

# Training of complementary skills - Results

These are the results from 299 submissions

last submission: Thursday, December 4, 2003 - 09:40

Numbers in brackets represent the count for the given answer.

A correlation analysis of the survey can be found [here](#).

If you have further comments on the survey or the topics that the survey is related to, you are welcome to post them at the MCFA Discussion forum: <http://www.mariecurie.org/discus>. If you prefer to directly contact the survey authors, simply send an email to [survey@mariecurie.org](mailto:survey@mariecurie.org).

[back to the main survey page](#)

<b>1. Would you like to receive continued professional training i.e. training in complementary skills ?</b>	<b>Yes</b> (267 - 89%) <b>No</b> (12 - 4%) <b>Indifferent</b> (20 - 6%)
<b>2. Which of the following areas for skill development would you consider important or useful for you?, please give each response a number, from 1 (not important), to 5 (very important)</b>	
2.1 Legal issues related to research e.g. consortium agreements	<b>1</b> (38 - 12%) <b>2</b> (71 - 23%) <b>3</b> (97 - 32%) <b>4</b> (62 - 20%) <b>5</b> (31 - 10%) average: 2.9
2.2 Intellectual property	<b>1</b> (22 - 7%) <b>2</b> (52 - 17%) <b>3</b> (82 - 27%) <b>4</b> (75 - 25%) <b>5</b> (68 - 22%) average: 3.4
2.3 Business administration	<b>1</b> (38 - 12%) <b>2</b> (64 - 21%) <b>3</b> (80 - 26%)

	<b>4</b> (81 - 27%) <b>5</b> (36 - 12%) average: 3.0
2.4 Financial management	<b>1</b> (25 - 8%) <b>2</b> (49 - 16%) <b>3</b> (89 - 29%) <b>4</b> (86 - 28%) <b>5</b> (50 - 16%) average: 3.3
2.5 Scientific budget calculation	<b>1</b> (15 - 5%) <b>2</b> (22 - 7%) <b>3</b> (74 - 24%) <b>4</b> (98 - 32%) <b>5</b> (90 - 30%) average: 3.8
2.6 Communication with the public	<b>1</b> (9 - 3%) <b>2</b> (26 - 8%) <b>3</b> (63 - 21%) <b>4</b> (88 - 29%) <b>5</b> (113 - 37%) average: 3.9
2.7 Negotiation skills	<b>1</b> (12 - 4%) <b>2</b> (28 - 9%) <b>3</b> (64 - 21%) <b>4</b> (105 - 35%) <b>5</b> (90 - 30%) average: 3.8
2.8 Language	<b>1</b> (23 - 7%) <b>2</b> (33 - 11%) <b>3</b> (53 - 17%) <b>4</b> (88 - 29%) <b>5</b> (102 - 34%) average: 3.7
2.9 Scientific (outside of your present domain)	<b>1</b> (11 - 3%) <b>2</b> (36 - 12%) <b>3</b> (76 - 25%) <b>4</b> (101 - 33%) <b>5</b> (75 - 25%) average: 3.6
2.10 Resource Management (personnel and infrastructure)	<b>1</b> (15 - 5%) <b>2</b> (32 - 10%) <b>3</b> (94 - 31%) <b>4</b> (97 - 32%) <b>5</b> (61 - 20%)

	average: 3.5
2.11 Project management	<b>1</b> (7 - 2%) <b>2</b> (13 - 4%) <b>3</b> (44 - 14%) <b>4</b> (95 - 31%) <b>5</b> (140 - 46%) average: 4.2
2.12 Fundraising	<b>1</b> (14 - 4%) <b>2</b> (30 - 10%) <b>3</b> (45 - 15%) <b>4</b> (81 - 27%) <b>5</b> (129 - 43%) average: 3.9
2.13 Marketing	<b>1</b> (51 - 17%) <b>2</b> (67 - 22%) <b>3</b> (84 - 28%) <b>4</b> (69 - 23%) <b>5</b> (28 - 9%) average: 2.9
2.14 Time management	<b>1</b> (34 - 11%) <b>2</b> (58 - 19%) <b>3</b> (68 - 22%) <b>4</b> (82 - 27%) <b>5</b> (57 - 19%) average: 3.2
2.15 Proposal writing	<b>1</b> (13 - 4%) <b>2</b> (20 - 6%) <b>3</b> (38 - 12%) <b>4</b> (74 - 24%) <b>5</b> (154 - 51%) average: 4.1
2.16 Scientific communication	<b>1</b> (11 - 3%) <b>2</b> (28 - 9%) <b>3</b> (31 - 10%) <b>4</b> (85 - 28%) <b>5</b> (144 - 48%) average: 4.1
<b>3. Do you think such extra-training would make yourself as a candidate for a job more attractive?</b>	<b>Yes</b> (248 - 82%) <b>No</b> (23 - 7%) <b>Indifferent</b> (28 - 9%)

#### 4. What other skill training would you consider important?

-

Pedagogic skills

Computing systems use.

IT-Skills (Writing, Programming, Application Design)

copyright, web etc.

technical writing

For international cooperation it is very important to learn about the features of the other countries, so a training in different ways to do science in different countries will be also very interesting

Programming Computers

I consider a 'must' to give back to the whole community the science we got, obviously in a more popular way. This is well connected with the fact that Science is, in general, poorly and wrongly expressed in most of the media, newspapers the most. We should try, also from the Marie Curie Association, to make a link to the media to improve science communication. And this also means that we, as scientists, need to improve our skills in communicating to the public our investigations.

certain specific computer skills consultancy

new technologies

Team working

Training in techniques inside of our present domain.

I am not able to add some other skill, because these 16 skill exhaust in my opinion all possibilities.

Project management training on relevant new technology (measurement techniques, software, coding language like C++)

IT (computer networks, databases)

Networking

e-training CV writing

Reflexion on science and society

How to guide personell. I susppose that's part of management training communicational skills (as beeing part of motivating colleagues and avoiding troubles among colleagues, not such much to give persentations)

Leading a productive team

Information on different cultural points of view. It will be important to understand how other scientifics from foreing countries work to improve team work and networking in the European Research Area and with other countries.

Writing of scientific publications

Global skills - cross-culture training - how to work well with people from different cultures. See [www.globesmart.net](http://www.globesmart.net) for an example.

Teaching skills

Presentation Skills Working with difficult people

team spirit

Presentations and IT

communication with journalists show to conduct interview to hire people how to organize a conference

practical personnel management

Data analysis in general, maybe together with computing skills.

Better computer use. Teaching skills. Group working skills.

people management, leadership

For me teacher trainig skills would be very helpful as my academic career has been spent entirely in research so I am at a disadvantage when applying for lecturing positions, thus I can't get the teaching experience I need, Catch 22!

Communication to the public in science issues such as genetically modified food or stem cell research is crucial. Computing applied to life science.

Public understanding of Science Science Teaching

I would also consider teaching skills important. This could perhaps be tied in with scientific communication

Presentation skills Leadership skills

Group leading abilities

Technical skills (e.g. plant identification, nature conservation, etc)

Critical reading

Pedagogic training (teaching)

Personal management

motivation training and communication skills development

It is difficult to add new skills since most of the important ones are already considered

conflict training, goal orientated project planning, knowledge of tools for project planning and monitoring, time management

creative scientific writing, creative development of project concepts

Bioinformatics

Pedagogic skills

Adaptability! World is changing people should be able to adapt if proposed changes lead to improvements.

team working teaching

For me, the most important skills to develop as an active scientist in fundamental research is fund raising and proposal writing, as well as the ability to present our research to the general public. Both of these subjects are not taught in current Master or PhD programs for pure scientists.

communication with industry people (transfer of knowledge)

Psychology (especially about human interactions in a professional environment).

Computer skill training

training to improve social abilities which are needed for higher positions, e.g. group leaders; course could be held e.g. by a psychologist

intercultural communication  
how to have successful meetings  
NLPL  
leadership skill development

'networking' skills  
presentation skills

Team working

statistics and econometrics for applied economics

general, verbal and non-verbal communication training  
commercial training

Computer system management, software would be very important.

New scientific techniques in my domain.

bureaucratic procedures

Computer training

Project management training. Writing of scientific publication.

Team leading and conflict solving, computer skills.

cross-sectoral cooperation, environmental issues, environmentally-sound technologies

**5. What would you consider to be the best way to acquire these skills?**

**e-learning** (17 - 5%)  
**Training by employer** (53 - 17%)  
**Dedicated training workshops** (180 - 60%)  
**Mentor controlled discussion forums** (12 -

4%)  
**Guides written by experienced professionals (30 - 10%)**  
**none of the above (3 - 1%)**

## 6. If you would like to make any other comments please use the space below.

also guides written by experienced professionals are good ways to acquire skills as these can be read whenever there is time

My main problem would be to find the time to attend to these training workshop... (which are probably the most effective way to learn).

There is no single "best way" to acquire the above skills. The best approach depends on the specific skill both in the teaching method and whether they should be supplied by the employer or pursued individually. Also the relative importance of the above skills differs according to the stage in the persons career.

this in combination with guides written by experienced professionals or e-learning

Ad Q5: "the best way" depends, in my opinion, on the content: legal stuff could well be taught through e-learning or written guides while, for project & time management, communication, etc., dedicated training workshops seem the best - if not the only - suitable way for me.

Dedicated training workshops, discussions forums and guides written by experienced professionals would also be helpful. Practical training is probably the best in most of these matters.

I have been 5 years in chemical industry now. Therefore the answer given above are retrospectively.

I can only conclude in this way; MCIF gives a big opportunities of development for a young scientists. In my case MCIF made during two years from a young Polish scientist, who spoke good only in Polish and Russian, a self-assured European scientist.

My employer (DLR - German Aerospace Center) offers all kind of training for free, however the candidate has a dense scheduled project and nearly no time to pursue any training

Most of the points above may be counted with "continuing education"; however (most) Universities (i.e. where the majority of the Marie Curie fellows work) offer extremely little support/opportunities for such continuing education and lab-directors only want to see their research done. Circulating guides written by experienced specialists would be the best way to sensitize post-docs, however the real learning experience comes (in my opinion) best through workshops.

This survey is clear and straightforward. Well done. Perhaps it is useful to have links to 'explanation' windows, that give a short definition of the term (e.g. in what way is 'business management' so different from 'project management'.

The skills for personnel management seems to me the most critical to learn from an independent source than our employer.

E-learning is the "easiest" way, but workshops and guides written by experienced professionals would be the most effective ways.

I think that these workshops could be organised similar to the San Sebastian Workshop of November 2002, a mixture of lectures by invited experts with workshops involving all participants.

I think academia has much to learn from the business world, where there is a far greater emphasis on career and personal development. What you learn in research is often on an ad hoc basis, often dependent on being in a research team with highly skilled individuals who take the time to teach and mentor you.

Training is always usefull regardless previous experience and age.However time is a major obstacle for continuing training.

I think a mixture of e-learning, training by employer and dedicated training workshops would be fine, or even better than leaving everything to dedicated training workshops (several of them would be needed). In any case, at least guides written by experienced professionals, and availabletrhough the internet, should exist. Better something, than nothing at all.

A combination of training workshops with good written support (guides from the teachers), both funded by either the employer or the funding body would be the best.

if I say one point is unimportant, then I mean it is not necessary to make a course about the subject. Mostly, you will learn about these subjects on an individual basis at your university or by instructions of your grant giving association.

The biggest problem in our way is that we can not do research activities at the same level, after finish the PhD. I believe in a future World where the research will have a leading part.

I reckon several of the method above can be useful and complementary, for instance "training by employer" and "dedicated training workshops"

In no 5 above, I think that given the large amount of work that i currently have, it would be very interesting to have a combination of the above, and definitely be able to find reliable information on the internet.