agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
Total	**1**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**7**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**30**

Table 11. Statement 10: Recruitment, including deviations from the chronological order of CVs and professional experience

Age and position	Up to 35							35+							Total
	doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		
Gender	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	
I definitely agree	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	7	4	2	1	0	20
I almost but not fully agree	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	6
I don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
I do not agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
Total	**1**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**8**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**31**

Table 12. Statement 11: Selection, including non-discrimination

Age and position	Up to 35							35+							Total
	doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		
Gender	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	
I definitely agree	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5	3	1	0	**21**
I almost but not fully agree	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	6
I don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
I do not agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Total	**1**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**8**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**31**

Table 13. Statement 12: Career progression, including co-authorship and the recognition of mobility experience

Age and position	Up to 35							35+							Total
	doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		
Gender	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	
I definitely agree	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	0	0	14
I almost but not fully agree	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	0	0	10
I don't know	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	4
I do not agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Total	**1**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**8**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**30**

PILLAR 3 - WORKING CONDITIONS AND PRACTICES

Table 14. Statement 13: Working conditions, funding and salaries

Age and position	Up to 35							35+							Total
	doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		
Gender	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	
I definitely agree	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	2	1	0	16
I almost but not fully agree	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	13
I don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
I do not agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	**1**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**8**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**31**

Table 15. Statement 14: Stability of employment:

Age and position	Up to 35							35+							Total
	doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		
Gender	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	
I definitely agree	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	2	1	0	18
I almost but not fully agree	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	8
I don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
I do not agree	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Total	**1**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**8**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**31**

Table 16. Statement 15: Contractual and legal obligations

Age and position	Up to 35							35+							Total
	doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		
Gender	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	
I definitely agree	1	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	7	4	3	0	0	21
I almost but not fully agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	1	0	6
I don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
I do not agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	**1**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**8**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**31**

Table 17. Statement 16: Dissemination and exploitation of results and also intellectual assets including intellectual property rights and public engagement

Age and position	Up to 35							35+							Total
	doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		
Gender	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	
I definitely agree	1	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	2	1	0	22
I almost but not fully agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
I don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	4
I do not agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	**1**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**10**	**8**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**30**

Table 18. Statement 17: Valuing diverse research

Age and position	Up to 35							35+							Total
	doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		
Gender	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	
I definitely agree	1	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	0	0	16
I almost but not fully agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	4
I don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	3	1	1	0	10
I do not agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	**1**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**8**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**31**

Table 19. Statement 18: Career development and advice

Age and position	Up to 35							35+							Total
	doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		
Gender	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	
I definitely agree	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	1	0	8
I almost but not fully agree	1	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	2	0	0	19
I don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
I do not agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	3
Total	**1**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**8**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**31**

Table 20. Statement 19: Continuous professional development, such as access to research training and continuous development

Age and position	up to 35							35+							Total
	doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		
Gender	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	
I definitely agree	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	0	1	0	15
I almost but not fully agree	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	0	0	12
I don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
I do not agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Total	**1**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**8**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**31**

Table 21. Statement 20: Supervision and mentoring, including relations with supervisors, and senior researchers support

Age and position	Up to 35							35+							Total
	doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		doctoral student position		research position			engineering position		
Gender	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	F	M	F	M	NP	F	M	
I definitely agree	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	1	0	11
I almost but not fully agree	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	8
I don't know	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	7
I do not agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	5
Total	**1**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**8**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**31**