



## Independent project support by Riksbankens Jubileumsfond

Agnete Vabø, Inge Ramberg and  
Rachel Sweetman

Report 27/2012

**NIFU**



# Independent project support by Riksbankens Jubileumsfond

Agnete Vabø, Inge Ramberg and  
Rachel Sweetman

Report 27/2012

Report 27/2012

Published by Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education (NIFU)  
Address PB 5183 Majorstuen, NO-0302 Oslo.

Commissioner Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (RJ)  
Address Kungsträdgårdsg. 18, Stockholm, Sweden,

Print Link Grafisk

ISBN 978-82-7218-856-5  
ISSN 1892-2597

[www.nifu.no](http://www.nifu.no)

---

# Preface

RJ contacted NIFU in the autumn of 2011 because they wanted to study the positive and negative effects of one of their financial instruments, namely, project support grants. In conducting this study, NIFU has surveyed both successful and unsuccessful applicants for project support in the years 2005-2010. In dialogue with RJ, NIFU developed a design that draws on comparative analysis of a similar instrument under the auspices of the Research Council of Norway.

The survey was conducted and the report written by NIFU researchers Agnete Vabø (project manager) and Inge Ramberg, with the assistance of Rachel Sweetman. Thanks to Chris Allinson for proofreading the report.

We are grateful to the many respondents who contributed to this study and who took the time to share their experiences and insights with us.

Oslo, June 2012

Sveinung Skule  
Director

Liv Langfeldt  
Head of Research



# Contents

<b>Summary of key findings .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>13</b>
1.1 Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (RJ) and the RJ project support – Background to the study .....	13
1.2 The evaluation task, data sources and methods.....	14
<b>2 Application success rates and RJ project characteristics .....</b>	<b>17</b>
2.1 Application success rates – analysis of application data.....	17
2.2 Researcher recruitment and established vs. younger researchers.....	19
2.3 Gender issues.....	20
2.4 RJ project characteristics .....	22
<b>3 Added value, research structure and strategic focus of RJ project scheme ....</b>	<b>25</b>
3.1 Introduction .....	25
3.2 Impact on structure and strategic focus.....	26
3.3 RJ project grant objectives, institutional strategies and distribution of roles .....	30
3.4 Complementarity and task division .....	31
3.5 Significance compared to other schemes .....	33
<b>4 RJ programme organisation and review procedures.....</b>	<b>36</b>
4.1 The organisation of the review process .....	36
4.2 Applicants' views.....	37
4.3 Feedback to applicants and the applicants' perceptions of the process .....	38
4.3.1 Differing patterns of response between humanities and social science respondents .....	40
4.3.2 Review procedures – qualitative statements of respondents .....	41
<b>References .....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Appendix 1 Tables.....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Appendix 2 Questionnaire to RJ project applicants.....</b>	<b>67</b>





# Summary of key findings

The Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (RJ) is an independent foundation, established in the late 1960s via a large donation from the Riksbanken (the Swedish Central Bank), which was later supplemented by donations from the Riksdag (Swedish government). Its goal is supporting research in the Humanities and social sciences and thereby supporting an important national objective. The fund provides different kinds of support for a range of research activities, the most common and substantial approach being its project support activities.

This study addresses the project support scheme of the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond. In conducting this study, NIFU has surveyed both successful and unsuccessful applicants for project support in the years 2005-2010, and the study takes a broad overview of the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond's activities and approach, including application and evaluation processes, strategy, communication, and instruments to evaluate the quality of projects.

A total of 397 responses are included in our dataset. This gives a response rate of 63.5 per cent based on the gross population size of 625 invitations.

The study gathers evidence about the significance of this funding scheme. It also provides information on international research collaboration and the development of interdisciplinary fields. Finally the value of the fund in comparison to other national and international research funding sources is considered.

At a time when more and more resources are being directed towards research, it is important to explore the positive and negative effects of instruments and forms of finance used to support and encourage research activity. Many major applications for research do not deliver clear outcomes which can be documented in scientific publications, and the extent to which an application and project 'pays off' may only be obvious in the long term. This report is therefore relevant to, and should be of interest to, groups outside of the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, not least to universities and colleges as main recipients of such funding. The study also raises the importance of the distinctive features of the Swedish model for funding of research, that there is not only one, but several key funders of research, in both private and public sector.

## Key findings

### Academic demography

- The Riksbankens Jubileumsfond receives a very high number of applications every year from the core disciplines and areas in humanities and social sciences, with particularly high numbers of applicants from economics, politics, sociology, and also from psychology and literature.
- Application and success rates vary across the disciplines and subfields. Those with the highest success rates are statistics, peace and conflict research, and economics. It is interesting to note the high application rates, and relatively high success rates of economics-based applications, as this subject has tended to stand out as being widely seen as a 'harder' social science, and one which has proved more influential in policy making in many cases. Beyond this, the RJ must ask whether it is desirable that some subjects appear to have a much greater impact than others. The question of the introduction of some criteria that provide a broader humanistic and social scientific scope could be discussed in RJ's Board.
- In terms of gender we find that Riksbankens Jubileumsfond has a relatively low proportion of female applicants and that the female researchers applying have a slightly lower success rate than their male counterparts. However, it may be these gender differences are driven by indirect patterns in applicants' disciplinary background and seniority. There are fewer senior female applicants, although the proportion of women with a PhD has improved in many social science and humanities subjects, female researchers still become scarcer at higher levels, meaning there is a smaller pool of potential senior applicants for funds such as the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond. The higher success rate of traditionally male-dominated disciplines (economics and statistics) compared to more feminised subjects of sociology and education may also contribute to this gender difference among successful applicants. In Sweden, considerable effort has been put into encouraging more women to pursue PhDs and research careers, so this may be an area which deserves further attention from the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, to clarify how these gender differences in funding patterns come about, and their links to other differences in applications.
- Such patterns of academic demography among applicants resist any single, definitive explanation; RJ has made efforts to reflect on the practices of peer review and assessment used in selecting applicants.

### Riksbankens Jubileumsfond project characteristics

- A substantial proportion of successful applicants report that, compared to their other projects, Riksbankens Jubileumsfond-funded research is more oriented to basic research, of higher scientific quality, and provides more scientific results; this feedback from applicants suggests the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond is meeting certain key objectives to a reasonable degree. It also seems that Riksbankens Jubileumsfond applications tend to be more multi-disciplinary and internationally oriented than the other R&D projects of applicants. The more interdisciplinary and internationally oriented applications to the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond are, the more likely they are to succeed and be funded. It seems that Riksbankens Jubileumsfond support is improving the opportunities for more international collaboration to some degree at least. However, there appears to be room for the fund to have an even greater impact in this area, as the majority of respondents see the differences between their Riksbankens Jubileumsfond-funded projects and other projects as being quite small.

## Added value of project funding from the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond

- The project support scheme offers an opportunity for academics to create a unique research project. Our study finds considerable support for applicants having very high ambitions for the projects proposed under the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond scheme. A majority of the respondents filing a full project application fully or partly agree that the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond project scheme has had a positive impact on their research career, in that it has: led to unexpected results of great importance to their research field; allowed areas of significant importance for their future research to be explored; and, that their research and innovation management skills have been improved. Participants believe the scheme has had a substantial impact on their own careers and skills, and on their research agendas. There is also some suggestion in the findings that Riksbankens Jubileumsfond funding may give rise to a Matthew effect, with successful applicants gaining a boost in their career that often releases further funds.
- However, according to the survey data, the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond's wider impact at departmental or institutional level is considerably weaker than its impact on researchers involved in the projects. This finding should be considered in light of the methods; as those researchers surveyed may be much aware of, and place more emphasis on, the impacts on their own careers and work than these 'spillover' impacts. Riksbankens Jubileumsfond funding does not seem to have a significant impact on departments' ability to prioritise new research areas, or departments' opportunities to attract new research talent. The interface between Riksbankens Jubileumsfond independent projects and developments in departments that host Riksbankens Jubileumsfond-funded projects seems to be quite weak. While this may not hinder the specific projects funded by the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, it may reduce its potential to create added value in the wider research communities. It is also possible that this limited impact on wider departments may be rooted in the nature of humanities and the social sciences research practices. While natural science departments tend to share broad problem areas, data sources, infrastructure and a common paradigmatic approach, the traditions in the humanities in social science are much more individualistic and idiosyncratic – this may also explain the limited success in these fields of science of targeted strategies aimed at improving research organisations' collaboration. But as institutions in higher education put more emphasis on strategic organisation of research, RJ might consider how to contribute to improve the interaction between external funding systems and the research environments of the universities and colleges.
- Applicants generally feel that the grants are distributed on the basis of concerns in line with the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond's objectives, and in line with fairly traditional notions of research activity. High scientific quality is thought to be the most important purpose underpinning the grants, followed by scientific renewal and the development of basic theory and methods. The international and interdisciplinary purposes are seen as important by a majority, but are not accentuated as strongly. Research recruitment seems to be the least well recognised purpose of the funds which might, to a certain extent, reflect the RJ decision not to fund PhD education, considering this to be the responsibility of the state.
- One aim of the fund is to support projects which might otherwise have limited alternative funding sources. A narrow majority agree fully or partly that Riksbankens Jubileumsfond funding complements other funding, in terms of the kinds of activities it supports. However, high proportions of respondents offer unequivocal responses to issues about the objectives of the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond fund, and other funds; this appears to reflect widespread uncertainties about the intentions and priorities underpinning research funding schemes. This uncertainty suggests the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond could attempt to articulate more clearly its particular role and focus in contrast to other schemes.

- Applicants indicate that project funding's significance is thought to be about the same or higher than other Swedish funding sources, and project funds are seen as particularly advantageous in terms of opportunities for doing unique/original research, and in the amount of funding the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond provides. However, when asked to compare the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond funding to other international sources, respondents typically 'cannot say' how these sources of support compare; again, this underlines the apparent low level of awareness about the role and aims of various funding schemes among researchers in these fields.

### Organisation and review procedures for project funds

- Attitudes towards the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond's review policies and processes are reasonably positive, although as might be expected, successful candidates are much more positive about the scheme's ability to select promising solid and original research than those who were not funded. Overall, a majority think the scheme supports well founded and solid research, or the most promising and important research to some degree. However, only a minority believe that the project scheme supports *high-risk research*, with most respondents unclear on the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond's role on this point. The largest proportion cannot say if the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond supports such projects.
- Regarding the access to relevant background information for the calls, the respondents seem very satisfied, a majority of those receiving funding also gave a positive evaluation of the *competence of external experts*, while those who did not received funding were less positive. The respondents give the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond a weaker assessment concerning transparency in funding decisions – the successful applicants gave more positive feedback on whether their reviewers were able to assess all the fields of research involved in the application, but those who were not funded are much more likely to doubt this.
- When it comes to such scepticism about the fairness and rigour of evaluation systems, there is no obvious, optimal solution for peer review systems – however, such a discrepancy in satisfaction between those who have, and those who have not succeeded is unfortunate. The Riksbankens Jubileumsfond might consider if there is anything more they can do to address such concerns, for example using more international expert panels and better elaborated standards offering more transparency.
- At a time when there is great emphasis on competitive research funding via such programmes, the low success rate may highlight a challenge; applicants are clearly investing considerable time and resources in unsuccessful applications. To avoid problems developing, Riksbankens Jubileumsfond might wish to consider improvements to certain aspects of the application process to ensure to maintain the trust of clients.

### The project funds compared to other funding schemes

- The approach used in this study of the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond has considerable overlap with a similar, recent study of *the Norwegian research funding schemes FRIPRO*. The broader research funding context in the two countries differs somewhat: Sweden has several key research funding organisations, creating more of a market situation for funding, while the Research Council of Norway dominates the Norwegian setting. The similar research questions, and overlaps in the aims of these schemes, provide a valuable comparison for the Riksbankens Jubileumsfunds performance.
- The response patterns found in the FRIPRO survey and the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond evaluation have many similarities. There are certain differences in the *demography of applicants*, as FRIRPO places more emphasis on attracting *PhD level applicants*, has a higher share of female applicants, and a better response rate for female applicants.

- Comparing the objectives of the applicants to Riksbankens Jubileumsfond with those of the FRIPRO applicants within social sciences and humanities, we find the latter to be significantly more oriented towards research recruitment and international cooperation. This reflects the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond's policy not to support doctoral work, and the Research Council of Norway's policy for pursuing international research collaboration more strongly.
- The comparison presents a positive picture for the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond in terms of the quality of information about funding schemes; Riksbankens Jubileumsfond applicants' higher satisfaction compared to FRIPRO applicants may, however, be due to the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond being a smaller organisation with a narrower scope. By focusing on the fields of humanities and social sciences it may be it is easier to keep information clear and targeted.

### **Key implications**

- All in all, we do not find clear empirical evidence that would either justify substantial changes in the project scheme, or suggest major changes are needed for this form of research support. Approaches to research funding can take many forms, and as elaborated in this report ,various approaches all have associated pros and cons. The current model works well in its own terms, and further decisions about changes in RJ's funding are therefore more a matter of strategic priorities.
- According to respondents the RJ three-year project grants do have many pros and the cons are thought to be quite limited. It appears it is functioning effectively, in regards to multidisciplinary work and scientific quality. The areas of relative weakness or challenges involve: internationalisation; clearer links between institutional strategies and RJ funding; continued attention to the recruitment of more younger/early career researchers; and more transparency and communication about the links and overlaps between RJ funding and other funding sources.
- Observations on the current system, not least through the applicants' definitions of challenges, therefore suggest areas where the RJ could steer decision making in future. But these would involve broader re-orientation of the fund's approach and desired impact. If the RJ wished to consider other approaches, or reprioritise the kinds of research it wishes to support, there are several angles to consider about research funding models:
  - o What position does the RJ want to occupy on the egalitarian/elite spectrum? A fundamental question in research funding is how widely funds are to be distributed across a range of research environments, or in contrast, concentrated to foster a few areas of excellence.
  - o Changes in duration? The three year period targeting younger researchers might be a fairly mainstream or common approach, and following this path may be fairly safe, but it will also limit the extent to which they are funding particular kinds of researchers, or research, rarely funded elsewhere. A five year duration might contribute to greater international potential and impact of RJ projects, allowing more time for complex international networks to develop. A five year duration will however lead to an even more elitist touch since there will be fewer recipients to share the funds.
  - o Changes in funding priorities? Putting more emphasis on the international dimension and quality may require more active use of international panels. However, as the report makes clear, the use of international peer review systems in assessing research proposals can be a resource intensive approach.
  - o The RJ could choose to encourage a more egalitarian approach to support institutions and research environments in Sweden to collaborate more to share data, methodological approaches and research results. This might broaden the influence of

RJ funding beyond leading universities into a wider range of research environments, and across a broader range of institution types. This would mark a shift from a more elitist approach to a more egalitarian approach – which would alter the type of impact and influence achieved by RJ.

- In considering any such changes it is also important to consider that the overall impact of RJ funds, and the kinds of research produced, results not only from the direct activity and policies of the RJ: the fund's approach and impact is framed by the wider research and funding context of Sweden, and increasingly by the international and European context. We have only had a limited opportunity to investigate the wider context and RJ's part in this more complex overall system of research funding. What could be improved or adapted are the contextual factors related to such research projects, including strengthened efforts for international research and collaboration, and clearer communication of the central aims and funding criteria of the RJ funds. Such a focus on increasing the numbers of post doc applicants will also tend to improve the gender balance among applicants, as gender balances are generally more even lower down in the academic hierarchy.
- To take a further step and change strategy in a substantial way, the interplay with the institutions and research environments should be considered carefully, to establish a more detailed and robust understanding of how the various funding bodies and instruments work together and overlap.

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (RJ) and the RJ project support – Background to the study

The Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (RJ) is an independent foundation, established via a large donation from the Riksbanken (the Swedish Central Bank) in the 1960s. Its goal is supporting research in the humanities and social sciences, including law and theology.

This report assesses the contemporary role played by the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (RJ) in research funding, and its broader influence on research activity and the research community.

The RJ offers research support of an 'open' and researcher-defined nature, through programmes, projects, infrastructural projects, and funds for research initiation. This report focuses on the project support scheme, which targets groups of advanced researchers carrying out a joint research project to be performed within a timeframe of three years. Applicants are otherwise free to define problems and design the project as they see fit. RJs annual research grants amount to approximately 350 million Swedish kronor (SEK), with about 100 million allocated annually over a spread of some 45 projects.

The approaches to funding research can take many forms, and appear to be changing over time. As also pointed to in a previous evaluation of Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, research funding is always characterised by several dilemmas, such as between elite and egalitarian funding, integrity and transparency, continuity and flexibility and so forth (Bertilsson et al. 2004). To draw out two simplified extremes, funding can be funded through more egalitarian modes, which aim to spread out funding over a wide range of areas and centres, or, in contrast, more elitist models can seek to concentrate considerable in certain areas or projects. The RJ takes an approach that is more in line with the latter model, in attempting to provide an avenue of support to international calibre, high quality research that would generally have limited alternative funding sources.

In Sweden as in other countries, and at the international level, we witness increasing debate about the effects and meaning of various funding schemes: their impact and importance regarding their influence on research quality, working conditions for researchers and the type of knowledge produced (Ioannidis 2011). There have however been few studies of such forms of support in terms of research outcomes, researcher and institutional profiles and individual careers. Against this backdrop, the RJ wishes to monitor and evaluate the role it plays in contemporary research through project funds. This evaluation focuses in particular on the characteristics of funded projects, the added value created by project funding, and the role of this kind of funding compared to other funding schemes.

Evaluation results that should also be of interest to HE institutions concern the effect research project funding has on institutional dynamics, external financing, and on the processes involved in developing and assessing applications.

Researchers or organisations applying for these kinds of funds will also find insights on the impact made by successful applications, not just on the individual researcher's career but on their wider research communities and institutions.

Finally, the study also offers a comparative perspective, comparing the RJ scheme with the FRIPRO funding scheme in Norway (Langfeldt et al. 2012). By bringing together these two funding schemes, the importance of wider national contexts in determining the impact of research funding is illustrated. The Norwegian case involves a system which operates with one research council (the RCN) in contrast to Sweden where several important organisations allocate research funding, the largest being the public Swedish Research Council, the private foundation SFF Stiftelsen for strategisk forskning, and VINNOVA (the Swedish governmental agency for innovation systems). This gives a different market situation for the FRIPRO and RJ schemes. The comparison of these contrasting cases illustrates how funding bodies and funding schemes roles and impacts are framed and shaped, to a large extent, by the characteristics of the national system to which they belong. This should be of interest for national bodies and research stakeholders shaping such policies.

## 1.2 The evaluation task, data sources and methods

This study is based on survey data collected by NIFU in March and April 2012 combined with documentary evidence from the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (RJ). Survey data from the applicants of independent projects of the Research Council of Norway from the 2012 FRIPRO evaluation study, (Langfeldt et al. 2012) is also applied for the purpose of comparison.

The background material used includes RJ annual reports for the period 2005 to 2010 and descriptions of the application review process and outcomes.

### **Survey of applicants of RJ independent project support**

NIFU conducted a web-based survey of both funded and rejected *RJ project applicants* (those who filed a full sized project application for peer review<sup>1</sup>) in the years 2005 to 2010. The years were selected in order to collect information on the outcome of the projects, as well as being recent enough for the respondents to recall the project application, and be able to reply also for the possible follow-up of rejected applications.

Respondents were asked about their particular RJ project application (listed in the questionnaire), the application/review process, the added value of the project in terms of scientific and other results, additional funding, collaboration/networks and internationalisation, as well as more general questions about the RJ project scheme. Those who had applied for several RJ projects in the 6-year period were asked to account for each of the applications. The questionnaire is found in Appendix 2 while accompanying tables are listed in Appendix 1.

### *Open responses section*

In the open responses section of the survey, the respondents frequently used the opportunity to offer their judgment or feedback about the review procedures of RJ. We have selected responses that illustrate the range of comments and concerns raised; a number of these focus on the process of peer review.

### *Applicant survey response rates*

The applicant web survey was launched on 8 March 2012 for the principal investigators listed in the RJ project applications (the total population in the 2005-2010 period who were invited to submit full

---

<sup>1</sup> In this study we understand peer review of project grant applications as judgements of scientific merit by other scientists working in, or close to the field in question.



application after the first stage application/sketch). Hence, the 625 invitations to participate were sent by email including a unique web-survey link for a total of 582 different applicants. Forty six applicants had submitted two or more applications in the period and received one invitation per application.

A total of three *reminders* were issued for the respondents not submitting a response. The data collection closed on 20 April 2012. A total of 397 responses are included in our dataset. This gives a response rate of 63.5 per cent based on the gross population size of 625 invitations<sup>2</sup>. We find the survey response rate to be satisfactory, and higher than could be expected taking the long questionnaire format with the many retrospective questions into consideration.

### **Comparative survey data from the evaluation of FRIPRO project support scheme**

Applicants to the Research Council of Norway's independent project support scheme FRIPRO were surveyed in January and February 2012. The survey of the RJ applicants included, in large part, identical questions to the Norwegian survey questionnaire for a comparative analysis of the RJ project support. The FRIPRO evaluation report published by NIFU includes full documentation<sup>3</sup>.

In contrast to the RJ project support, *the FRIPRO support scheme includes all academic fields and disciplines*. However, only FRIPRO applicants within humanities and social sciences are included in the comparative analysis of the present report. FRIPRO is a responsive mode funding scheme, with annual open calls and few restrictions. In addition to regular research projects (3-4 years), applications for post doc fellowships (up to 3 years) and support for events/conferences are accepted.<sup>4</sup> Both PhD-fellowships and post doc fellowships may be funded as part of the research projects, and the integration of such research recruitment in the projects, as well as collaboration between senior and junior researchers, are among the review criteria. Plans for international collaboration are also stated as an additional review criterion.

*FRIPRO survey response rate (humanities and social sciences only)*. This gross sample consisted of 854 applications and 460 unique applicants within humanities and social sciences only in the 2005 to 2007 period. A major difference compared to the RJ independents project scheme is that all FRIPRO applications are peer reviewed by external experts in a *one-step application/review procedure*. The gross sample of our survey included therefore all applicants that submitted an application. Our net sample (humanities and social sciences) included a total of 533 applications (99 funded and 434 rejected). A total of 18.7 per cent of submitted applications were funded by the Research Council of Norway.

### **Data limitations**

The study of independent projects of Riksbankens Jubileumsfond targets the *applicants' views and experiences* of the funding scheme. The main data source is a survey of both successful as well as rejected applicants who submitted their applications from 2005 to 2010. The survey applied both closed and open-ended question formats and the major part of the questions were adapted from previous surveys largely from the Norwegian survey of applicants of the FRIPRO independent project scheme. Unlike the larger FRIPRO evaluation study the RJ survey was not accompanied by qualitative interviews of selected applicants. Qualitative interviews would have provided more contextual information and additional insight into applicants' experiences of the independent project scheme, not available in the present study (which, in addition to the survey data, relies on the basic registration data of the applicants and documentation on the funding schemes of the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond).

---

<sup>2</sup> However, among the 397 respondents there are some 60 respondents who have answered only a few of the questions. Several of these respondents did not finally submit the form. After the first opening question, no items needed to be filled in for the respondent to proceed to the final question and submit the form. The adjusted response rate is 4.5 percentage points higher (68.2) if we base the calculation upon individual applicants (instead of the total number of applications including multiple applications from a number of applicants). Also, in the calculation of the adjusted response rate, we have not subtracted the 70 e-mail addresses of the gross sample size that proved to be invalid.

<sup>3</sup> Liv Langfeldt, Inge Ramberg, Gunnar Sivertsen, Carter Bloch, Dorothy Sutherland Olsen (2012): *Evaluation of the Norwegian scheme for independent research projects (FRIPRO)*. Oslo, NIFU-rapport 8/2012.

<sup>4</sup> In addition, PhD and post doc fellows in the funded FRIPRO projects may apply for mobility grants for research sojourns at institutions abroad.

The present study also does not include scientific reviews (i.e. panel review reports) or bibliometric data that could address scientific quality of funded and rejected applications.

All applicants that submitted a full proposal in the six year period were invited to take part in the survey, while applicants rejected in the first stage (after submitting shorter sketches) were not surveyed. This was decided because these applicants would only be able to answer a small part of the questionnaire having a quite limited contact with the RJ project scheme in the period in question (unless they applied another year during the follow-up period up until 2010, and then submitted a full application). Such applicants were however, included in the survey sample in that year. Timing is a dilemma when using survey data to study the outcome of research funding (completed projects able to report results versus those recent enough for applicants to recall the application). A few of the applicants receiving the questionnaire also reported back that they could not recall the application or the details needed to answer (part of) the questionnaire. As could be expected, the response rates for the non-funded projects are substantially lower than for the funded projects (typically with 25-30 percentage points difference).

Moreover, concerning the study of the impacts of the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (as well as the FRIPRO scheme), a more robust research design would be required to investigate *causal effects* of funding schemes, providing baseline and time series data of the PIs' activities and funding prior to the submission of the application (roughly covering a time period of up to 10 years). An ex post impact research design, investigating the long term effects of the programme is however not feasible here. Given such constraints, we are unable to rule out that other factors not investigated, may give other conclusions concerning the impact of the funding scheme.

## 2 Application success rates and RJ project characteristics

### 2.1 Application success rates – analysis of application data

This section presents success rates for RJ project applications in the period 2005 to 2010. Application statistics and success rates provide valuable information on who applies and who is assessed as having the best applications.

Table 2.1 below shows that RJ receives many applications from the humanities and social science disciplines and subject areas. This in itself is a basic indicator that RJ has great significance.

Altogether the database contains 4653 RJ project applications (sketches and full applications) in the relevant 6 year period – some 700 to 900 applications per year. The overall success rate, based on all submitted applications, has increased over time: 4.5 per cent of the applications were funded in 2005 while 6.1 per cent of the applications received a grant in 2010 (Table 2-1 below). For the whole six year period the average success rate, calculated on the first stage application is 5.7 per cent.

**Table 2-1 Success rates of RJ project applications 2005-2010, by year. Per cent.**

Application year	Funded application	Rejected application	Not externally evaluated *	N
2005	4.5	6.3	89.2	917
2006	5.0	9.7	85.3	735
2007	5.1	10.0	84.8	758
2008	6.8	6.8	86.5	709
2009	6.6	6.1	87.2	783
2010	6.1	8.5	85.4	751
Total%	5.7	7.8	86.5	100
Total #	263	365	4025	4653

Source: RJ project application data.

\*Includes declined sketches and withdrawn applications.

The average success rate of the 628 project applications invited to submit a full application in the second stage of the application process (successful sketches) was much higher, however, averaging 41.9 per cent for the six year period. There were 582 one-off unique applicants behind these applications while 46 of the applicants filed multiple applications in the six-year period<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, 3997 of the total 4653 sketches submitted to Riksbankens Jubileumsfond were filed by unique applicants (while e.g. four applicants submitted a total of seven applications each during the 2005-2010 period).

Recipients are primarily individuals and groups at the major universities: Uppsala, with the most funding in the period 2005-2010, followed by Stockholm, Lund and Gothenburg. And we see a tendency for some academic milieus which succeed well, such as peace and conflict studies, political science and history of ideas at the University of Uppsala, history at Lund University, and linguistics in Stockholm and Lund.

The success rate across the different academic disciplines varies quite considerably. While one in three applications in statistics was granted RJ project support, only 2.2 per cent of project applications in education received support (see Table 2-2).

After statistics applications, the most successful applicants for RJ project funding were found in peace and conflict research, and economics and linguistics. In addition to education, we find the applicants from modern languages, sociology and cultural geography to have the lowest success rate for RJ independent project support.

**Table 2-2 Successful applications (RJ projects) 2005-2010 by academic discipline.**

<b>Academic discipline</b>	<b>Number of granted applications</b>	<b>Total number of applications</b>	<b>Success rate (per cent)</b>
Linguistics	19	191	9.9
Political science	18	310	5.8
Economics	17	162	10.5
History	16	279	5.7
Sociology	15	439	3.4
Business economics	15	355	4.2
History of ideas	14	218	6.4
Economic history	13	157	8.3
Literature	12	327	3.7
Psychology	11	303	3.6
Philosophy	11	196	5.6
Ethnology	11	121	9.1
Art/aesthetic subjects	10	108	9.3
History of religion	9	173	5.2
Law	8	92	8.7
Statistics	8	24	33.3
Anthropology	7	98	7.1
Peace and conflict research	7	49	14.3
Archaeology	6	133	4.5
Information technology	6	121	5.0
Education	4	185	2.2
Cultural Geography	4	121	3.3
Medicine	4	112	3.6
Cinema and theatre studies	4	68	5.9
Musicology	4	61	6.6
Architecture	3	52	5.8
Classical languages	3	51	5.9
Modern languages	2	87	2.3
Other	2	60	3.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>4653</b>	<b>5.7</b>

Source: RJ records of applicants.

Research funders can, in principle, use a variety of instruments to fund research. Various funding tools all have their advantages and disadvantages. At one extreme are relatively egalitarian models where small amounts are given to many groups or individuals who already receive basic funding; at the other extreme are more elitist models where large sums are given to fewer recipients. The RJ's project support instrument is towards the latter model. The low funding levels might be expected to discourage good applicants, but despite the limited grant amounts the RJ has high application numbers. This can be explained to some extent by the RJ system where applicants initially send an outline on which they are then invited to expand, or it is rejected. This is in contrast to schemes like FRIPRO where all applications are handled by a central administrative apparatus and a special international evaluation panel is organised for each application round. In other words, an arrangement that requires much more resource and time for the individual researcher and for the institutions, universities and colleges where both academic and administrative staff can spend time on the application work. This is unlike RJ's scheme, which seems to be less stressful in administration and use of time.

Beyond this, the RJ must ask whether it is desirable that some subjects appear to have a much greater impact than others. The question of the introduction of criteria that provide a broader humanistic and social scientific scope could be discussed in RJ's Board.

But the fact that project support is three years and not five years (as VR practise it) allows more people to get their applications approved, giving a higher success rate. The time frame has, however, been criticised by the RJs assessment panel as being too short and not giving sufficient room for heavy synthesis-based international research. Also, internationally, projects of shorter duration have been criticised for causing researchers to use too much time writing grant proposals and managing the application work (Ioannidis 2011).

## **2.2 Researcher recruitment and established vs. younger researchers**

Apart from publications, recruitment of researchers is a valuable result of independent project grant funding schemes. PhD candidates are however *not* eligible for RJ project applications while post doc candidates are. This may provide important temporary funding for research recruits after their doctorate not so easily available elsewhere.

During the 21st Century, Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (RJ) has increasingly concentrated its research grants only on those researchers who have defended their doctor's thesis. Special attention has been given to young researchers who have recently completed their doctor's thesis and who require grants in order to establish themselves within the academic arena.

In addition, contributions for 16 post-doctoral research and trainee positions within the ABM sector are underway, i.e. archives, libraries and museums. Here, RJ works together with the Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities and the responsible authorities for the cultural sectors. Furthermore, RJ has also initiated a five-year post-doctoral programme regarding foreign politics and international security together with the VolkswagenStiftung, Hannover and Compagnia di San Paulo, Turin.<sup>6</sup>

Pro Futura gives researchers the opportunity to devote themselves to free research for five years, stationed for a period at Swedish and foreign research institutes and afforded senior researchers as mentors. The programme was established in 1999 by Riksbankens Jubileumsfond in collaboration with the Swedish Collegium for Advanced Studies (SCAS).

---

<sup>6</sup> Post doctoral initiatives: <http://www.rj.se/english/projects/>

The survey questionnaire asked the RJ applicants to indicate the number of people in recruitment positions involved in their own organisation as well as possible external partner organisations. Respondents frequently report post doc researchers engaged in the project application both from their own organisation as well as external research institutions. According to the survey respondents, the total number of completed post docs in RJ funded projects since 2005 were reported to be 33 compared to 9 people from project applications which did not receive RJ project support. Also, 41 people with RJ project support and 15 without are respectively reported by survey respondents to be post docs in progress.

As in other countries, not least Norway, career routes for doctoral candidates in Sweden are rather unclear. Junior researchers may have a position as research assistant, lecturer or postdoctoral fellow. What the applicants themselves report as position categories in the respective projects are nevertheless not precise enough for us to consider RJs distribution of resources between different age-related careers; between juniors and seniors.

## 2.3 Gender issues

Applying RJ applicant records of the 2007-2010 period, we find that of the total 3001 project sketches, 1267 were filed by female (42 per cent) and 1734 (58 per cent) by male researchers. Of the total 236 RJ project grant awardees in this period, 70 were female applicants (37 per cent) versus 115 male applicants (62 per cent). In Table 2-3 below we find the relative distribution of rejected and funded applicants.

**Table 2-3 Distribution of RJ applications by gender and review panel. Per cent.**

	Rejected stage 1 (Avslag skiss)		Rejected stage 2 (Avslag ansökan)		Funded by RJ (Beviljas)		Total (N)
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	
Review panel 1	27.4	57.5	2.7	4.8	2.0	5.0	602
Review panel 2	39.9	47.5	3.1	3.9	1.8	3.4	1086
Review panel 3	43.6	39.7	5.6	4.4	3.1	3.1	610
Review panel 4	31.5	54.2	2.4	4.2	2.7	4.2	695
All review Panels	36.1	49.4	3.4	4.4	2.3	3.8	3001

Source: RJ records of applicants 2007-2010. 24 applications are not included in the table (16 of these were withdrawn; 8 rejected applications did not belong to a particular review panel).

Overall, 2.3 per cent of the 3001 applications submitted by female researchers in the 2007-2010 period were funded compared to 3.8 per cent of the applications submitted by male applicants. A higher proportion of male applicants are rejected in stage 2 by all but review panel 3 (assessing applications for Languages, Art and Literary Studies, among others). We find the lowest share of female awardees in review panel 2 (assessing applications for research in the social sciences) which awarded 1.8 percent of female applicants compared to 3.4 of male applicants.

In the 2005-2010 period however, over 2700 RJ project applications were submitted by male researchers compared with more than 1900 by female researchers. A minor difference in the success rate for male and female RJ projects is indicated for the period in Table 2-4 below. Male researchers had a success rate of 6 percent while 5.2 percent of the female principal investigators received funding for their project applications.

**Table 2-4 Full applications reviewed 2005-2010 by gender**

	Not funded	Funded	Total # of applications*	Success rate (per cent)
Female	155	100	1930	5.2
Male	210	163	2723	6.0
Total	365	263	4653	5.7

Source: RJ records of applicants.

In the Nordic countries Sweden has distinguished itself by having a focus on gender-political implications of research policy and funding (Lindgren et al. 2010, Sandström et al. 2011). Since the 1970s gender political issues have been stressed by Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (Hemlin 1997). Nevertheless, we note that the RJ still has a relatively low proportion of female applicants. This can be understood in light of the fact that the proportion of women in senior positions is lower, although it is higher in the humanities and social sciences than in other disciplines. In 2007, the proportion of women full professors in Sweden was 29 per cent in the humanities and 21 per cent in social sciences, with an average for all subject areas of 18 per cent.<sup>7</sup> The gender disparity as regards the success rate of male and female applicants in RJ might also reflect that traditionally male dominated subjects, like economics and statistics, tend to have a better success rate than typical feminised subjects like sociology and education.

By comparison, FRIPRO has a much higher proportion of female applicants, and a better success rate for women. This reflects probably that FRIPRO is open to a larger pool of applicants for PhD scholarships.

Such patterns of academic demography among applicants resist any single, definitive explanation. RJ has made efforts to reflect on the practices of peer review and assessment used in selecting applicants, and should always be aware of the often unconscious power relations concerning academic and social characteristics of, for instance, review panels, and the possible intended and non-intended outcome these might give (Lamont 2009).

---

<sup>7</sup> Source "She figures" 2009 Statistics and Indicators of Gender Equity in Science. European Commission. Brussels: Directorate General for Research

**Table 2-5 Success rate for RJ project applications 2005-2010 by academic discipline and gender. Per cent.**

	Female success rate	Male success rate	Total success rate	Total number of applications
Statistics	0.0	33.3	33.3	24
Peace and conflict research	4.1	10.2	14.3	49
Economics	3.7	6.8	10.5	162
Linguistics	4.2	5.8	9.9	191
Art/aesthetic subjects	5.6	3.7	9.3	108
Ethnology	5.0	4.1	9.1	121
Law	4.3	4.3	8.7	92
Economic history	1.3	7.0	8.3	157
Anthropology	4.1	3.1	7.1	98
Musicology	1.6	4.9	6.6	61
History of ideas	3.7	2.8	6.4	218
Cinema and theatre studies	1.5	4.4	5.9	68
Classical languages	2.0	3.9	5.9	51
Political science	1.6	4.2	5.8	310
Architecture	1.9	3.8	5.8	52
History	1.8	3.9	5.7	279
Philosophy	1.0	4.6	5.6	196
History of religion	2.3	2.9	5.2	173
Information technology	3.3	1.7	5.0	121
Archaeology	1.5	3.0	4.5	133
Business economics	1.1	3.1	4.2	355
Literature	2.4	1.2	3.7	327
Psychology	0.7	3.0	3.6	303
Medicine	0.9	2.7	3.6	112
Sociology	1.4	2.1	3.4	439
Cultural Geography	0.8	2.5	3.3	121
Modern languages	2.3	0.0	2.3	87
Education	1.6	0.5	2.2	185
Other	0.0	3.3	3.3	60
Total	2.1	3.5	5.7	4653

Source: RJ records of applicants.

## 2.4 RJ project characteristics

In the survey, applicants were asked to compare the characteristics of their RJ projects with their other research projects. This provides important insight into the nature of projects approaching RJ funding and the role of these projects within the applicants' research groups or research environments.

Both national and supranational funders (such as the EU) have in recent years placed great emphasis on organising applied research programmes with specific objectives. Such programmes tend to have a large number of users, both in terms of formulation of goals and evaluation of applications. Such a trend has also been frequently debated and criticised, not least in Norway, for undermining both basic research in basic disciplines and the need to develop quality, creativity and talent among individual researchers and research groups.<sup>8</sup> A substantial proportion of the successful applicants report that,

<sup>8</sup> I.e. *Evne til forskning. Norsk forskning sett innenfra*. Report. Oslo: Det norske videnskaps-akademi. The Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters. 2008



compared to their other research, their RJ projects are more oriented towards basic research, have higher scientific quality and provide more new scientific results. While very few report that their other projects perform better on these characteristics than RJ projects, the majority see the differences between RJ projects and others as being quite small: the largest proportions answer that there is no difference between their RJ project and their other project, or that they cannot tell the difference (Table 2-6 below).

**Table 2-6 Applicants' comparisons of RJ projects with their other projects. Per cent.**

<b>Please compare the nature of your most recent RJ project with your other R&amp;D projects, and indicate which projects:</b>	<b>The RJ project</b>	<b>No difference</b>	<b>My other projects</b>	<b>Cannot say/NA</b>	<b>N</b>
a) are most strategically important to your organisation?	26.0	36.5	4.2	33.3	192
b) are most oriented towards basic research?	24.6	41.4	5.8	28.3	191
c) provide most new scientific results?	29.5	39.4	1.0	30.1	193
d) are most scientifically risky?	16.1	36.3	9.3	38.3	193
e) have the highest scientific quality?	23.4	44.8	2.1	29.7	192
f) are most long-term?	28.5	33.2	9.8	28.5	193
g) are most multidisciplinary?	20.5	34.7	14.7	30.0	190
h) are most internationally oriented?	22.4	39.6	8.3	29.7	192

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-20010. Only applicants who indicated that RJ had funded their research in the period 2005 to 2010 were posed this question (Q30).

In general we find only minor differences in the response patterns on these items between those applicants receiving RJ funding and those funded by alternative sources<sup>9</sup>. There are however two interesting deviations here, concerning the multidisciplinary and international orientation of the projects. The majority of respondents giving a substantial answer here indicate that the RJ-funded project may be more multidisciplinary and more internationally oriented compared to other R&D projects of the applicants.

#### **RJ project characteristics compared to FRIPRO project characteristics within the humanities and social sciences**

Table 2-7 below gives a comparison on the identical questions in the 2012 FRIPRO survey in Norway. Here applicants within humanities and social sciences report that their independent project applications are more oriented towards basic research and also are more long term and more strategically important to their organisation compared to their other projects. Only a few applicants reply that their other projects score higher on these characteristics.

The most interesting difference between independent projects and other projects in the Norwegian case concerns basic research (over 30 percentage points). In the RJ case this difference is less than 20 percentage points.

**Table 2-7 Applicants' comparisons of FRIPRO projects with their other projects\*. Per cent.**

<b>Please compare the nature of your most recent FRIPRO project with your other R&amp;D projects, and indicate which projects:</b>	<b>The FRIPRO project</b>	<b>No difference</b>	<b>My other projects</b>	<b>Cannot say/NA</b>	<b>N</b>
a) are most strategically important to your organisation?	36.7	25.9	10.1	27.2	158
b) are most oriented towards basic research?	36.9	31.8	5.1	26.1	157
c) provide most new scientific results?	29.5	37.8	5.1	27.6	156
d) are most scientifically risky?	14.7	36.5	8.3	40.4	156
e) have the highest scientific quality?	24.4	42.9	5.1	27.6	156
f) are most long-term?	30.1	28.8	14.1	26.9	156
g) are most multidisciplinary?	22.1	33.8	15.6	28.6	154
h) are most internationally oriented?	25.8	39.4	9.0	25.8	155

Source: Survey of FRIPRO applicants 2005-2007. Only applicants who indicated that FRIPRO had funded their research in the period 2005 to 2010 were posed this question (Q29) \*within humanities and the social sciences

<sup>9</sup> These questions seem to have been hard for many respondents to answer. The number of indifferent answers (Cannot say/Not applicable) is considerable.

## **Summing up: key points from Chapter 2:**

### **The credibility of the application process**

At a time when there is great emphasis on competitive research funding through such programmes, the low success rate of applications to the RJ fund may highlight a challenge; applicants are clearly investing considerable time and resources in unsuccessful applications. Clearly, whether or not an application is successful, the applicant's assessment of the integrity and fairness of the application process should be the same. To avoid problems developing, Riksbankens Jubileumsfond might wish to consider improvements to certain aspects of the application process to ensure to maintain the trust of clients.

### **The balance of the disciplines funded**

The Riksbankens Jubileumsfond receives a very high number of applications every year from the core disciplines and areas in humanities and social sciences, with particularly high numbers of applicants from economics, politics, sociology and also from psychology and literature. Application and success rates vary across the disciplines and subfields. Those with the highest success rates are statistics, peace and conflict research and economics. It is interesting to note the high application rates, and relatively high success rates of economics-based applications as this subject has tended to stand out as being widely seen as a 'harder' social science and one which has proved more influential in policy making in many cases.

### **Gender disparity**

In terms of gender we find that Riksbankens Jubileumsfond has a relatively low proportion of female applicants and that the female researchers applying also have a slightly lower success rate than their male counterparts. However, it may be these gender differences are driven by indirect patterns in applicants' disciplinary background and seniority. There are fewer senior female applicants, although the share of women with a PhD has improved enormously in many social science and humanities subjects, female researchers still become scarcer at higher levels, meaning there is a smaller pool of potential senior applicants for funds such as the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond. The higher success rate of traditionally male-dominated disciplines (economics and statistics) compared to more feminised subjects of sociology and education may also contribute to this gender difference among successful applicants. In Sweden, considerable effort has been put into encouraging more women to pursue PhDs and research careers, so this may be an area which deserves further attention from the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, to clarify how these gender differences in funding patterns have come about, and their links to other differences in applications.

### **Opportunity to capitalise on success**

A substantial proportion of successful applicants report that, compared to their other projects, Riksbankens Jubileumsfond funded research is more oriented to basic research, of higher scientific quality, and provides more scientific results; this feedback from applicants suggests the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond is meeting certain key objectives to a reasonable degree. It also seems that Riksbankens Jubileumsfond applications tend to be more multi-disciplinary and internationally oriented than the other R&D projects of applicants; furthermore, the more interdisciplinary and internationally oriented applications to the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond are, the more likely they are to succeed and be funded. It seems Riksbankens Jubileumsfond support is improving the opportunities for more collaborative and international working to some extent. However, there appears to be room for the fund to have an even greater impact in this area, as the majority of respondents see the differences between their Riksbankens Jubileumsfond-funded projects and other projects as being quite small.

# 3 Added value, research structure and strategic focus of RJ project scheme

## 3.1 Introduction

The survey addressed a key question concerning the added value created by the RJ project scheme in the research environments that were successful in funding applications. In this chapter, applicants' perception of their RJ project's impact on their wider research activities, international collaboration, and general RJ project objectives is analysed. The section also considers differences in perceived impacts of RJ projects at universities and the independent research institutes respectively.

Applicants were asked to assess the impact of the RJ project scheme on their own careers, their research groups' structures and strategic focus, and on wider research topic and innovation developments. This battery of questions was only posed to applicants who received funding from RJ or implemented the project with other funding (around 250).

Furthermore, in this chapter we look at applicants' perception of the niche of the RJ project grant scheme and its complementarity with other funding schemes; how they rate the significance of RJ project grant in comparison with other funding schemes; to what extent funding from RJ project grant also generates funding from other sources; and to what extent rejected RJ project grant applications obtain funding from other sources.

## 3.2 Impact on structure and strategic focus

**Table 3-1 Impact of the RJ project scheme on the structure and strategic focus of the research communities. Per cent.**

	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither Agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know	N
a) I had <i>higher ambitions</i> for this project than for my research funded by my own institution	32.4	18.8	27.6	2.0	5.6	13.6	250
b) The project had a positive impact on my <i>research career</i> (e.g. new research position/promotion based on research resulting from the project)	43.5	25.8	16.1	1.6	2.0	10.9	248
c) The project led to some <i>unexpected results</i> of great importance to my research field	35.6	36.0	14.6	1.6	.4	11.7	247
d) My research and innovation <i>management skills</i> have been significantly improved as a result of the project	27.5	41.8	18.9	.8	2.0	9.0	244
e) The project has improved my <i>department's reputation</i> in Swedish and international research communities	22.3	37.2	21.9	.8	2.0	15.8	247
f) As a result of the project, my department has better opportunities for <i>attracting research talents</i> in my field of research	14.3	24.1	29.4	5.3	5.3	21.6	245
g) As a result of the project funding, my department is more able to <i>prioritise new research areas</i>	6.6	14.5	40.9	5.0	9.1	24.0	242
h) Through the project new research areas of significant <i>importance for our future research/innovation</i> activities have been explored	32.4	31.6	18.4	2.0	2.5	13.1	244
i) The project has changed my research activities towards <i>larger collaborative projects</i>	15.0	41.1	26.0	5.3	5.7	6.9	246
j) A new research group was established as a result of the project	14.8	28.7	22.5	7.0	20.9	6.1	244
k) Long term international cooperation links have been considerably enhanced as a result of the project	28.9	34.1	19.1	4.1	6.5	7.3	246
l) The project has led to or contributed to innovation (improved products, processes or organisational methods)	6.6	17.2	32.0	4.5	18.4	21.3	244
m) The project has contributed to solving societal challenges	5.3	21.5	28.5	4.1	15.9	24.8	246

Source: Survey of RJ project applicants 2005-2010. The questions were posed only for projects funded by RJ or implemented with other resources. (Q29)

In general, the responses indicate positive but sober valuation of the shorter and longer term impacts of the projects (Table 3.1). We find considerable support in the survey material that the applicants generally have high ambitions for their project proposed to the RJ scheme. Nearly half of the respondents agreed with the statement 'I had higher ambitions for this project than for my research funded by my own institution' (item a in Table 3-1). Given the high ambitions, we may also expect that the projects have a reasonably high impact.

Six of the items measured prevail with particular high or low impact. First, unexpected results (item c), positive impact on my research career (item b), and research and innovation management skills have been significantly improved (item d), are accentuated by many respondents. As much as 71 per cent fully or partly agree that 'The project led to some unexpected results of great importance to my

research field' (item c). Sixty nine per cent fully or partly agree that 'The project had a positive impact on my research career' (item b) and 69 per cent also fully or partly agree that 'My research and innovation management skills have been significantly improved as a result of the project' (item d).

Contrary to this, the lowest level of impact is reported on the department's ability to prioritise research areas (item g), the project's contribution to innovation (item l) and solving social challenges. There is almost a negative balance of opinion on the project's contribution to innovation but a more positive valuation of the contribution for solving social challenge. These findings are however not surprising as societal impacts of projects with a basic/less applied nature, cannot be expected and are hardly measurable 1-5 years upon completion. Moreover, the replies regarding new groups (item k) and larger collaborative projects (item i) indicate a low to moderate potential for the RJ scheme relating to changing group structure and strategic focus of the research communities in the time perspective covered by this survey. It appears for example that the project does not usually result in the establishment of a new research group.

As regards the impact at departmental level, this finding should be considered in light of the survey methods, as those researchers surveyed may be much aware of, and place more emphasis on, the impacts on their own careers and work than these 'spillover' impacts. In simple terms we might argue that, unlike the natural sciences, the humanities and social sciences departments, due to the knowledge type of these disciplines, and because of the internal division of labour that usually exists between academic members of departments, are quite fragmented, thematically, theoretically and methodologically (Becher & Trowler 2001). Typically, research is often organised on an individual basis, with important research often taking place in cooperation with individuals and groups at other institutions at home and abroad. But as institutions put more emphasis on strategic organisation of research, for instance by creating larger units, for example merger of university departments, creation of research groups and so on. As an independent foundation Riksbank has no formal authority over the institutions, and the foundation is just one of several funding sources in the Swedish research. Nevertheless, RJ might consider how to contribute to the improvement of the interaction between external funding system/agencies and the research strategies and environments of the universities and colleges. Trends indicate that institutional research strategies, external funding and the question of co-financing, are all becoming increasingly important. But it is obviously important to bear in mind here that the autonomy of individuals and of the academic environment is essential for creativity and excellence in research, and that RJ, according to our material, helps to strengthen this dimension of the humanities and social sciences.

As reflected in the table, the respondents' valuation of the more individually oriented results and short-term outcomes is generally positive: the potential for positive *career development* (item b) seems particularly strong for the successful RJ project applicants. When comparing replies between the successful RJ project applicants, and unsuccessful applicants who nonetheless completed their project using alternative funds, we find a considerable difference in terms of positive research career effects (Table 3-2). In light of these results, it seems that RJ project funding may give rise to a 'Matthew effect' where the successful applicants gain a greater boost in their academic career than rejected RJ project applicants who received other funding for their proposal. More analysis and register data on career development over a longer period of time would be needed to investigate this hypothesis further, but it may be that success in RJ grant applications acts as a strong signal of quality or prestige, that is helpful for researchers' wider career development.

**Table 3-2 b) The project had a positive impact on my research career (e.g. new research position/promotion based on research resulting from the project). Per cent.**

<b>Result of application</b>	<b>Fully agree</b>	<b>Partly agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Partly disagree</b>	<b>Fully disagree</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>N</b>
Funding	50.6	28.2	12.6		1.7	6.9	174
No funding	27.0	20.3	24.3	5.4	2.7	20.3	74
Total	43.5	25.8	16.1	1.6	2.0	10.9	248

Source: Survey of RJ project applicants 2005-2010. The question was posed only for projects funded by RJ or implemented with other resources.

We also find that 75 per cent of the successful applicants reported that the project led to some unexpected results of great importance to their research field, compared to 64 per cent of the unsuccessful applicants (Table 3-3):

**Table 3-3 c) The project led to some unexpected results of great importance to my research field. Per cent by funded and not funded RJ project applicants.**

<b>Result of application</b>	<b>Fully agree</b>	<b>Partly agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Partly disagree</b>	<b>Fully disagree</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>N</b>
Funding	37.7	37.1	14.3	1.1		9.7	175
No funding	30.6	33.3	15.3	2.8	1.4	16.7	72
Total	35.6	36.0	14.6	1.6	0.4	11.7	247

Source: Survey of RJ project applicants 2005-2010. The question was posed only for projects funded by RJ or implemented with other resources.

A less strong impact is indicated in terms of patterns of international collaboration for RJ funded projects (in Table 3-4). These are however somewhat more likely to have led to increased long term international cooperation links than rejected RJ projects which were funded via other sources.

**Table 3-4 l) Long term international cooperation links have been considerably enhanced as a result of the project. Per cent by funded and not funded RJ project applicants.**

<b>Result of application</b>	<b>Fully agree</b>	<b>Partly agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Partly disagree</b>	<b>Fully disagree</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>N</b>
Funding	29.3	36.2	18.4	3.4	6.9	5.7	174
No funding	27.8	29.2	20.8	5.6	5.6	11.1	72
Total	28.9	34.1	19.1	4.1	6.5	7.3	246

Source: Survey of RJ project applicants 2005-2010. The question was posed only for projects funded by RJ or implemented with other resources.

Long term international cooperation is a more prevalent result of independent project support for the applicants of the Norwegian FRIPRO-programme compared to RJ applicants, while the opposite is true for item c) unexpected results of great importance to my research field. The most diverging items from the RJ applicants' results in relation to the FRIPRO applicants of humanities and the social sciences are included (see Table 3-5 below).

**Table 3-5 Impact of the FRIPRO and RJ Project scheme on the structure and strategic focus of the research communities. Per cent.**

	FRIPRO applicants				RJ applicants			
	Fully agree	Partly agree	Don't Know	N	Fully agree	Partly agree	Don't Know	N
b) The project had a positive impact on my research career (e.g. new research position/promotion based on research resulting from the project)	45.8	16.8	13.1	214	43.5	25.8	10.9	248
c) The project led to some <i>unexpected results</i> of great importance to my research field	28.0	39.3	10.0	211	35.6	36.0	11.7	247
d) My research and innovation <i>management skills</i> have been significantly improved as a result of the project	32.5	32.1	11.5	209	27.5	41.8	9.0	244
f) As a result of the project, my department has better opportunities for <i>attracting research talents</i> in my field of research	17.6	22.9	21.4	210	14.3	24.1	21.6	245
g) As a result of the project funding, my department is more able to <i>prioritise new research areas</i>	8.7	16.0	25.7	206	6.6	14.5	24.0	242
l) Long term international cooperation links have been considerably enhanced as a result of the project	49.3	23.7	9.0	211	28.9	34.1	7.3	246
m) The project has led to or contributed to innovation (improved products, processes or organisational methods)	14.5	16.4	24.6	207	6.6	17.2	21.3	244

Source: Survey of RJ project applicants 2005-2010 and FRIPRO project applicants 2005-2007 within humanities and the social sciences. The questions were posed only for projects funded by RJ/ FRIPRO or implemented with other resources. (Q28).

The FRIPRO details on the items research career, unexpected results and international collaboration are also included in the table. We find that positive impact on the research career is highlighted by the FRIPRO applicants in Norway.

However, a stronger impact reported by the FRIPRO applicants concerns patterns of international collaboration from independent project support compared to the RJ applicants; these are somewhat less likely to lead to increased long term international cooperation links, a difference that might be explained due to the emphasis RCN places on international collaboration.

### 3.3 RJ project grant objectives, institutional strategies and distribution of roles

The survey results show that the research community perceives RJ grants as being squarely aimed at supporting the scientific process and high standards within it (see Table 3-6). Applicants perceive high scientific quality to be the most important purpose of the grants, with a very large proportion also seeing scientific renewal and developing basic theory and methods as important or highly important purposes. The international and interdisciplinary purposes related to the fund are seen as important by a majority of applicants, but are not accentuated as strongly; furthermore, around a quarter of applicants see these as being less important. Research recruitment seems to be the least well-recognised purpose of the funds, with 15 per cent expressing no opinion on this issue.

These perceived objectives are the site of some differences between successful and unsuccessful applicants: those who did not receive funds are less likely to rate these purposes as highly important, particularly in the cases of high scientific quality, developing basic theory and methods, scientific renewal and interdisciplinary collaboration.

**Table 3-6 Applicants' perceptions of the RJ project objectives. Per cent.**

To what extent do you consider the following to be important purposes of the RJ project grant scheme?	Highly important	Somewhat important	Less important	No opinion	N
High scientific quality	86.9	9.1	0.9	3.0	329
Scientific renewal	60.6	25.2	7.1	7.1	325
Develop basic theory and methods	41.0	43.4	8.6	7.0	327
International cooperation	19.7	47.1	23.4	9.8	325
Interdisciplinary collaboration	19.0	39.0	33.4	8.6	326
Research recruitment	14.3	44.7	25.2	15.8	322
Other objectives	6.1	5.1	5.1	83.8	198

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010. Question 13. To what extent do you consider the following to be important purposes of the RJ scheme?

The perceived purposes of the fund fit fairly well with applicants' views of their own research groups' objectives. Table 3-7 shows a similar hierarchy of objectives, with scientific quality and scientific renewal as clear leaders. Views on the aims of international cooperation and interdisciplinary collaboration again appear to be less certain: applicants are fairly evenly divided on the relative importance of these objectives, with a little over a quarter (26.5 per cent) who see international cooperation as 'sometimes' important and a third (33.1 per cent) seeing interdisciplinary research in such 'middle ground' terms. Again, research recruitment is the least prioritised objective, and when we compare funded and non-funded applicants' views, those who were successful were more likely to say they never approached this as an important part of their research group's work.



**Table 3-7 Applicants' accounts of the objectives of their own research. Per cent.**

How would you describe your own research/ research group's objectives in terms of the following dimensions:	Always an important objective	Often an important objective	Sometimes an important objective	Never an important objective	N
High scientific quality	88.9	10.5	0.6		324
Scientific renewal	60.3	33.4	5.3	0.9	320
Develop basic theory and methods	37.7	44.2	17.4	0.6	321
International cooperation	34.0	37.7	26.5	1.9	321
Interdisciplinary collaboration	29.1	32.8	33.1	5.0	320
Research recruitment	9.5	32.5	44.2	13.9	317

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010. A cross table of Q14 by funded and not funded applicants is given in Appendix 1.

Comparing the objectives of the applicants of Riksbankens Jubileumsfond with objectives of the FRIPRO applicants within social sciences, we find the latter to be significantly more oriented towards research recruitment (40 per cent 'always important' for FRIPRO applicants as opposed to 10 per cent for RJ applicants) as well as international cooperation (57 per cent 'always important' for FRIPRO applicants as opposed to 34 per cent for RJ applicants). This may reflect the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond policy not to support doctoral work and the Research Council of Norway policy for pursuing international research collaboration more strongly.

### 3.4 Complementarity and task division

The survey sought to establish how far applicants saw the RJ grants working well alongside other forms of funding instruments. Overall, a narrow majority agree (either fully or partly) that RJ support complements other funding in terms of the kinds of activities it supports (see Table 3-8). Around one in five are neutral or disagree with this view, but a larger share, 27.5 per cent, cannot say if it is complementary in this way. This appears to reflect fairly widespread uncertainty about the kinds of activities the RJ schemes or other national schemes seek to support.

**Table 3-8 Complementarity and task division between the RJ project scheme and other RJ research support schemes. Per cent.**

16. How do you regard the complementarity and task division between the RJ research support schemes and other national schemes\*

a) RJ support schemes are complementary to other national schemes in terms of the kinds of activities funded

	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Cannot say	N
Funding	30.9	27.6	11.6	3.9		26.0	181
No funding	15.8	28.8	19.4	5.0	1.4	29.5	139
Total	24.4	28.1	15.0	4.4	0.6	27.5	320

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010. \* e.g. research programmes, infrastructural and institutional measures (centre schemes, funding for scientific equipment/databases, basic funding to research institutes).

b) RJ support schemes are complementary to other national schemes in terms of the size of the grants

	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Cannot say	N
Funding	23.2	25.4	18.8	4.4	0.6	27.6	181
No funding	12.9	23.0	23.7	4.3	3.6	32.4	139
Total	18.8	24.4	20.9	4.4	1.9	29.7	320

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 3-9 Complementarity and task division between the FRIPRO scheme and other RCN research support schemes. Per cent.**

15. How do you regard the complementarity and task division between the FRIPRO scheme and other RCN research support schemes\*

a) FRIPRO is complementary to other RCN schemes in terms of the kinds of activities funded

	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Cannot say	N
Funding	31.4	32.6	14.0	7.0	5.8	9.3	86
No funding	16.4	27.5	15.2	11.1	4.5	25.4	244
Total	20.3	28.8	14.8	10.0	4.8	21.2	330

b) FRIPRO is complementary to other RCN schemes in terms of the size of the grants

	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Cannot say	N
Funding	19.8	23.3	23.3	7.0	9.3	17.4	86
No funding	4.9	14.3	23.7	13.1	8.2	35.9	245
Total	8.8	16.6	23.6	11.5	8.5	31.1	331

Source: Survey of FRIPRO applicants 2005-2007 within humanities and social sciences. \* e.g. research programmes, infrastructural and institutional measures (centre schemes, funding for scientific equipment/databases, basic funding to research institutes).

Similar results emerge for the complementarity of RJ schemes and others national support schemes regarding the sizes of grants on offer: a little under half (43.2 per cent) of applicants agree to this, while nearly a third (29.7 per cent) cannot say.

For both of these issues, of complementarity in the kinds of activities and size of grants between RJ schemes and other national funding, there are some fairly clear differences in opinion between those who did and those who did not receive RJ funding. Those who were not funded are substantially less positive about the complementarity between funding schemes and also more often reply "cannot say". This may reflect their belonging to research groups or working in areas which are less well funded or with fewer funding options, or may simply reflect their increased sense of having limited options open to them, after an unsuccessful application.

Also in Sweden there is a widespread sense that the humanities is in a state of crisis, i.e that there is fewer and fewer resources to engage in advanced research in this field (Geschwind & Larsen 2008). Against this backdrop it is interesting that our survey also indicates that the humanities are more dependent upon the funding from RJ than are the social scientists.

### Resubmission and alternative funding sources for declined project applications

Seventy per cent of 152 rejected applicants reported to have revised and resubmitted their RJ project grant application to RJ or to other funding schemes in Table 3-10. Among the resubmitted applications, 12 per cent were reported to have received funding for the applications resubmitted to the RJ in the period in question. Furthermore, 13 per cent reported to have received more funding than the sum requested in the original RJ project application. Also, a considerable number of the rejected project applications to Riksbankens Jubileumsfond were implemented without external funding, as 17 per cent answered "yes" and 27 per cent "partly" to this question.

Out of the 121 applications resubmitted to RJ or other funding agencies 59 (49 per cent) were reported to have received funding, mainly from other sources, while 57 (47 per cent) did not.

**Table 3-10 Rejected RJ applicants' alternatives: To what scheme(s) was your application later submitted/resubmitted to and what was the outcome? Number.**

	Submitted, but no funding	Submitted and received funding	Submitted and still pending	N
RJ project grants	39	15	1	55
RJ programme	2			2
RJ Infrastructural support	2			2
RJ research initiation	1			1
FP 7 Ideas (European Research Council)	1	2	1	4
Other parts of FP7 or FP 6	1	2		3
Other (please specify below)	11	40	3	54
<b>Total</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>121</b>

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010. Q 21. To what scheme(s) was your application later submitted/resubmitted to and what was the outcome?

### 3.5 Significance compared to other schemes

In the survey applicants were asked to rate the RJ project scheme with alternative Swedish and international funding sources, in particular ERC grants, according to a range of variables such as to what extent they offer opportunities for doing original research, addressing high risk topics and building international networks etc. (see Table 3-11 below).

**Table 3-11 Comparing RJ project scheme with alternative Swedish funding sources. Per cent.**

	Better	About the same	Poorer	Cannot say	N
Opportunities offered for doing unique/original research?	24.1	46.5	7.0	22.5	316
Opportunities for building new international scholarly networks?	12.1	41.3	3.8	42.9	315
Opportunities for maintaining international scholarly networks?	9.5	41.3	3.5	45.7	315
Opportunities offered for addressing high-risk topics?	12.6	37.2	7.9	42.3	317
Support for new projects without requiring preliminary research?	11.1	42.7	5.7	40.5	316
Opportunities offered for doing interdisciplinary research?	17.4	43.4	4.4	34.8	316
Opportunities offered for broadening your field of expertise?	10.2	48.7	5.1	36.0	314
Amount of funding?	15.8	49.7	9.5	25.0	316
Flexibility of use of funds?	9.5	40.5	6.6	43.4	316
Support for young scientists?	7.3	35.9	8.6	48.3	315
Impact on the prestige and career of the awarded investigators?	12.7	51.7	3.5	32.1	315

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010. Q24: Comparing RJ project scheme with alternative Swedish funding sources (e.g. Vetenskapsrådet, FAS and Formas), is the RJ project scheme poorer, about the same or better concerning:

It is obviously quite difficult to make these types of judgments as many applicants, independent of whether they are successful or not, indicate "cannot say" on these questions. This is particularly the case when asked to compare the RJ scheme with alternative international funding sources, where more than 70 per cent indicate "cannot say".

Bearing this pattern of response in mind, RJ scores better compared to other Swedish sources particularly with regard to opportunities for doing unique/original and interdisciplinary research. As regards amount of funding compared to other Swedish sources, 65 per cent indicate "better" or "about the same", and 10 per cent indicate "poorer". A large number of applicants indicate that RJ holds

about the same quality as other Swedish funding sources, particularly as regards the impact on the prestige and career of the awarded investigators, where 52 per cent indicate “about the same” and 13 per cent “better”.

Not surprisingly only 36 per cent indicate that RJ is about the same when it comes to support for young scientists. Among those comparing qualities of the RJ project scheme with alternative international funding sources, in particular ERC funding, it is not surprising that RJ schemes are ranked as poorer regarding opportunities to maintain and build new international scholarly networks. It is also ranked as poorer when it comes to the amount of funding and impact on the prestige and career of the awarded investigators. RJ schemes are however ranked as better when it comes to support for new projects without requiring preliminary research, and flexibility of use of funds.

In the FRIPRO survey we find a similar response pattern, although much more answer “better” as regards opportunities to do unique original research, reflecting that there is mainly one research agency that provides such an opportunity. But when it comes to the question about opportunities offered for doing interdisciplinary research as well as support for new projects without requiring preliminary research, RJ receives a more positive valuation.

### **Interfaces with other funding schemes – applicants’ qualitative valuations**

Respondents were asked to give their opinion regarding the complementarity and task division between the RJ research support schemes and other national schemes. The humanities and social sciences are typically characterised by a lack of funding when seen in relation to the range of research interests involved, and number of applicants in these fields. As pointed out by many respondents, the RJ is therefore an important funder for this area, not least as the broader research agenda is often thought to be “dictated by buzzwords like innovation and entrepreneurship”. Against this backdrop, some commented positively that the RJ still supports individual based projects, in an era where the trend is to support larger research groups and environments. Furthermore RJ funding of interdisciplinary projects is appreciated. In that regards some compared RJ with VR, although they characterise VR as more strongly attached to the system of academic disciplines.

The question of appropriate and realistic overhead costs and external funding is a matter which has been discussed between university leadership and RJ. Nevertheless many argued that the funding for overheads allowed by RJ is too low for the needs of universities and colleges; this means that RJ then requires co-funding from the universities, making it less attractive compared to VR, which operates with higher overhead funding.

Another concern about funding expressed by respondents is that young researchers, who are often working on limited and/ or part-time contracts, find the process challenging. The RJ’s rule that beneficiaries have to wait one year after the project period ends, before they send in a new application, was seen as unreasonable.

## **Summing up: key points from Chapter 3**

### **The distinguishing values of the RJ fund**

There are many positive qualities about this funding scheme that are highlighted in this evaluation: it offers a unique opportunity for researchers in Sweden and is the only scheme that gives priority to the humanities and social sciences. The scheme thereby widens and increases opportunities for research, and respondents report that the funded projects are associated with ambitious aims and high quality. The scheme is also thought to offer great autonomy to the researchers themselves, leaving them relatively free to develop ideas.

### **Beneficial effects and leverage for the individual researcher**

Applicants have very high ambitions for the projects proposed under the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond scheme. A majority of the respondents filing a full project application fully or partly agree that the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond project scheme has had a positive impact on their research career, in that it has: led to unexpected results of great importance to their research field; allowed areas of significant importance for their future research to be explored; and improved their research and innovation management skills. Participants believe the scheme has a substantial impact on their own careers and skills, and on their research agendas. There is also some suggestion in the findings that Riksbankens Jubileumsfond funding may give rise to a “Matthew effect”, with successful applicants gaining a boost in their career that often releases further funds.

### **Institutional deficit**

However, the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond’s wider impact on the departmental or institutional level is considerably weaker than its impact on researchers involved in the projects. Riksbankens Jubileumsfond funding does not seem to have a significant impact on departments’ ability to prioritise new research areas, or departments’ opportunities to attract new research talent. The interface between Riksbankens Jubileumsfond funding and developments in departments that host Riksbankens Jubileumsfond-funded projects seems to be quite weak. While this may not hinder the specific projects funded by the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, it may reduce its potential to create added value, in the wider research communities. It is also possible that this limited impact on wider departments may be rooted in the nature of humanities and the social sciences research practices. While natural science departments tend to share broad problem areas, data sources, infrastructure and a common paradigmatic approach, the traditions in the humanities in social science are much more individualistic and idiosyncratic – this may also explain the limited success in these fields of science of targeted strategies that seek to improve research organisations’ collaboration.

### **Coherence with RJ objectives**

Applicants generally feel that the grants are distributed on the basis of concerns in line with the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond’s objectives, and in line with fairly traditional notions of research activity; high scientific quality is thought to be the most important purpose underpinning the grants, followed by scientific renewal and the development of basic theory and methods. The international and interdisciplinary purposes are seen as important by a majority, but are not accentuated as strongly. Research recruitment seems to be the least well recognised purpose of the funds.

### **Clarity and distinctiveness in the research funding field**

One aim of the fund is to support projects which might otherwise have limited alternative funding sources. A narrow majority agree fully or partly that Riksbankens Jubileumsfond funding complements other funding, in terms of the kinds of activities it supports. However, a high proportion of respondents offer unequivocal responses to issues about the objectives of the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond fund, and other funds; this appears to reflect widespread uncertainties about the intentions and priorities underpinning research funding schemes. This uncertainty suggests the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond could attempt to articulate more clearly its particular role and focus in contrast to other schemes.

### **An awareness gap**

Applicants indicate that project funding’s significance is thought to be about the same or higher than other Swedish funding sources, and project funds are seen as particularly advantageous in terms of opportunities for doing unique/original research and the amount of funding the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond provides. However, when asked to compare the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond funding to other international sources, respondents typically ‘cannot say’ how these sources of support compare; again, this underlines the apparent low level of awareness about the role and aims of various funding schemes among researchers in these fields.

## 4 RJ programme organisation and review procedures

This chapter addresses various elements relating to the organisation of the RJ scheme such as the design of funding announcements and application and assessment systems. Do these elements as experienced by the applicants help or hinder the achievement of the scheme's objectives? The experiences and views of applicants are important, not at least since the rate of success in the project based funding scheme is fairly low.

### 4.1 The organisation of the review process

Applications are assessed based on their scientific quality and international standards. Applications with international connections are given priority. The annual calls are assessed in a two-step process. First, the RJ's review panels consider applications, and selected applicants are invited to develop a more detailed application to be reviewed by external experts. The RJ's Board has the final say in funding decisions. Applications for research initiation funds are reviewed on a running basis by the Executive Committee of the Board.

The researchers on the Board of Directors and the Review Panels used by the RJ draw on a very wide range of competencies, in line with the fund's breadth of activity and interests. The Board of Directors includes experts in economics and politics, professors and members of parliament. The RJ has very strong links with the academic community and these networks support the RJ's Review Panels. Each panel includes a number of the RJ's Board members, 'alternates' (researchers and members of parliament), and national and international researchers. The second stage of the selection process usually draws on additional reviews of applications by external national and international experts.<sup>10</sup>

A major difference compared to the RJ independent project scheme, is that all FRIPRO applications are peer reviewed by international experts in a one-step application/review procedure. The gross sample of the FRIPRO survey therefore included all applicants that submitted an application, whereas the RJ survey only included those who were invited to submit full applications.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> In its broader work of identifying areas of research needs and fostering the research environment, the foundation has also established 'sector committees' which include academics from key disciplines and other representatives of relevant public stakeholders.

<sup>11</sup> At present (from 2011), the FRIPRO review is organised in four broad expert committees ('fagkomiteer'), one for biology and medicine, one for natural sciences and technology, one for the humanities and one for the social sciences. The FRIPRO budget is allocated on research areas by the Research Board, whereas the expert committees make the final decisions regarding grant awards within their area(s). As a basis for the decisions in the expert committees, peer review panels rate all proposals and write a review report. The general review form for RCN applications is used, asking the reviewers to assess – on a scale from 1 to 7 – the scientific merit of the project and the qualifications of the research

## 4.2 Applicants' views

Attitudes towards the RJ grant scheme's review processes and policies are reasonably positive, although, as would be expected, successful candidates are much more positive about the scheme's ability to select promising, solid and original research. A majority think the scheme supports well-founded and solid research, or the most promising and important research (agreeing to a high or considerable degree). Views on the other selection features the RJ scheme might use are more mixed, and only 3.4 per cent find that the scheme to a high degree has policies and processes appropriate for supporting high-risk research (see Table 4-1 below).

Across all the statements on this issue there are also high proportions who 'cannot say', suggesting a lack of familiarity with the way RJ review processes and policies target these kinds of research qualities and outcomes. This is particularly clear in the case of assessing the potential of junior scientists and selecting the best candidates, and supporting high-risk research, where a large proportion are unsure how the RJ scheme's policies and processes relate to these outcomes.

**Table 4-1 Applicants' views on the application and review process. Per cent.**

In your opinion, to what degree does the RJ project grant scheme have the appropriate policies and review processes to:	5 To a high degree	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say	N
Support well-founded and solid research?	25.2	38.3	14.4	4.6	0.9	16.6	326
Support the most promising and important research (in your field of research)?	21.3	30.2	18.2	9.9	4.3	16.0	324
Support original and ground breaking research?	13.8	23.9	22.3	15.3	4.3	20.5	327
Assess the potentials of junior scientists/select the best talents?	9.5	17.5	20.6	13.8	3.4	35.1	325
Support high-risk research?	3.4	14.1	18.4	16.3	9.8	38.0	326

Source: Survey of RJ project applicants 2005-2010.

Those who were not funded are less positive about the RJ schemes policies and processes, notably those which relate to selection based on research attributes. While 67.2 per cent of funded applicants think the scheme has appropriate policies to select 'the most promising and important research' in the field (to a high or considerable degree), only 31.2 per cent of those not receiving funding agree. Similarly, only around a fifth (21.7 per cent) of those not receiving funding think the RJ scheme has the right policies (to a high or considerable degree) to support original and ground breaking research, in contrast to 50 per cent of those who did get funding.

It might not come as a surprise that a fairly low proportion find that RJ supports high risk research, as such a feature usually is not associated with the humanities and social sciences - thus 35 per cent find it difficult to answer this question.

The response pattern is fairly similar as regards the ability of RJ and FRIPRO to assess the potential of junior scientists/select the best talents.

Table 4-2 below reports mean differences in RJ project and FRIPRO applicants' perceptions of the application and review process within the humanities and social sciences. Here 5 is the highest score (To a high degree) while the lowest possible score is 1.0 (Not at all). As the table below shows, RJ funding is much more highly rated than FRIPRO funding in terms of its ability to support high risk research. Otherwise the response patterns are quite similar.

---

group. The panel also fill in text comments in the review form. For each committee, there are 8 to 11 review panels. The panels are ad hoc and consist of non-Norwegian researchers. New panels<sup>11</sup> are put together each summer to match that year's applications.

**Table 4-2 Applicants' views on the FRIPRO and RJ application and review processes. Means.**

In your opinion, to what degree does the RJ project/ FRIPRO scheme have the appropriate policies and review processes to:...	Average FRIPRO HSS	FRIPRO funding	No FRIPRO funding	Average RJ	RJ funding	No RJ funding
q16a Support the most promising and important research (in your field of research)?	3.2	4.1	3.1	2.8	3.1	2.3
q16c Support high-risk research?	2.5	3.1	2.3	4.0	4.2	3.7
q16d Support well-founded and solid research?	3.6	4.2	3.7	3.3	3.8	2.8
q16e Support original and ground breaking research?	3.1	3.8	2.8	3.2	3.6	2.7
q16f Assess the potentials of young scientists/select the best talents?	3.0	3.6	2.7	2.8	3.1	2.3

Source: Survey of FRIPRO applicants 2005-2007 and Survey of RJ project applicants 2005-2010. Respondents answering "cannot say" are not included in the calculation. Question wording: Q16/17.

### 4.3 Feedback to applicants and the applicants' perceptions of the process

Regarding the access to relevant background information for the call in Table 4-3, all in all the respondents seem very satisfied, though with some different response patterns between those who did and those who did not receive funding - as the first group gave a slightly more positive evaluation of the relevance of the background information.

**Table 4-3 Applicants' satisfaction with the application and review process. Per cent.**

	To a great extent					Not at all	Cannot say	N
	5	4	3	2	1			
Access to relevant background information for the call	35.9	40.4	15.6	0.9	0.6	6.6	334	
Clarity and easy to understand information about the call	36.9	39.6	15.1	2.7	0.6	5.1	331	
Support during the application process	20.4	23.4	20.1	7.2	4.2	24.6	333	
The types of applications and size of projects accepted (in the call for applications)	21.0	28.0	19.5	5.2	3.0	23.2	328	
The competence of the RJ external experts from Sweden and abroad	24.3	27.0	23.7	8.4	4.2	12.3	333	
Transparency regarding funding decisions	17.3	19.8	27.1	13.1	9.4	13.4	329	
Clarity and completeness of the feedback to applicants	21.5	28.2	24.8	16.4	4.5	4.5	330	
User-friendliness of the reporting system	14.8	27.3	24.2	6.4	2.1	25.2	330	

Source: Survey of RJ project applicants 2005-2010 on Q11: Considering your RJ application(s) in general, to what extent were the following RJ (funding) processes satisfactory?

A similar pattern of response reveals itself also in relation to the next issue with respect to clarity and easy-to-understand information about the call. In comparison FRIPRO respondents also give a rather positive assessment to these questions, but slightly less than RJ respondents. In contrast to RCN, RJ is a smaller funding agency covering mainly two fields of science. It is reasonable we believe to suggest that this is advantageous for maintaining a high quality of information about calls.



As regards support during the application process, the evaluation by the respondents again is fairly positive, however with a majority of positive replies among the beneficiaries. A rather large group of 25 per cent replied “cannot say” to this question.

Regarding the question on types of application and size of projects accepted, a majority of those who received funding are positive, and one should bear in mind that we also find a relatively large group of respondents replying “cannot say” to this question.

Many respondents used the opportunity of the open response section to give positive feedback to RJ on the professional administration of the application process. One respondent called for steps to simplify the application process, which was seen as unnecessarily complicated. In particular the web interface is thought to have room for improvement, so that users can submit formatted text.

As regards the question on the competence of the RJ external experts from Sweden and abroad, it should come as no surprise that we find great variations between the answering patterns of the ‘funding – no funding’ categories. The majority of those who had received funding gave a positive evaluation of the competence of the external experts, while those who did not receive funding gave a less positive evaluation. The respondents gives a slightly weaker assessment of transparency regarding funding decisions. The ‘no funding’ category gives a slightly more positive evaluation of the clarity and completeness of the feedback to the applicants.

Regarding the user-friendliness of the reporting system, reasonably enough a fairly large group, 25 per cent, replied “cannot say”. Those who received funding gave a rather more positive assessment.

The successful applicants also gave the most positive evaluation to the question *To what degree do you think RJ provided sufficient feedback in the initial phase of the application process including your sketch?* – with 49 per cent of the beneficiaries, and 24 per cent of the unsuccessful applicants, indicating 5 and 4.

**Table 4-4 Sufficient feedback in the initial phase of the application process including your sketch?**

	1 Not at all	2	3	4	5 To a great extent	Cannot say	N
Funding	8.6	6.5	20.4	30.1	18.8	15.6	186
No funding	17.8	15.1	32.2	19.9	4.1	11.0	146
Total	12.7	10.2	25.6	25.6	12.3	13.6	332

Source: Survey of RJ project applicants 2005-2010 on Q13. To what degree do you think that RJ provided sufficient feedback in the initial phase of the application process including your sketch?

Against this backdrop, it was predictable that the successful applicants among the respondents would give the most positive feedback (refer to Table 4-5 below), 73 per cent indicating 5 or 4 to the question *to what degree do you think that the reviewers who assessed your application was able to assess all the fields of research involved in the application?* with just 52 per cent of the unsuccessful applicants indicating 5 and 4 to the same question. The discrepancy between the response pattern of the successful and unsuccessful applicants is however much greater on the question on *whether the reviewers provided an impartial and unbiased assessment of your application*, where as many as 78 per cent of the successful applicants indicate 4 or 5 as opposed to 27 percent of those unsuccessful. To the question on whether *the reviewers who assessed your application provided a thorough assessment of your application*, a similar pattern is revealed; 77 per cent of the successful applicants indicate 5 and 4, as opposed to 27 per cent of the unsuccessful ones.

**Table 4-5 To what degree do you think that the reviewers who assessed your application:**

<b>Were able to assess all the fields of research involved in the application?</b>							
	<b>5 To a great extent</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1 Not at all</b>	<b>Cannot say</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>Funding</b>	36.0	36.5	17.5	4.2	0.5	5.3	189
<b>No funding</b>	4.1	20.7	28.3	25.5	11.7	9.7	145
<b>Total</b>	22.2	29.6	22.2	13.5	5.4	7.2	334

  

<b>Provided an impartial and unbiased assessment of your application?</b>							
	<b>5 To a great extent</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1 Not at all</b>	<b>Cannot say</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>Funding</b>	41.3	37.6	12.2	2.6		6.3	189
<b>No funding</b>	6.2	20.7	27.6	18.6	16.6	10.3	145
<b>Total</b>	26.0	30.2	18.9	9.6	7.2	8.1	334

  

<b>Provided a thorough assessment of your application?</b>							
	<b>5 To a great extent</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1 Not at all</b>	<b>Cannot say</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>Funding</b>	39.2	37.6	14.3	1.1		7.9	189
<b>No funding</b>	7.6	19.3	29.7	23.4	11.0	9.0	145
<b>Total</b>	25.4	29.6	21.0	10.8	4.8	8.4	334

Source: Survey of RJ project applicants 2005-2010 on Q14. To what degree do you think that the reviewers who assessed your application?

#### **4.3.1 Differing patterns of response between humanities and social science respondents**

The respondents from the humanities are however less pleased with both the feedback in the initial phase and the transparency regarding funding decisions.

**Table 4-6 Main external (other than your own organisation's funding sources) for research projects since 2005. Per cent.**

<b>Please indicate your main external (other than your own organisation's funding sources) for research projects since 2005</b>	<b>RJ</b>	<b>Other Swedish sources</b>	<b>International sources</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>N</b>
Humanities (incl. theology)	39.2	45.5	2.8	12.6	143
Social science (incl. law)	25.4	65.9	5.8	2.9	138
Centre, group, institute etc. with high degree of cross-disciplinarity	6.7	73.3	6.7	13.3	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>31.1</b>	<b>56.4</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>296</b>

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010. Q10

**Table 4-7 Provided an impartial and unbiased assessment of your application?. Per cent.**

<b>Provided an impartial and unbiased assessment of your application?</b>	<b>5 To a great extent</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1 Not at all</b>	<b>Cannot say</b>	<b>N</b>
Humanities (incl. theology)	23.1	29.3	21.8	8.8	8.2	8.8	147
Social science (incl. law)	30.2	32.4	15.8	9.4	6.5	5.8	139
Centre, group, institute etc. with high degree of cross-disciplinarity	26.7	26.7	26.7	20.0			15
<b>Total</b>	<b>26.6</b>	<b>30.6</b>	<b>19.3</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>301</b>

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010. Q12

### **4.3.2 Review procedures – qualitative statements of respondents**

In the open section of the RJ survey the review processes were frequently commented upon and questioned – a trend we also find in surveys regarding other funding agencies. This first and foremost is the case among the group of respondents who did not succeed in the final round; the process was criticised for not 'picking experts with the right competence'. Many claimed to have received negative evaluation due to a lack of relevant theoretical or methodological expertise among the reviewers, or the reviews to be irrelevant. Some argued that this was particularly the case when 'local' – Swedish experts – were involved, and that RJ tended to use the same experts all over again and thereby reproduce some 'unlucky' review practices.

The peer review used by RJ was also argued by some to have led to particularly critical evaluation of interdisciplinary research, as these projects are mainly reviewed by experts in just one of the fields involved.

One respondent remarked that the review practices used by RJ should also be more gender sensitive, for example a project with female participants should not be evaluated by an all-male review panel.

Nevertheless, peer review is important and there were also some respondents who wrote positively about the peer review process used by RJ, for example that it was useful to take part in the process and receive the reviewers comments. Comments also illustrate that applicants' contact and subsequent satisfaction with the review process varies substantially.

One respondent noted it was useful to get feedback orally on how to proceed with the stage two application after their sketch had been accepted. Another commented that they had not been given any feedback or information after the first sketch. A third argued that it would have been valuable to get feedback, even if the application did not qualify for the second round.

Respondents made a number of suggestions for ways that the review process could be improved. It was argued that RJ should improve its standard of peer review by: applying better routines for

selecting the right people; applying clearer evaluation criteria; not accepting negative comments on minor details; and taking steps to improve the quality and impartiality of the feedback by using more international experts. Another suggestion was the introduction of some type of grading scale (e.g. from 1-10) to indicate the relative strength or quality of an application, to help applicants gauge to what extent it would be worthwhile their trying again. There were also more general comments that reviewers should try to keep to a sympathetic and constructive style, something which was not always the case in today's system.

Some argued having received negative evaluation due to personal reasons (noting that Sweden is a small country ) and saying that RJ should be careful not to select reviewers who have previous strong links to the applicants; experiences with a lack of anonymity were also put forward by a couple of respondents.

Some argued RJ supports a system open to 'clientism' where scholars who receive support often have contacts at RJ or are part of the milieu around the professors or senior researchers with such contacts. One argued that the nomination processes used by RJ were based on the senior professors' judgments of who is most deserving, not on the broader merits of applicants.

These experiences and views among applicants are important, not least because the rate of success for project based funding is very low, at around 6 per cent. The chances of success are small and in many cases success or failure will depend on quite small differences in quality. In the long run this situation might result in problems in perceptions of the legitimacy of the funding practices used by RJ, irrespective of the robustness and transparency of selection and peer review processes selected.

While peer review is an evaluation tool applied in many types of evaluations of scientific quality and merit, there are some sceptical comments about how it is applied in selecting projects. While it is supposed to secure competent and fair judgments, with impartiality sought through rules for handling conflict of interest and the use of international experts, the subjective nature of any peer review can open space for suspicion about the criteria used by reviewers (Langfeldt 2001, Lamont 2009).

It is however difficult to establish any system of peer review that would be viewed with a very high degree of legitimacy among the researchers/applicants involved. We would argue this is particularly likely to be the case within the humanities and social sciences. Furthermore disciplines within the humanities and social sciences are usually thematically, theoretically and methodologically quite fragmented, leading to individualistic modes of research practice and interdisciplinary research traditions.

RJ has a reflective approach to its peer practice, as this issue, amongst others, has received special attention in seminars and debates arranged by RJ. Nevertheless, there is, we believe, no optimal solution for the peer review system to be selected.

RCN has strict conflict of interest regulations and only uses non-Norwegian external reviewers. This must be seen, among other things, against the background that conflict of interest may often be a particular problem in Norway, a small country with small research communities and only one Research Council.

It is costly to base all applications on international expert evaluation and it can be difficult to recruit international experts willing to take on this task. It also requires that all applications are written in English, which is not always seen as 'positive' in the humanities and social sciences.

Basing decisions strictly on external peer review may also imply a fairly rigid review process, less open to diverse influence and concerns, in contrast to RJ employing an active and inclusive role in formulating relevant humanities and social issues and research.

We believe all models have advantages and disadvantages, but the great discrepancy in satisfaction between those who have and have not succeeded is somewhat worrying, and against this backdrop RJ might consider improving its performance, and using international experts.

## **Summing up: key findings from Chapter 4**

### **Attitudes and understanding**

Attitudes towards the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond's review policies and processes are reasonably positive, although as might be expected, successful candidates are much more positive about the schemes ability to select promising solid and original research than those who were not funded. Overall, a majority think the schemes supports well founded and solid research, or the most promising and important research to some degree at least. However, only a minority believe that the project scheme supports *high-risk research*, with most respondents unclear on the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond's role on this point (the largest proportion cannot say if the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond supports such projects).

### **The application process**

Regarding the access to relevant background information for the calls, the respondents seem very satisfied, a majority of those receiving funding also gave a positive evaluation of the *competence of external experts*, while those who did not receive funding were less positive. The respondents give the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond a weaker assessment concerning transparency in funding decisions – the successful applicants gave more positive feedback on whether their reviewers were able to assess all the fields of research involved in the application, but those who were not funded are much more likely to doubt this.

### **Improving perceived impartiality**

When it comes to such scepticism about the fairness and rigour of evaluation systems, there is no obvious, optimal solution for peer review systems – however, such a discrepancy in satisfaction between those who have and those who have not succeeded is unhealthy – the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond might consider if there is anything more they can do to address such concerns, for example using more international expert panels and better elaborated standards offering more transparency.

### **Different targets (1)**

The response patterns found in the FRIPRO survey and the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond evaluation have many similarities. There are certain differences in the *demography of applicants*, as FRIPRO places more emphasis on attracting *PhD level applicants*, and has a higher share of female applicants with a better response rate.

### **Different targets (2)**

Comparing the objectives of the applicants to Riksbankens Jubileumsfond and objectives of the FRIPRO applicants within social sciences and humanities, we find the latter to be significantly more oriented towards research recruitment and international cooperation. This reflects the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond's policy not to support doctoral work, and the Research Council of Norway's policy of pursuing international research collaboration more strongly.

The comparison presents a positive picture for the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond in terms of the quality of information about funding schemes; Riksbankens Jubileumsfond applicants' higher satisfaction compared to FRIPRO applicants may, however, be due to the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond being a smaller organisation with a narrower scope.

## References

- Bertilsson, T.M., Nybom, T., Sejersted, F., Seppälä, E-O., Skoie, H., Stenlund, B. och Åmark, K. Riksbankens Jubileumsfond 2004 *Hinc robur et securitas? En forskningsstiftelses handel og vandel*. Stiftelsen Riksbankens Jubileumsfond 1989-2003. Stockholm: Riksbankens Jubileumsfond/Hedemora: Gidlunds Förlag
- Becher, T. & P:R: Trowler 2001 *Academic Tribes and Territories. Intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.
- Annaya-Carlsson, K. & Melin, G. 2007 *Den postdoktoral perioden för doktorsexaminerade läsåret 1998/99*. Arbetsrapport 2007:60 Stockholm: SISTER
- Geschwind, L., Larsson, K. 2008 *Om Humanistisk forskning. Nutida villkor och framtida förutsättningar*. Rapport 8/2008. Stockholm: SISTER
- Hemlin, M. 1997 *Det har ändå hänt fantastiskt mycket*. Seminar report. Stockholm: Riksbankens Jubileumsfond.
- Ioannidis, J.P.A 2011 Fund people not projects. *Nature* Vol. 477 529-531
- Lamont, M (2009), *How Professors Think: Inside the Curious World of Academic Judgment*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard.
- Langfeldt, L., I. Ramberg, G. Sivertsen, C. Bloch & D. Sutherland Olsen (2012), *Evaluation of the Norwegian scheme for independent research projects (FRIPRO)*. Oslo, NIFU-rapport 8/2012.
- Langfeldt, L (2001), The Decision-Making Constraints and Processes of Grant Peer Review, and Their Effects on the Review Outcome. *Social Studies of Science* 31(6):820–841.
- Lindgren, G. et. al (2010). *Nördar, nomader och duktiga flickor – kön och jämställdhet i excellenta miljöer*, Delegationen för jämställdhet i högskolan, Stockholm
- Sandström, U. et. al. *Hans Excellens: om miljardsatningarna på starka forskningsmiljöer*. Delegationen för jämställdhet i högskolan, Stockholm

# Appendix 1 Tables

## List of Tables

Table 2-1	Success rates of RJ project applications 2005-2010, by year. Percentages. ....	17
Table 2-2	Successful applications (RJ projects) 2005-2010 by academic discipline. ....	18
Table 2-3	Distribution of RJ applications by gender and review panel. Per cent. ....	20
Table 2-4	Full applications reviewed 2005-2010 by gender .....	21
Table 2-5	Success rate for RJ project applications 2005-2010 by academic discipline and gender. Per cent .....	22
Table 2-6	Applicants' comparisons of RJ projects with their other projects. Per cent. ....	23
Table 2-7	Applicants' comparisons of FRIPRO projects with their other projects*. Per cent. ....	23
Table 3-1	Impact of the RJ project scheme on the structure and strategic focus of the research communities. Per cent. ....	26
Table 3-2	b) The project had a positive impact on my research career (e.g. new research position/promotion based on research resulting from the project) Per cent. ....	28
Table 3-3	c) The project led to some unexpected results of great importance to my research field. Per cent by funded and not funded RJ project applicants. ....	28
Table 3-4	l) Long term international cooperation links have been considerably enhanced as a result of the project. Per cent by funded and not funded RJ project applicants. ....	28
Table 3-5	Impact of the FRIPRO and RJ Project scheme on the structure and strategic focus of the research communities. Per cent. ....	29
Table 3-6	Applicants' perceptions of the RJ project objectives. Per cent. ....	30
Table 3-7	Applicants' accounts of the objectives of their own research. Per cent. ....	31
Table 3-8	Complementarity and task division between the RJ project scheme and other RJ research support schemes. Per cent. ....	31
Table 3-9	Complementarity and task division between the FRIPRO scheme and other RCN research support schemes. Per cent. ....	32
Table 3-10	Rejected RJ applicants' alternatives: To what scheme(s) was your application later submitted/resubmitted to and what was the outcome? Per cent. ....	33
Table 3-11	Comparing RJ project scheme with alternative Swedish funding sources. Per cent. ...	33
Table 4-1	Applicants' views on the application and review process. Per cent. ....	37
Table 4-2	Applicants' views on the FRIPRO and RJ application and review processes. Means. ....	38
Table 4-3	Applicants' satisfaction with the application and review process. Per cent. ....	38
Table 4-4	Provided sufficient feedback in the initial phase of the application process including your sketch? .....	39
Table 4-5	To what degree do you think that the reviewers who assessed your application: .....	40
Table 4-6	Main external (other than your own organisation's funding sources) for research projects since 2005. Per cent. ....	41
Table 4-7	Provided an impartial and unbiased assessment of your application?. Per cent. ....	41

## Tables in appendix

Table 0-1 Funding from RJ schemes in the period 2005-2010 by RJ project funding. Per cent. ....	47
Table 0-2 External research funding in the period 2005-2010 by RJ project funding. Per cent. ....	48
Table 0-3 Source of external research funding in the period 2005-2010 by RJ project funding. Per cent. ....	48
Table 0-4 RJ project grant application process: information and contact with RJ by RJ project funding. Per cent. ....	48
Table 0-5 RJ project grant application review of application by RJ project funding . Per cent. ....	49
Table 0-6 RJ project grant application – feedback in application process by RJ project funding. Per cent. ....	50
Table 0-7 Important purposes of the RJ project grant scheme. Per cent. ....	51
Table 0-8 Ojectives of your own research/research group. Per cent. ....	51
Table 0-9 Important purposes of the RJ project grant scheme by RJ funding. Per cent. ....	51
Table 0-10 Ojectives of your own research/research group by RJ funding. Per cent. ....	53
Table 0-11 Complementarity and task division between the RJ research support schemes and other national schemes by RJ funding. Per cent. ....	54
Table 0-12 Policies and review processes of the RJ project grant scheme. Per cent. ....	54
Table 0-13 Policies and review processes of the RJ project grant scheme by RJ funding. Per cent. ...	55
Table 0-14 Awareness of alternative project funding sources by RJ funding. Per cent. ....	56
Table 0-15 RJ Project funding enable additional project funding sources. (funded project applicants only) Per cent. ....	56
Table 0-16 (Re)submission of the declined RJ project application. Per cent. ....	56
Table 0-17 Resubmission of the RJ project application. Per cent. ....	56
Table 0-18 Implementation after declined RJ project application. Per cent. ....	56
Table 0-19 Comparing RJ project scheme with alternative Swedish funding sources. Per cent. ....	57
Table 0-20 Comparing RJ project scheme with alternative international funding sources. Per cent. ...	57
Table 0-21 Comparing RJ project scheme with alternative Swedish funding sources by RJ project funding. Per cent. ....	58
Table 0-22 Importance of the project on your organization by RJ project funding. Per cent. ....	59
Table 0-23 Statements about project results. Per cent. ....	60
Table 0-24 Statements about project results by RJ project funding. Per cent. ....	61
Table 0-25 Nature of RJ project compared to your other projects. Per cent. ....	63
Table 0-26 Nature of RJ project compared to your other projects by RJ project funding. Per cent. ....	64
Table 0-27 Significance of RJ project compared to your other projects. Per cent. ....	65
Table 0-28 Nature of RJ project compared to your other projects by RJ project funding. Per cent. ....	65



**Table 0-1 Funding from RJ schemes in the period 2005-2010 by RJ project funding. Per cent.**

8. Please indicate the kinds of RJ schemes which have funded your research in the period 2005-2010:

<b>Project grants from the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (RJ) between 2005 and 2010</b>			
	Yes	No	N
<b>Funding</b>	89.4	10.6	189
<b>No funding</b>	22.1	77.9	136
<b>Total</b>	61.2	38.8	325
<b>Programme grants from the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (RJ) between 2005 and 2010</b>			
	Yes	No	N
<b>Funding</b>	4.0	96.0	99
<b>No funding</b>	3.3	96.7	121
<b>Total</b>	3.6	96.4	220
<b>Infrastructural project grants</b>			
	Yes	No	N
<b>Funding</b>	9.7	90.3	103
<b>No funding</b>	1.7	98.3	119
<b>Total</b>	11.9	88.1	222
<b>RJ research initiation grants support for conferences, seminars, workshops and creation of new researcher networks</b>			
	Yes	No	N
<b>Funding</b>	14.6	85.4	103
<b>No funding</b>	9.7	90.3	124
<b>Total</b>	11.9	88.1	227
<b>Pro Futura (RJ post-doctoral programme) collaborative effort with The Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study</b>			
	Yes	No	N
<b>Funding</b>	0	100.0	96
<b>No funding</b>	0	100.0	120
<b>Total</b>	0	100.0	216
<b>Other RJ funding</b>			
	Yes	No	N
<b>Funding</b>	4.2	95.8	96
<b>No funding</b>	2.5	97.5	120
<b>Total</b>	3.2	96.8	216

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-2 External research funding in the period 2005-2010 by RJ project funding. Per cent.**

9. Please give an estimate of how your research was financed by other sources than your own organisation in 2011. Has the share decreased or increased since 2005?

<b>External funding</b>				
	Decreased	Unchanged	Increased	N
<b>Funding</b>	17.7	50.0	32.3	158
<b>No funding</b>	18.7	43.3	38.1	134
<b>Total</b>	18.2	46.9	34.9	292

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-3 Source of external research funding in the period 2005-2010 by RJ project funding. Per cent.**

10. Please indicate your main external (other than your own organisation's funding sources) for research projects since 2005

<b>Your main external (other than your own organisation's funding sources) for research projects since 2005</b>					
	International sources	RJ	Other Swedish sources	None	N
<b>Funding</b>	3.2	45.5	46.5	4.8	187
<b>No funding</b>	6.5	9.2	71.9	12.4	153
	4.7	29.1	57.9	8.2	340

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-4 RJ project grant application process: information and contact with RJ by RJ project funding. Per cent.**

11. Considering your RJ application(s) in general, to what extent were the following RJ (funding) processes satisfactory?

<b>Access to relevant background information for the call</b>							
	5 To a great extent	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	43.1	38.8	10.6			7.4	188
<b>No funding</b>	26.7	42.5	21.9	2.1	1.4	5.5	146
	35.9	40.4	15.6	0.9	0.6	6.6	334
<b>Clarity and easy to understand information about the call</b>							
	5 To a great extent	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	41.7	40.6	11.2	2.1		4.3	187
<b>No funding</b>	30.6	38.2	20.1	3.5	1.4	6.3	144
	36.9	39.6	15.1	2.7	0.6	5.1	331
<b>Support during the application process</b>							
	5 To a great extent	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	25.0	26.6	17.0	6.9	1.6	22.9	188
<b>No funding</b>	14.5	19.3	24.1	7.6	7.6	26.9	145
	20.4	23.4	20.1	7.2	4.2	24.6	333

<b>The types of applications and size of projects accepted (in the call for applications)</b>							
	5 To a great extent	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	25.0	31.0	18.5	2.7	2.2	20.7	184
<b>No funding</b>	16.0	24.3	20.8	8.3	4.2	26.4	144
	21.0	28.0	19.5	5.2	3.0	23.2	328
<b>The competence of the RJ external experts from Sweden and abroad</b>							
	5 To a great extent	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	38.5	33.7	16.6	1.6		9.6	187
<b>No funding</b>	6.2	18.5	32.9	17.1	9.6	15.8	146
	24.3	27.0	23.7	8.4	4.2	12.3	333
<b>Transparency regarding funding decisions</b>							
	5 To a great extent	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	23.4	25.5	23.9	10.1	3.7	13.3	188
<b>No funding</b>	9.2	12.1	31.2	17.0	17.0	13.5	141
	17.3	19.8	27.1	13.1	9.4	13.4	329
<b>Clarity and completeness of the feedback to applicants</b>							
	5 To a great extent	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	30.5	33.2	22.5	8.0	1.6	4.3	187
<b>No funding</b>	9.8	21.7	28.0	27.3	8.4	4.9	143
	21.5	28.2	24.8	16.4	4.5	4.5	330
<b>User-friendliness of the reporting system</b>							
	5 To a great extent	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	18.7	28.3	26.7	5.9	0.5	19.8	187
<b>No funding</b>	9.8	25.9	21.0	7.0	4.2	32.2	143
	14.8	27.3	24.2	6.4	2.1	25.2	330

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-5 RJ project grant application review of application by RJ project funding . Per cent.**

12. To what degree do you think that the reviewers who assessed your application:

<b>Was able to assess all the fields of research involved in the application?</b>							
	5 To a great extent	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	36.0	36.5	17.5	4.2	0.5	5.3	189
<b>No funding</b>	4.1	20.7	28.3	25.5	11.7	9.7	145
	22.2	29.6	22.2	13.5	5.4	7.2	334
<b>Provided an impartial and unbiased assessment of your application?</b>							
	5 To a great extent	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	41.3	37.6	12.2	2.6		6.3	189
<b>No funding</b>	6.2	20.7	27.6	18.6	16.6	10.3	145
	26.0	30.2	18.9	9.6	7.2	8.1	334

<b>Provided a thorough assessment of your application?</b>							
	5 To a great extent	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	39.2	37.6	14.3	1.1		7.9	189
<b>No funding</b>	7.6	19.3	29.7	23.4	11.0	9.0	145
	25.4	29.6	21.0	10.8	4.8	8.4	334

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-6 RJ project grant application – feedback in application process by RJ project funding. Per cent.**

13. To what degree do you think that RJ provided sufficient feedback in the initial phase of the application process including your sketch?

<b>Provided sufficient feedback in the initial phase of the application process including your sketch?</b>							
	1 Not at all	2	3	4	5 To a great extent	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	8.6	6.5	20.4	30.1	18.8	15.6	186
<b>No funding</b>	17.8	15.1	32.2	19.9	4.1	11.0	146
	12.7	10.2	25.6	25.6	12.3	13.6	332

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

## RJ project grant objectives

**Table 0-7 Important purposes of the RJ project grant scheme. Per cent.**

14. To what extent do you consider the following to be important purposes of the RJ project grant scheme?

	Highly important	Somewhat important	Less important	No opinion	N
<b>High scientific quality</b>	86.9	9.1	0.9	3.0	329
<b>Scientific renewal</b>	60.6	25.2	7.1	7.1	325
<b>Develop basic theory and methods</b>	41.0	43.4	8.6	7.0	327
<b>International cooperation</b>	19.7	47.1	23.4	9.8	325
<b>Interdisciplinary collaboration</b>	19.0	39.0	33.4	8.6	326
<b>Research recruitment</b>	14.3	44.7	25.2	15.8	322

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-8 Objectives of your own research/research group. Per cent.**

15. How would you describe your own research/research group's objectives in terms of the following dimensions:

	Always an important objective	Often an important objective	Sometimes an important objective	Never an important objective	N
<b>High scientific quality</b>	88.9	10.5	.6		324
<b>Scientific renewal</b>	60.3	33.4	5.3	0.9	320
<b>Develop basic theory and methods</b>	37.7	44.2	17.4	0.6	321
<b>International cooperation</b>	34.0	37.7	26.5	1.9	321
<b>Interdisciplinary collaboration</b>	29.1	32.8	33.1	5.0	320
<b>Research recruitment</b>	9.5	32.5	44.2	13.9	317

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-9 Important purposes of the RJ project grant scheme by RJ funding. Per cent.**

14. To what extent do you consider the following to be important purposes of the RJ project grant scheme?

<b>High scientific quality</b>					
	Highly important	Somewhat important	Less important	No opinion	N
<b>Funding</b>	93.0	6.4		0.5	187
<b>No funding</b>	78.9	12.7		6.3	142
	86.9	9.1		3.0	329
<b>Develop basic theory and methods</b>					
	Highly important	Somewhat important	Less important	No opinion	N
<b>Funding</b>	46.5	44.9	5.9	2.7	185
<b>No funding</b>	33.8	41.5	12.0	12.7	142
	41.0	43.4	8.6	7.0	327

<b>Scientific renewal</b>						
	Highly important	Somewhat important	Less important	No opinion	N	
<b>Funding</b>	65.8	27.7	3.3	3.3	184	
<b>No funding</b>	53.9	22.0	12.1	12.1	141	
	60.6	25.2	7.1	7.1	325	

  

<b>Research recruitment</b>						
	Highly important	Somewhat important	Less important	No opinion	N	
<b>Funding</b>	16.8	45.7	25.5	12.0	184	
<b>No funding</b>	10.9	43.5	24.6	21.0	138	
	14.3	44.7	25.2	15.8	322	

  

<b>International cooperation</b>						
	Highly important	Somewhat important	Less important	No opinion	N	
<b>Funding</b>	22.3	48.9	21.7	7.1	184	
<b>No funding</b>	16.3	44.7	25.5	13.5	141	
	19.7	47.1	23.4	9.8	325	

  

<b>Interdisciplinary collaboration</b>						
	Highly important	Somewhat important	Less important	No opinion	N	
<b>Funding</b>	22.6	42.5	29.0	5.9	186	
<b>No funding</b>	14.3	34.3	39.3	12.1	140	
	19.0	39.0	33.4	8.6	326	

  

<b>Other objectives (please specify below)</b>						
	Highly important	Somewhat important	Less important	No opinion	N	
<b>Funding</b>	6.7	5.7	3.8	83.8	105	
<b>No funding</b>	5.4	4.3	6.5	83.9	93	
	6.1	5.1	5.1	83.8	198	

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-10 Objectives of your own research/research group by RJ funding. Per cent.**

15. How would you describe your own research/research group's objectives in terms of the following dimensions:

<b>High scientific quality</b>					
	Always an important objective	Often an important objective	Sometimes an important objective	Never an important objective	N
<b>Funding</b>	90.7	8.7	0.5		183
<b>No funding</b>	86.5	12.8	0.7		141
	88.9	10.5	0.6		324
<b>Develop basic theory and methods</b>					
	Always an important objective	Often an important objective	Sometimes an important objective	Never an important objective	N
<b>Funding</b>	40.6	41.7	17.2	0.6	180
<b>No funding</b>	34.0	47.5	17.7	0.7	141
	37.7	44.2	17.4	0.6	321
<b>Scientific renewal</b>					
	Always an important objective	Often an important objective	Sometimes an important objective	Never an important objective	N
<b>Funding</b>	60.9	33.0	5.0	1.1	179
<b>No funding</b>	59.6	34.0	5.7	0.7	141
	60.3	33.4	5.3	0.9	320
<b>Research recruitment</b>					
	Always an important objective	Often an important objective	Sometimes an important objective	Never an important objective	N
<b>Funding</b>	10.7	29.9	43.5	15.8	177
<b>No funding</b>	7.9	35.7	45.0	11.4	140
	9.5	32.5	44.2	13.9	317
<b>International cooperation</b>					
	Always an important objective	Often an important objective	Sometimes an important objective	Never an important objective	N
<b>Funding</b>	32.0	41.4	24.9	1.7	181
<b>No funding</b>	36.4	32.9	28.6	2.1	140
	34.0	37.7	26.5	1.9	321
<b>Interdisciplinary collaboration</b>					
	Always an important objective	Often an important objective	Sometimes an important objective	Never an important objective	N
<b>Funding</b>	28.9	32.2	32.2	6.7	180
<b>No funding</b>	29.3	33.6	34.3	2.9	140
	29.1	32.8	33.1	5.0	320

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-11 Complementarity and task division between the RJ research support schemes and other national schemes by RJ funding. Per cent.**

16. How do you regard the complementarity and task division between the RJ research support schemes and other national schemes\*?

a) RJ support schemes are complementary to other national schemes in terms of the kinds of activities funded

	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	30.9	27.6	11.6	3.9		26.0	181
<b>No funding</b>	15.8	28.8	19.4	5.0	1.4	29.5	139
	24.4	28.1	15.0	4.4	0.6	27.5	320

b) RJ support schemes are complementary to other national schemes in terms of the size of the grants

	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	23.2	25.4	18.8	4.4	0.6	27.6	181
<b>No funding</b>	12.9	23.0	23.7	4.3	3.6	32.4	139
	18.8	24.4	20.9	4.4	1.9	29.7	320

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-12 Policies and review processes of the RJ project grant scheme. Per cent.**

17. In your opinion, to what degree does the RJ project grant scheme have the appropriate policies and review processes to:

	5 To a high degree	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Support well-founded and solid research?</b>	25.2	38.3	14.4	4.6	0.9	16.6	326
<b>Support the most promising and important research (in your field of research)?</b>	21.3	30.2	18.2	9.9	4.3	16.0	324
<b>Support original and ground breaking research?</b>	13.8	23.9	22.3	15.3	4.3	20.5	327
<b>Assess the potentials of junior scientists/select the best talents?</b>	9.5	17.5	20.6	13.8	3.4	35.1	325
<b>Support high-risk research?</b>	3.4	14.1	18.4	16.3	9.8	38.0	326

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.



**Table 0-13 Policies and review processes of the RJ project grant scheme by RJ funding. Per cent.**

17. In your opinion, to what degree does the RJ project grant scheme have the appropriate policies and review processes to:

<b>Support the most promising and important research (in your field of research)?</b>							
	5 To a high degree	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	30.6	36.6	13.7	2.2	1.6	15.3	183
<b>No funding</b>	9.2	22.0	24.1	19.9	7.8	17.0	141
	21.3	30.2	18.2	9.9	4.3	16.0	324
<b>Support high-risk research?</b>							
	5 To a high degree	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	4.9	19.1	20.8	11.5	4.9	38.8	183
<b>No funding</b>	1.4	7.7	15.4	22.4	16.1	37.1	143
	3.4	14.1	18.4	16.3	9.8	38.0	326
<b>Support well-founded and solid research?</b>							
	5 To a high degree	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	31.1	41.0	10.4	2.2		15.3	183
<b>No funding</b>	17.5	35.0	19.6	7.7	2.1	18.2	143
	25.2	38.3	14.4	4.6	.9	16.6	326
<b>Support original and ground breaking research?</b>							
	5 To a high degree	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	19.6	30.4	21.2	8.7		20.1	184
<b>No funding</b>	6.3	15.4	23.8	23.8	9.8	21.0	143
	13.8	23.9	22.3	15.3	4.3	20.5	327
<b>Assess the potentials of junior scientists/select the best talents?</b>							
	5 To a high degree	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	14.2	23.5	20.8	6.6	1.6	33.3	183
<b>No funding</b>	3.5	9.9	20.4	23.2	5.6	37.3	142
	9.5	17.5	20.6	13.8	3.4	35.1	325

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

## Funding outcome of your RJ project grant application

**Table 0-14 Awareness of alternative project funding sources by RJ funding. Per cent.**

18. Are you aware of other funding sources which would have been relevant for the project you applied to the RJ project grant scheme for?

	Yes	No	N
<b>Other Swedish funding sources</b>	94.6	5.4	184
<b>International funding sources</b>	40.8	59.2	169

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-15 RJ Project funding enable additional project funding sources. (funded project applicants only) Per cent.**

19. To what extent did the RJ project grant funding enable you to successfully compete for funding from other external sources?

Resulted in additional Swedish funding							
	5 To a high degree	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	9.2	9.8	6.0	2.2	24.5	48.4	184
	9.2	9.8	6.0	2.2	24.5	48.4	184
Resulted in additional international funding							
	5 To a high degree	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	2.2	4.4	1.7	2.8	34.8	54.1	181
	2.2	4.4	1.7	2.8	34.8	54.1	181

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-16 (Re)submission of the declined RJ project application. Per cent.**

20. Was your original RJ project grant application later (revised and) resubmitted to RJ or submitted to other funding schemes?

	No	Yes	N
<b>No funding</b>	31.3	69.7	152

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-17 Resubmission of the RJ project application. Per cent.**

21. To what scheme(s) was your application later submitted/resubmitted to and what was the outcome?

<b>RJ project grants</b>	Submitted, but no funding	Submitted and received funding	Submitted and still pending	N
<b>No funding</b>	70.9	27.3	1.8	55

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-18 Implementation after declined RJ project application. Per cent.**

23. Was the project you proposed implemented/performed without external funding?

	No	Partly	Yes	N
	55.8	26.7	17.4	86

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

## Role of RJ project scheme compared to other research funding schemes nationally/internationally

**Table 0-19 Comparing RJ project scheme with alternative Swedish funding sources. Per cent.**

24. Comparing RJ project scheme with alternative Swedish funding sources (i.e. Vetenskapsrådet, FAS and Formas), is the RJ project scheme poorer, about the same or better concerning:

	Better	About the same	Poorer	Cannot say	N
<b>Opportunities offered for doing unique/original research?</b>	24.1	46.5	7.0	22.5	316
<b>Opportunities for building new international scholarly networks?</b>	12.1	41.3	3.8	42.9	315
<b>Opportunities for maintaining international scholarly networks?</b>	9.5	41.3	3.5	45.7	315
<b>Opportunities offered for addressing high-risk topics?</b>	12.6	37.2	7.9	42.3	317
<b>Support for new projects without requiring preliminary research?</b>	11.1	42.7	5.7	40.5	316
<b>Opportunities offered for doing interdisciplinary research?</b>	17.4	43.4	4.4	34.8	316
<b>Opportunities offered for broadening your field of expertise?</b>	10.2	48.7	5.1	36.0	314
<b>Amount of funding?</b>	15.8	49.7	9.5	25.0	316
<b>Flexibility of use of funds?</b>	9.5	40.5	6.6	43.4	316
<b>Support for young scientists?</b>	7.3	35.9	8.6	48.3	315
<b>Impact on the prestige and career of the awarded investigators?</b>	12.7	51.7	3.5	32.1	315

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-20 Comparing RJ project scheme with alternative international funding sources. Per cent.**

25. Comparing the RJ project scheme with alternative international funding sources, and ERC funding schemes in particular, is the RJ scheme, about the same or better concerning:

	Better	About the same	Poorer	Cannot say	N
<b>Opportunities offered for doing unique/original research?</b>	11.9	10.9	5.1	72.1	312
<b>Opportunities for building new international scholarly networks?</b>	2.6	11.9	13.8	71.7	311
<b>Opportunities for maintaining international scholarly networks?</b>	2.3	14.1	11.3	72.3	311
<b>Opportunities offered for addressing high-risk topics?</b>	9.6	9.3	4.5	76.6	312
<b>Support for new projects without requiring preliminary research?</b>	9.0	12.5	1.9	76.6	312
<b>Opportunities offered for doing interdisciplinary research?</b>	3.9	17.0	5.8	73.3	311
<b>Opportunities offered for broadening your field of expertise?</b>	5.4	16.0	4.8	73.7	312
<b>Amount of funding?</b>	5.1	11.2	14.1	69.6	312
<b>Flexibility of use of funds?</b>	12.8	10.6	1.9	74.7	312
<b>Support for young scientists?</b>	5.1	14.4	4.2	76.3	312
<b>Impact on the prestige and career of the awarded investigators?</b>	1.6	12.8	13.8	71.8	312

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-21 Comparing RJ project scheme with alternative Swedish funding sources by RJ project funding. Per cent.**

25. Comparing the RJ project scheme with alternative international funding sources, and ERC funding schemes in particular, is the RJ scheme, about the same or better concerning:

<b>Opportunities offered for doing unique/original research?</b>					
	Better	About the same	Poorer	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	14.5	11.7	1.1	72.6	179
<b>No funding</b>	8.3	9.8	10.5	71.4	133
	11.9	10.9	5.1	72.1	312
<b>Opportunities for building new international scholarly networks?</b>					
	Better	About the same	Poorer	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	3.4	13.4	10.6	72.6	179
<b>No funding</b>	1.5	9.8	18.2	70.5	132
	2.6	11.9	13.8	71.7	311
<b>Opportunities for maintaining international scholarly networks</b>					
	Better	About the same	Poorer	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	3.4	15.7	8.4	72.5	178
<b>No funding</b>	0.8	12.0	15.0	72.2	133
	2.3	14.1	11.3	72.3	311
<b>Opportunities offered for addressing high-risk topics?</b>					
	Better	About the same	Poorer	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	12.8	7.8	2.8	76.5	179
<b>No funding</b>	5.3	11.3	6.8	76.7	133
	9.6	9.3	4.5	76.6	312
<b>Support for new projects without requiring preliminary research?</b>					
	Better	About the same	Poorer	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	11.2	11.7	0.6	76.5	179
<b>No funding</b>	6.0	13.5	3.8	76.7	133
<b>Opportunities offered for doing interdisciplinary research?</b>					
	Better	About the same	Poorer	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	5.0	17.3	3.9	73.7	179
<b>No funding</b>	2.3	16.7	8.3	72.7	132
	3.9	17.0	5.8	73.3	311
<b>Opportunities offered for broadening your field of expertise?</b>					
	Better	About the same	Poorer	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	7.3	17.3	2.8	72.6	179
<b>No funding</b>	3.0	14.3	7.5	75.2	133
	5.4	16.0	4.8	73.7	312
<b>Amount of funding?</b>					
	Better	About the same	Poorer	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	4.5	10.6	12.8	72.1	179
<b>No funding</b>	6.0	12.0	15.8	66.2	133
	5.1	11.2	14.1	69.6	312

<b>Flexibility of use of funds?</b>					
	Better	About the same	Poorer	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	15.1	9.5	1.1	74.3	179
<b>No funding</b>	9.8	12.0	3.0	75.2	133
	12.8	10.6	1.9	74.7	312

  

<b>Support for young scientists?</b>					
	Better	About the same	Poorer	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	6.7	16.2	3.4	73.7	179
<b>No funding</b>	3.0	12.0	5.3	79.7	133
	5.1	14.4	4.2	76.3	312

  

<b>Impact on the prestige and career of the awarded investigators?</b>					
	Better	About the same	Poorer	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	1.7	14.0	11.7	72.6	179
<b>No funding</b>	1.5	11.3	16.5	70.7	133
	1.6	12.8	13.8	71.8	312

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

## Project results

**Table 0-22 Importance of the project on your organization by RJ project funding. Per cent.**

28. At what level in your organisation has the project has the had most importance?

	The department	The faculty	The organisation as a whole	N
<b>Funding</b>	77.2	12.0	10.8	158
<b>No funding</b>	75.4	13.8	10.8	65
	76.7	12.6	10.8	223

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-23 Statements about project results. Per cent.**

29. To what extent do you agree with the following statements? Please answer for the specific project.

	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know	N
a) I had higher ambitions for this project than for my research funded by my own institution	32.4	18.8	27.6	2.0	5.6	13.6	250
b) The project had a positive impact on my research career (e.g. new research position/promotion based on research resulting from the project)	43.5	25.8	16.1	1.6	2.0	10.9	248
c) The project led to some unexpected results of great importance to my research field	35.6	36.0	14.6	1.6	0.4	11.7	247
d) My research and innovation management skills have been significantly improved as a result of the project	27.5	41.8	18.9	0.8	2.0	9.0	244
e) The project has improved my department's reputation in Swedish and international research communities	22.3	37.2	21.9	0.8	2.0	15.8	247
f) As a result of the project, my department has better opportunities for attracting research talents in my field of research	14.3	24.1	29.4	5.3	5.3	21.6	245
g) As a result of the project funding, my department is more able to prioritise new research areas	6.6	14.5	40.9	5.0	9.1	24.0	242
h) Through the project new research areas of significant importance for our future research/innovation activities have been explored	32.4	31.6	18.4	2.0	2.5	13.1	244
i) The project has changed my research activities towards larger collaborative projects	15.0	41.1	26.0	5.3	5.7	6.9	246
j) A new research group was established as a result of the project	14.8	28.7	22.5	7.0	20.9	6.1	244
k) Long term international cooperation links have been considerably enhanced as a result of the project	28.9	34.1	19.1	4.1	6.5	7.3	246
l) The project has led to or contributed to innovation (improved products, processes or organisational methods)	6.6	17.2	32.0	4.5	18.4	21.3	244
m) The project has contributed to solving social challenges	5.3	21.5	28.5	4.1	15.9	24.8	246

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-24 Statements about project results by RJ project funding. Per cent.**

29. To what extent do you agree with the following statements? Please answer for the specific project.

a) I had higher ambitions for this project than for my research funded by my own institution							
	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know	N
<b>Funding</b>	32.2	20.1	27.0	1.1	3.4	16.1	174
<b>No funding</b>	32.9	15.8	28.9	3.9	10.5	7.9	76
	32.4	18.8	27.6	2.0	5.6	13.6	250

  

b) The project had a positive impact on my research career (e.g. new research position/promotion based on research resulting from the project)							
	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know	N
<b>Funding</b>	50.6	28.2	12.6		1.7	6.9	174
<b>No funding</b>	27.0	20.3	24.3	5.4	2.7	20.3	74
	43.5	25.8	16.1	1.6	2.0	10.9	248

  

c) The project led to some unexpected results of great importance to my research field							
	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know	N
<b>Funding</b>	37.7	37.1	14.3	1.1		9.7	175
<b>No funding</b>	30.6	33.3	15.3	2.8	1.4	16.7	72
	35.6	36.0	14.6	1.6	0.4	11.7	247

  

d) My research and innovation management skills have been significantly improved as a result of the project							
	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know	N
<b>Funding</b>	28.3	45.7	17.9	1.2	1.2	5.8	173
<b>No funding</b>	25.4	32.4	21.1		4.2	16.9	71
	27.5	41.8	18.9	0.8	2.0	9.0	244

  

e) The project has improved my department's reputation in Swedish and international research communities							
	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know	N
<b>Funding</b>	24.0	41.7	21.7		1.7	10.9	175
<b>No funding</b>	18.1	26.4	22.2	2.8	2.8	27.8	72
	22.3	37.2	21.9	0.8	2.0	15.8	247

f) As a result of the project, my department has better opportunities for attracting research talents in my field of research							
	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know	N
<b>Funding</b>	14.9	29.3	28.7	3.4	5.2	18.4	174
<b>No funding</b>	12.7	11.3	31.0	9.9	5.6	29.6	71
	14.3	24.1	29.4	5.3	5.3	21.6	245

  

g) As a result of the project funding, my department is more able to prioritise new research areas							
	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know	N
<b>Funding</b>	7.6	16.9	45.3	2.9	7.0	20.3	172
<b>No funding</b>	4.3	8.6	30.0	10.0	14.3	32.9	70
	6.6	14.5	40.9	5.0	9.1	24.0	242

  

h) Through the project new research areas of significant importance for our future research/innovation activities have been explored							
	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know	N
<b>Funding</b>	34.5	35.1	17.2	1.7	1.1	10.3	174
<b>No funding</b>	27.1	22.9	21.4	2.9	5.7	20.0	70
	32.4	31.6	18.4	2.0	2.5	13.1	244

  

i) The project has changed my research activities towards larger collaborative projects							
	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know	N
<b>Funding</b>	16.1	45.4	23.6	5.2	5.7	4.0	174
<b>No funding</b>	12.5	30.6	31.9	5.6	5.6	13.9	72
	15.0	41.1	26.0	5.3	5.7	6.9	246

  

j) A new research group was established as a result of the project							
	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know	N
<b>Funding</b>	15.7	29.7	24.4	7.6	18.6	4.1	172
<b>No funding</b>	12.5	26.4	18.1	5.6	26.4	11.1	72
	14.8	28.7	22.5	7.0	20.9	6.1	244



k) Long term international cooperation links have been considerably enhanced as a result of the project							
	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know	N
<b>Funding</b>	29.3	36.2	18.4	3.4	6.9	5.7	174
<b>No funding</b>	27.8	29.2	20.8	5.6	5.6	11.1	72
	28.9	34.1	19.1	4.1	6.5	7.3	246

l) The project has led to or contributed to innovation (improved products, processes or organisational methods)							
	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know	N
<b>Funding</b>	7.0	18.0	32.0	4.1	18.0	20.9	172
<b>No funding</b>	5.6	15.3	31.9	5.6	19.4	22.2	72
	6.6	17.2	32.0	4.5	18.4	21.3	244

m) The project has contributed to solving social challenges							
	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know	N
<b>Funding</b>	4.6	23.0	31.0	4.6	15.5	21.3	174
<b>No funding</b>	6.9	18.1	22.2	2.8	16.7	33.3	72
	5.3	21.5	28.5	4.1	15.9	24.8	246

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-25 Nature of RJ project compared to your other projects. Per cent.**

30. Please compare the nature of your most recent RJ project with your other R&D projects and indicate which projects...

	The RJ project	No difference	Other projects	Cannot say/NA	N
<b>a) are most strategically important to your organisation?</b>	26.0	36.5	4.2	33.3	192
<b>b) are most oriented towards basic research?</b>	24.6	41.4	5.8	28.3	191
<b>c) provide most new scientific results?</b>	29.5	39.4	1.0	30.1	193
<b>d) are most scientifically risky?</b>	16.1	36.3	9.3	38.3	193
<b>e) have the highest scientific quality?</b>	23.4	44.8	2.1	29.7	192
<b>f) are most long-term?</b>	28.5	33.2	9.8	28.5	193
<b>g) are most multidisciplinary?</b>	20.5	34.7	14.7	30.0	190
<b>h) are most internationally oriented?</b>	22.4	39.6	8.3	29.7	192

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-26 Nature of RJ project compared to your other projects by RJ project funding. Per cent.**

30. Please compare the nature of your most recent RJ project with your other R&D projects and indicate which projects...					
a) are most strategically important to your organisation?					
	The RJ project	No difference	Other projects	Cannot say/NA	N
<b>Funding</b>	25.0	37.8	5.1	32.1	156
<b>No funding</b>	30.6	30.6		38.9	36
	26.0	36.5	4.2	33.3	192
b) are most oriented towards basic research?					
	The RJ project	No difference	Other projects	Cannot say/NA	N
<b>Funding</b>	24.7	41.6	6.5	27.3	154
<b>No funding</b>	24.3	40.5	2.7	32.4	37
	24.6	41.4	5.8	28.3	191
c) provide most new scientific results?					
	The RJ project	No difference	Other projects	Cannot say/NA	N
<b>Funding</b>	30.8	40.4	.6	28.2	156
<b>No funding</b>	24.3	35.1	2.7	37.8	37
	29.5	39.4	1.0	30.1	193
d) are most scientifically risky?					
	The RJ project	No difference	Other projects	Cannot say/NA	N
<b>Funding</b>	17.9	37.2	8.3	36.5	156
<b>No funding</b>	8.1	32.4	13.5	45.9	37
	16.1	36.3	9.3	38.3	193
e) have the highest scientific quality?					
	The RJ project	No difference	Other projects	Cannot say/NA	N
<b>Funding</b>	25.0	45.5	1.9	27.6	156
<b>No funding</b>	16.7	41.7	2.8	38.9	36
	23.4	44.8	2.1	29.7	192
f) are most long-term?					
	The RJ project	No difference	Other projects	Cannot say/NA	N
<b>Funding</b>	30.1	34.6	9.0	26.3	156
<b>No funding</b>	21.6	27.0	13.5	37.8	37
	28.5	33.2	9.8	28.5	193
g) are most multidisciplinary?					
	The RJ project	No difference	Other projects	Cannot say/NA	N
<b>Funding</b>	21.9	35.5	15.5	27.1	155
<b>No funding</b>	14.3	31.4	11.4	42.9	35
	20.5	34.7	14.7	30.0	190

h) are most internationally oriented? Crosstabulation					
	The RJ project	No difference	Other projects	Cannot say/NA	N
<b>Funding</b>	24.4	41.7	7.1	26.9	156
<b>No funding</b>	13.9	30.6	13.9	41.7	36
	22.4	39.6	8.3	29.7	192

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-27 Significance of RJ project compared to your other projects. Per cent.**

37. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the the significance of RJ project support:

	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Cannot say	N
a) RJ project support is significant for building larger research environments/ mileus at the institution	34.0	28.8	16.0	4.3	2.1	14.7	326
b) RJ project support provides a flexible budgeting for research projects	25.9	29.6	17.3	3.4	2.2	21.6	324
c) RJ project support are of great importance for the financing of the Swedish Humanities / Social Research	69.6	16.0	3.7	1.5	0.6	8.6	326
d) RJ project support increases the rate of temporary positions in Academia	31.6	23.8	13.9	2.5	0.6	27.6	323

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

**Table 0-28 Nature of RJ project compared to your other projects by RJ project funding. Per cent.**

37. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the the significance of RJ project support:

a) RJ project support is significant for building larger research environments/ mileus at the institution							
	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	37.6	33.1	14.9	2.2	1.7	10.5	181
<b>No funding</b>	29.7	23.4	17.2	6.9	2.8	20.0	145
	34.0	28.8	16.0	4.3	2.1	14.7	326

  

b) RJ project support provides flexible budgeting for research projects							
	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	31.7	37.8	13.3	3.3	2.2	11.7	180
<b>No funding</b>	18.8	19.4	22.2	3.5	2.1	34.0	144
	25.9	29.6	17.3	3.4	2.2	21.6	324

c) RJ project support is of great importance for the financing of the Swedish Humanities / Social Research							
	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	81.2	9.4	3.3	0.6		5.5	181
<b>No funding</b>	55.2	24.1	4.1	2.8	1.4	12.4	145
	69.6	16.0	3.7	1.5	0.6	8.6	326

d) RJ project support increases the rate of temporary positions in Academia							
	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Cannot say	N
<b>Funding</b>	34.1	24.0	15.6	2.8	0.6	22.9	179
<b>No funding</b>	28.5	23.6	11.8	2.1	0.7	33.3	144
	31.6	23.8	13.9	2.5	0.6	27.6	323

Source: Survey of RJ applicants 2005-2010.

## Appendix 2 Questionnaire to RJ project applicants

### RJ Project PI Survey Questionnaire

#### Project confirmation

This survey addresses researchers who have applied for independent project grants (RJ-projekt) financed by Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (RJ). The experiences of both successful and unsuccessful applicants are of great value to the ongoing evaluation and possible restructuring of the RJ grant scheme.

The questionnaire relates to your RJ-project application listed below. We appreciate your responses about your experience and views on the RJ-project application process, the RJ-project funding scheme, as well as relevant alternative funding schemes. First, we would like you to confirm some basic information about your RJ-project application so we can direct you to the relevant questions.

**Application and funding:** Prefilled information based on RJ-project administrative records, to be verified by you below.

1. Please confirm that the information in question 2, 3 and 4 below is correct. In case you were not the principal investigator of the project, please type in the correct information in the box below.

- Yes, the prefilled project information below is correct or has been corrected by me
- I cannot say; the principal investigator for the specified RJ project was (please fill in name and e-mail-address):

2. RJ-project application/ project name:

3. Year of application:

4. RJ-project funding of application:

- No funding  Funding

5. To avoid answering the entire questionnaire for multiple RJ-project applications, please select the correct category below.

- I have received this questionnaire only and can answer for the application specified above
- I have received multiple questionnaires and want to complete the entire questionnaire for the application specified above.
- I have already completed the entire questionnaire for another application (when you select this option, you will be directed to the application specific questions and skip all general questions, i.e. your opinions about the RJ-project scheme and objectives).
- I don't know this application (when you select this option you are excluded from the respondent group, you will be directed to the last page of the survey, then please select "submit")

Start

Powered by  
[Opinio Survey Software](#)

**RJ Project PI Survey Questionnaire**

6. Please indicate the number of researchers who participated in the project. (If no part of the project was implemented, indicate the number of researchers listed in the project application).

	Number of people in recruitment positions (PhDs/postdocs)	Number of senior staff	Other staff
Own organisation	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
External partner organisations	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

7. Please indicate your approximate number of applications to Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (RJ) between 2005 and 2010 (only include applications with you as principal investigator/project leader).

Total number of RJ project grant applications	<input type="text"/>
Total number of other RJ applications	<input type="text"/>

8. Please indicate the kinds of RJ schemes which have funded your research in the period 2005-2010:

	Yes	No
RJ project grants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
RJ programme grants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
RJ infrastructural project grants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
RJ research initiation grants support for conferences, seminars, workshops and creation of new researcher networks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pro Futura (RJ post-doctoral programme) collaborative effort with The Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other RJ funding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other RJ funding, please specify

9. Please give an estimate of how your research was financed by other sources than your own organisation in 2011. Has the share decreased or increased since 2005?

	Proportion 2011			
	%	Decreased	Unchanged	Increased
External funding	<input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10. Please indicate your main external (other than your own organisation's funding sources) for research projects since 2005

- RJ  
 Other Swedish sources  
 International sources  
 None

Powered by  
[Opinio Survey Software](#)

**RJ Project PI Survey Questionnaire****RJ project grant application process: information and contact with RJ**

11. Considering your RJ application(s) in general, to what extent were the following RJ (funding) processes satisfactory?

	5 To a great extent	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say
Access to relevant background information for the call	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Clarity and easy to understand information about the call	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support during the application process	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The types of applications and size of projects accepted (in the call for applications)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The competence of the RJ external experts from Sweden and abroad	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transparency regarding funding decisions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Clarity and completeness of the feedback to applicants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
User-friendliness of the reporting system	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12. To what degree do you think that the reviewers who assessed your application:

	5 To a great extent	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say
Was able to assess all the fields of research involved in the application?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provided an impartial and unbiased assessment of your application?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provided a thorough assessment of your application?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you have comments concerning obstacles or needs for improvements in the terms for applications, or the review process, please use the free text section below

Powered by  
[Opinio Survey Software](http://www.opinio.no/)

**RJ Project PI Survey Questionnaire**

13. To what degree do you think that RJ provided sufficient feedback in the initial phase of the application process including your sketch?

- 5 To a great extent
- 4
- 3
- 2
- 1 Not at all
- Cannot say

If you have comments concerning obstacles or needs for improvements in the terms for applications, or the review process, please use the free text section below

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

[Back](#) [Next](#)

Powered by  
[Opinio Survey Software](#)



### RJ Project PI Survey Questionnaire

#### RJ project grant objectives

14. To what extent do you consider the following to be important purposes of the RJ project grant scheme?

	Highly important	Somewhat important	Less important	No opinion
High scientific quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Develop basic theory and methods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Scientific renewal	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Research recruitment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
International cooperation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Interdisciplinary collaboration	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other objectives (please specify below)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

15. How would you describe your own research/research group's objectives in terms of the following dimensions:

	Always an important objective	Often an important objective	Sometimes an important objective	Never an important objective
High scientific quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Develop basic theory and methods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Scientific renewal	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Research recruitment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
International cooperation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Interdisciplinary collaboration	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

16. How do you regard the complementarity and task division between the RJ research support schemes and other national schemes\*?

\* e.g. research programmes, infrastructural and institutional measures (centre schemes, funding for scientific equipment/databases, basic funding to research institutes).

	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Cannot say
RJ support schemes are complementary to other national schemes in terms of the kinds of activities funded	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
RJ support schemes are complementary to other national schemes in terms of the size of the grants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you think the complementarity needs to be improved, please elaborate in the free text section below (e.g. if there are funding needs that are not covered by any RJ scheme, or schemes that should be better coordinated to avoid overlap)

Powered by  
[Opinio Survey Software](http://www.opinio.no/)

**RJ Project PI Survey Questionnaire**

17. In your opinion, to what degree does the RJ project grant scheme have the appropriate policies and review processes to:

	5 To a high degree	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say
Support the most promising and important research (in your field of research)?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support high-risk research?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support well-founded and solid research?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support original and ground breaking research?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assess the potentials of junior scientists/select the best talents?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Powered by  
[Opinio Survey Software](http://www.opinio.no)

**RJ Project PI Survey Questionnaire****Funding outcome of your RJ project grant application**

18. Are you aware of other funding sources which would have been relevant for the project you applied to the RJ project grant scheme for?

	Yes	No
Other Swedish funding sources	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
International funding sources	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

19. To what extent did the RJ project grant funding enable you to successfully compete for funding from other external sources?

	5 To a high degree	4	3	2	1 Not at all	Cannot say
Resulted in additional Swedish funding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Resulted in additional international funding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

20. Was your original RJ project grant application later (revised and) resubmitted to RJ or submitted to other funding schemes?

- Yes  
 No

Powered by  
[Opinio Survey Software](http://www.opinio.no/)

**RJ Project PI Survey Questionnaire**

21. To what scheme(s) was your application later submitted/resubmitted to and what was the outcome?

	Submitted, but no funding	Submitted and received funding	Submitted and still pending
RJ project grants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
RJ programme	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
RJ Infrastructural support	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
RJ research initiation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Submitted, but no funding	Submitted and received funding	Submitted and still pending
FP 7 Ideas (European Research Council)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other parts of FP7 or FP 6	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify below)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other, please specify

22. Please indicate the total funding resulting from resubmitting the application:

- Received no funding
- Received the same or similar to the sum requested in the original RJ project application
- Received more funding than the sum in the original RJ project application
- Received less funding than the sum in the original RJ project application
- Don't remember

[Back](#) [Next](#)

Powered by  
[Opinio Survey Software](#)

**RJ Project PI Survey Questionnaire**

Role of RJ project scheme compared to other research funding schemes nationally/internationally

23. Was the project you proposed implemented/performed without external funding?

- Yes  
 Partly  
 No

24. Comparing RJ project scheme with alternative Swedish funding sources (i.e. Vetenskapsrådet, FAS and Formas), is the RJ project scheme poorer, about the same or better concerning:

	Better	About the same	Poorer	Cannot say
Opportunities offered for doing unique/original research?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunities offered for addressing high-risk topics?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support for new projects without requiring preliminary research?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunities offered for doing interdisciplinary research?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunities offered for broadening your field of expertise?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Amount of funding?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Flexibility of use of funds?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support for young scientists?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Impact on the prestige and career of the awarded investigators?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunities for building new international scholarly networks?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunities for maintaining international scholarly networks?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

25. Comparing the RJ project scheme with alternative international funding sources, and ERC funding schemes in particular, is the RJ scheme, about the same or better concerning:

	Better	About the same	Poorer	Cannot say
Opportunities offered for doing unique/original research?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunities offered for addressing high-risk topics?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support for new projects without requiring preliminary research?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunities offered for doing interdisciplinary research?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunities offered for broadening your field of expertise?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Amount of funding?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Flexibility of use of funds?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support for young scientists?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Impact on the prestige and career of the awarded investigators?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunities for building new international scholarly networks?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunities for maintaining international scholarly networks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Back Next

Powered by  
[Opinio Survey Software](http://www.opinio.com)

### RJ Project PI Survey Questionnaire

#### Project results

26. Please indicate the number of Postdocs resulting from the project

	Number
Ended postdocs	<input type="text"/>
Postdocs in progress	<input type="text"/>

27. Please indicate the number of scientific publications which are a direct result of the project.

Include both those authored by you and those authored by other project group members. Publication that were mainly funded by other sources should not be included. PhD theses should not be included.

Number of articles/book chapters published	<input type="text"/>
Number of books/monographies published	<input type="text"/>

28. At what level in your organisation has the project has the had most importance?

- The organisation as a whole  
 The faculty  
 The department

Other, specify:

29. To what extent do you agree with the following statements? Please answer for the specific project.

	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know
a) I had higher ambitions for this project than for my research funded by my own institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b) The project had a positive impact on my research career (e.g. new research position/promotion based on research resulting from the project)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c) The project led to some unexpected results of great importance to my research field	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d) My research and innovation management skills have been significantly improved as a result of the project	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e) The project has improved my department's reputation in Swedish and international research communities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f) As a result of the project, my department has better opportunities for attracting research talents in my field of research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g) As a result of the project funding, my department is more able to prioritise new research areas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h) Through the project new research areas of significant importance for our future research/innovation activities have been explored	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Don't know
i) The project has changed my research activities towards larger collaborative projects	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j) A new research group was established as a result of the project	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
k) Long term international cooperation links have been considerably enhanced as a result of the project	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
l) The project has led to or contributed to innovation (improved products, processes or organisational methods)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
m) The project has contributed to solving social challenges	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Back Next

**RJ Project PI Survey Questionnaire**

30.

Please compare the nature of your most recent RJ project with your other R&D projects and indicate which projects...

	The RJ project	No difference	Other projects	Cannot say/NA
a) are most strategically important to your organisation?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b) are most oriented towards basic research?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c) provide most new scientific results?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d) are most scientifically risky?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e) have the highest scientific quality?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f) are most long-term?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g) are most multidisciplinary?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h) are most internationally oriented?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

 Powered by  
[Opinio Survey Software](http://www.opinio.no/)

**RJ Project PI Survey Questionnaire**

31. What is your current position?

Select Position

Other..

32. Your age   
and gender:

Female

Male

33. Please indicate your (main) current institutional affiliation

Select institutional category

Other (please specify)

34. Please state your area of research

Humanities (incl. theology)

Social science (incl. law)

Centre, group, institute etc. with high degree of cross-disciplinarity

Other

Please state your academic speciality (ie. sociology, English literature)

35. International co-operation: Indicate the share of your research that are carried out in co-operation with researchers from other countries:

Percentage

36. Considering your research projects the past 5 years (that you led or took part in), how many researchers at your institution usually participate in these projects (including doctoral students)?

Average number of (local) group members

Powered by  
[Opinio Survey Software](#)



**RJ Project PI Survey Questionnaire**

37. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the the significance of RJ project support:

	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Cannot say
a) RJ project support is significant for building larger research environments/ mileus at the institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b) RJ project support provides a flexible budgeting for research projects	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c) RJ project support are of great importance for the financing of the Swedish Humanities / Social Research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d) RJ project support increases the rate of temporary positions in Academia	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

38. Other comments:

Please feel free to give your comments below concerning your overall RJ experience, the RJ project scheme's challenges and areas for improvement (or comments about this survey).

Powered by  
[Opinio Survey Software](http://www.opinio.no)

Nordisk institutt for studier av  
innovasjon, forskning og utdanning

Nordic Institute for Studies in  
Innovation, Research and Education

[www.nifu.no](http://www.nifu.no)