

# Unknown, unloved? About companies with R&D-activity, experiences with PhD holders, and employers' perceptions of their skills

Authors: Veerle Huyghe<sup>1</sup>, Katia Levecque<sup>1</sup>, Alain De Beuckelaer<sup>1,2</sup>

## FROM PHD TO COMPANY

The vast majority of PhD holders in Flanders eventually transition to the non-academic labor market after defending their PhD. This is no different in other knowledge regions (OECD, 2023). In Flanders, various stakeholders are undertaking initiatives to optimize the intersectoral mobility of PhD holders. In this context, intersectoral mobility is regarded as an important lever for knowledge diffusion and knowledge valorization. Knowledge diffusion refers to the transfer of academic knowledge to the professional field. Knowledge valorization, in turn, refers to making innovative technologies and knowledge accessible to the social and economic sectors.

In the Flemish Policy Note on Economy, Science, Innovation and Industry 2024-2029 (Diependaele, 2024), knowledge diffusion and knowledge valorization form part of the objectives aimed at fostering productivity growth in Flanders. To optimize this knowledge diffusion and knowledge valorization, the Flemish government has, since 2013, made structural investments in programs aimed at the broader development of junior researchers through the so-called *Support for Junior Researchers* (OJO) funding (Bongers et al., 2018). This is achieved through training both subject-specific and transferable skills. Other initiatives by the Flemish government take place, amongst others, through Flanders Innovation and Entrepreneurship (VLAIO). Companies can turn to VLAIO for support, advice, and applications for funding. For example, VLAIO supports the financing of (post)doctoral positions situated at the intersection of academia and industry (such as co-funding through Baekeland mandates and funding through innovation mandates). In addition, the Flemish Government also provides funding for example through the Industrial Research Fund (IOF), an internal fund of an association (a university and one or more universities of applied sciences), whose resources are used for strategic basic research and applied scientific research with an economic or socio-economic objective.

From the Federal Government, companies can also receive support through a partial exemption from the remittance of payroll withholding tax to the tax authorities. This measure can be applied when a company employs researchers in fundamental research, industrial research, or

experimental development (see, among others, BELSPO, n.d.). As of 2027, changes will be introduced to this measure (VLAIO, 2026).

The strategic importance of knowledge diffusion and knowledge valorization for Flanders' future competitiveness can be found in the recommendations of both the Flemish Advisory Council for Innovation and Entrepreneurship (VARIO) and the Social and Economic Council of Flanders (SERV). In its report *Strategic Choices for Flanders*, VARIO (2026) recommends, among other things, placing a stronger focus on strategic domains in which scientific excellence, innovation capacity, and economic valorization reinforce one another. The report also explicitly highlights the importance of entrepreneurship and the availability of highly qualified talent as crucial preconditions for economic dynamics. Within this context, PhD holders are an important link: they possess advanced research competencies and can serve as a bridge between knowledge institutions and companies, thereby contributing to the diffusion, application, and further development of new knowledge. In its advisory report *Towards a Valorization-Oriented Flemish R&D&I System*, SERV (2026) likewise argues that Flanders performs strongly at the international level in research and innovation, but that the translation of knowledge into economic and societal applications requires further strengthening. The council therefore puts forward fourteen action points aimed at promoting knowledge diffusion, knowledge valorization, and collaboration between knowledge institutions and companies. Particular attention is devoted to human capital, the mobility of knowledge workers, and improving the flux of expertise between research and business environments.

From the side of the Flemish universities, united within the Flemish Interuniversity Council (VLIR), a range of initiatives, alongside the training programs offered by the Doctoral Schools, is being undertaken to optimally prepare junior researchers and enhance their employability. These initiatives include [job shadowing](#), [job markets](#), a [PhD Talent Advisory Board](#) and a [PhD Talent Pool](#). All of these initiatives aim to strengthen connections between academia and the non-academic labor market and to facilitate successful transitions between the two sectors.

<sup>1</sup> ECOOM HR in R&D: Ghent University, Department General & Applied Psychology, Henri Dunantlaan 2, 9000 Ghent, Belgium

<sup>2</sup> ECOOM HR in R&D: Ghent University, University Services, Functional Domain Research, Universiteitsstraat 8, 9000 Ghent, Belgium

## WHAT SKILLS DO PHD HOLDERS BRING TO COMPANIES?

The answer to this question depends, in part, on who is replying. Within ECOOM HR in R&D, we monitor researchers' careers from a multi-stakeholder perspective. More specifically, in our monitoring activities the perspective of junior researchers (see [ECOOM HR in R&D](#), n.d.-a), of PhD holders both within and outside academia (see [ECOOM HR in R&D](#), n.d.-b, and [ECOOM HR in R&D](#), n.d.-c), are included, as well as policymakers and employers (see below; Bebiroglu et al., 2026). This sheds light on different perceptions and perspectives, as well as different expectations regarding the PhD and PhD holders.

A brief survey conducted by De Grande et al. (2014) provided initial insights into employers' perceptions in Flanders regarding the skills they seek in researchers. These insights were later refined through in-depth interviews with employers (Stassen et al., 2016). One of the key angles in the interviews with employers conducted by Mortier et al. (2022) concerned entrepreneurship among PhD holders. These interviews also provided extensive insights into entrepreneurial skills. Entrepreneurial skills are, of course, not only useful for starting one's own business but are also essential for innovation and success within existing organizations.

## SKILLS OF PHD HOLDERS ACCORDING TO EMPLOYERS IN THE SURVEY OF EMPLOYERS 2022

In 2022, ECOOM HR in R&D conducted a more in-depth survey of employers regarding PhD holders through the *Survey of Employers 2022*. The survey reached 226 companies with R&D activities and focused on a range of topics, including the recruitment and employability of PhD holders within their organizations, as well as initiatives that could help promote these. For more information about the survey, the companies that participated, their representativeness, and the topics covered, we refer to ECOOM-brief 48.

In ECOOM-briefs 59 and 60, we presented initial findings from the survey regarding the skills that companies with R&D activities believe PhD holders possess. ECOOM-brief 59 provides a descriptive view of how employers assess the presence of 15 specific skills, such as expertise, learning ability, business skills, teamwork, and pragmatism. In ECOOM-brief 60, we explored the underlying patterns in employers' perceptions about the skills of PhD holders. Three patterns emerged: "professional attitude & cognitive capacity", "pragmatism & business skills", and "agility & goal orientation". Appendix 1 gives a list of the specific skills that make up each of these patterns. For further details on the 15 surveyed skills and the analytical approaches applied to them, we refer to ECOOM-briefs 59 and 60.

In what follows, we examine whether employers' perceptions regarding the skills of PhD holders differ according to key company characteristics. More specifically, we address the following four research questions:

1. *Do employers' perceptions differ depending on size, lifespan and sector of the company?*

2. *Do employers' perceptions differ depending on R&D&I-characteristics?*
3. *Do employers' perceptions differ depending on whether the company has experience with PhD holders?*
4. *Do employers' perceptions differ depending on who responded to the survey questions?*

In Table 1, we report the mean scores for the skills that make up "professional attitude & cognitive capacity", "pragmatism & business skills", and "agility & goal orientation". Differences in employers' perceptions are examined using Welch's ANOVA. Given the limited sample size, we report not only the conventional significance threshold ( $p < 0.05$ ) but also indicative significance at  $0.05 < p < 0.10$ . These indicative significance levels suggest that a statistically significant association might have been detected if a larger number of companies had participated in the survey.

## DO EMPLOYERS' PERCEPTIONS DIFFER DEPENDING ON SIZE, LIFESPAN AND SECTOR OF THE COMPANY?

In Table 1, we find that company size is associated with perceptions about PhD holders' "professional attitude & cognitive capacity", "pragmatism & business skills", and "agility & goal orientation". For "professional attitude & cognitive capacity", this association is indicatively significant. The overall pattern by company size shows that medium-sized and large companies express themselves the most positive across all three dimensions. Looking at company lifespan, we observe a significant association with perceptions of "pragmatism & business skills". Companies that have been active in the economy for a decade or longer report the most positive perceptions of these skills among PhD holders.

Looking at the sector in which a company operates, we do not observe any systematic differences in employers' perceptions about the skills of PhD holders. For the analysis, companies were grouped according to the NACEBEL classification system (<https://statbel.fgov.be/nl>). This resulted in four categories: "industry", "professional, scientific & technical activities", "information & communication", and "other".

## DO EMPLOYERS' PERCEPTIONS DIFFER DEPENDING ON R&D&I-CHARACTERISTICS?

Table 1 also differentiates companies according to a set of R&D&I characteristics. More specifically, we differentiate companies according to the R&D-intensity of their sector, as defined by BELSPO category 3 (<https://meri.belspo.be/>). We also distinguish between companies that engage exclusively in internal R&D and those that combine internal and external R&D-activities. The same distinction is made with respect to innovation activities. Finally, we differentiate companies according to whether their R&D-activities or innovation activities are conducted on a permanent or an occasional basis.

Table 1. Perceptions of companies regarding the “professional attitude & cognitive capacity”, “pragmatism & business skills”, and “agility & goal orientation” of PhD holders, differentiation by various company characteristics (Flanders, 2022)

|                                                           | Professional attitude & cognitive capacity | Pragmatism & business skills | Agility & goal orientation |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Company size (N=225)</b>                               | <b>n.s.<sup>1</sup></b>                    | <b>**</b>                    | <b>*</b>                   |
| Micro (N=60)                                              | 3.68                                       | 2.55                         | 3.16                       |
| Small (N=92)                                              | 3.57                                       | 2.73                         | 3.10                       |
| Medium (N=51)                                             | 3.74                                       | 2.99                         | 3.34                       |
| Large (N=22)                                              | 3.89                                       | 2.89                         | 3.38                       |
| <b>Company lifespan (N=225)</b>                           | <b>n.s.</b>                                | <b>*</b>                     | <b>n.s.</b>                |
| 0-10 years (N=60)                                         | 3.64                                       | 2.58                         | 3.17                       |
| 11-20 years (N=62)                                        | 3.64                                       | 2.80                         | 3.20                       |
| 21 years and more (N=103)                                 | 3.70                                       | 2.84                         | 3.21                       |
| <b>Sector NACEBEL (N=225)</b>                             | <b>n.s.</b>                                | <b>n.s.</b>                  | <b>n.s.</b>                |
| Industry (N=75)                                           | 3.62                                       | 2.83                         | 3.19                       |
| Professional, scientific, and technical activities (N=64) | 3.80                                       | 2.64                         | 3.28                       |
| Information & communication (N=46)                        | 3.58                                       | 2.80                         | 3.19                       |
| Other (N=40)                                              | 3.63                                       | 2.76                         | 3.10                       |
| <b>Sector R&amp;D intensity (N=225)</b>                   | <b>n.s.</b>                                | <b>n.s.</b>                  | <b>n.s.</b>                |
| High (N=36)                                               | 3.66                                       | 2.63                         | 3.21                       |
| High medium (N=79)                                        | 3.58                                       | 2.83                         | 3.19                       |
| Medium (N=8)                                              | 3.75                                       | 2.63                         | 3.10                       |
| Low medium (N=61)                                         | 3.78                                       | 2.75                         | 3.27                       |
| Low (N=41)                                                | 3.64                                       | 2.77                         | 3.11                       |
| <b>Type R&amp;D (N=225)</b>                               | <b>n.s.<sup>1</sup></b>                    | <b>n.s.</b>                  | <b>n.s.</b>                |
| Only internal R&D (N=140)                                 | 3.62                                       | 2.73                         | 3.20                       |
| Internal and external R&D (N=85)                          | 3.74                                       | 2.80                         | 3.19                       |
| <b>Nature of internal R&amp;D (N=225)</b>                 | <b>n.s.</b>                                | <b>n.s.</b>                  | <b>n.s.</b>                |
| Permanent (N=190)                                         | 3.66                                       | 2.74                         | 3.19                       |
| Occasional (N=35)                                         | 3.71                                       | 2.87                         | 3.21                       |
| <b>Type Innovation (N=220)</b>                            | <b>n.s.</b>                                | <b>n.s.</b>                  | <b>n.s.</b>                |
| Only internal innovation (N=179)                          | 3.66                                       | 2.75                         | 3.21                       |
| Internal and external innovation (N=41)                   | 3.68                                       | 2.76                         | 3.12                       |
| <b>Nature of internal innovation (N=220)</b>              | <b>n.s.</b>                                | <b>n.s.</b>                  | <b>n.s.</b>                |
| Permanent (N=187)                                         | 3.67                                       | 2.75                         | 3.20                       |
| Occasional (N=33)                                         | 3.63                                       | 2.76                         | 3.13                       |
| <b>Ever collaborated with PhD holders (N=198)</b>         | <b>n.s.<sup>1</sup></b>                    | <b>n.s.<sup>1</sup></b>      | <b>n.s.</b>                |
| Yes (N=120)                                               | 3.72                                       | 2.68                         | 3.23                       |
| No (N=78)                                                 | 3.56                                       | 2.85                         | 3.12                       |
| <b>Employment of PhD holders (N=205)</b>                  | <b>*</b>                                   | <b>n.s.</b>                  | <b>**</b>                  |
| Never (N=60)                                              | 3.46                                       | 2.77                         | 2.99                       |
| Past only (N=26)                                          | 3.67                                       | 2.67                         | 3.14                       |
| Present only (N=11)                                       | 3.79                                       | 2.91                         | 3.47                       |
| Past and present (N=108)                                  | 3.77                                       | 2.74                         | 3.30                       |
| <b>Position respondent (N=225)</b>                        | <b>n.s.</b>                                | <b>n.s.<sup>1</sup></b>      | <b>n.s.</b>                |
| CEO/managing director (N=97)                              | 3.67                                       | 2.62                         | 3.10                       |
| Finance (N=19)                                            | 3.75                                       | 2.74                         | 3.20                       |
| HR (N=57)                                                 | 3.63                                       | 2.95                         | 3.28                       |
| R&D&I (N=20)                                              | 3.71                                       | 2.88                         | 3.32                       |
| Other (N=32)                                              | 3.65                                       | 2.78                         | 3.27                       |
| <b>Respondent obtained a PhD? (N=223)</b>                 | <b>***</b>                                 | <b>*</b>                     | <b>n.s.</b>                |
| Yes (N=34)                                                | 3.95                                       | 2.53                         | 3.34                       |
| No (N=189)                                                | 3.62                                       | 2.80                         | 3.17                       |

Note: Significance based on Welch-ANOVA; n.s. = not significant; \*= $p<0.05$ ; \*\*= $p<0.01$ ; \*\*\*= $p<0.001$ ; n.s.<sup>1</sup> = indicative difference based on  $0.05< p<0.10$

The results reveal a remarkably consistent pattern. We find for virtually none of these characteristics significant differences in employers' perceptions regarding the skills of PhD holders. We observe only one indicative difference, namely for "professional attitude & cognitive capacity". For these skills, a larger sample might demonstrate a somewhat more positive perception among companies that engage in both internal and external R&D-activities.

### DO EMPLOYERS' PERCEPTIONS DIFFER DEPENDING ON WHETHER THE COMPANY HAS EXPERIENCE WITH PHD HOLDERS?

Table 1 also differentiates companies according to whether they have ever collaborated with PhD holders and whether they have ever employed PhD holders or currently employ them.

We first compare companies that have previously collaborated with PhD holders with companies that have never collaborated with PhD holders. We observe two indicatively significant differences. These point out that, had more companies participated in the survey, potentially statistically significant differences might have emerged. More specifically, the indicative significance levels suggest that companies that have previously collaborated with PhD holders are more positive in their perceptions of PhD holders' "professional attitude & cognitive capacity", but are more negative in their perceptions of PhD holders' "pragmatism & business skills". We do not observe significant differences in companies' perceptions of the "agility & goal orientation" of PhD holders depending on whether they have previously collaborated with PhD holders.

Next, we compare companies according to their experience with employing PhD holders. We do not observe significant differences in perceptions of "pragmatism & business skills" among PhD holders. We do, however, find significant differences in perceptions of "professional attitude & cognitive capacity" and "agility & goal orientation". More specifically, companies that have never employed PhD holders express themselves as the least positive. Companies that were employing PhD holders at the time of the survey express the most positive perceptions.

### DO EMPLOYERS' PERCEPTIONS DIFFER DEPENDING ON WHO RESPONDED TO THE SURVEY QUESTIONS?

The *Survey of Employers* was completed by representatives holding a variety of positions within the participating companies. In most companies, the survey was completed either by the CEO/managing director or by someone from the finance department, HR department, or the R&D&I department. In a number of other companies, the respondent held a different position, such as project manager or director of technology and environment. Some of these respondents hold a PhD themselves, while others do not. Table 1 provides an answer to the question of whether a respondent's role within the company, and whether or not they hold a PhD themselves, is associated with the employer perceptions they report regarding the skills of PhD holders. In Table 1, we observe that perceptions of "professional attitude & cognitive capacity" and of "agility & goal orientation" do not differ systematically according to respondents' positions within the company.

We do, however, find an indicatively significant difference for "pragmatism & business skills". Respondents working in HR or R&D&I appear more likely to indicate that PhD holders are pragmatic and possess sufficient business skills.

Finally, does it matter whether respondents themselves hold a PhD? We find that respondents who are themselves PhD holders are significantly more positive in their perceptions of the "professional attitude & cognitive capacity" of PhD holders, but significantly more negative in their perceptions of the "pragmatism & business skills". No significant differences were found for "agility & goal orientation".

### DISCUSSION

The majority of PhD holders eventually pursue careers outside academia. Their deployment in companies contributes not only to research, development, and innovation, but also to the knowledge diffusion and knowledge valorization that are crucial to the growth of the Flemish economy. In its recent advisory report on a valorization-oriented Flemish R&D&I system, the SERV (2026) emphasizes that Flanders needs a stronger transition of knowledge, expertise, and talent between knowledge institutions and companies in order to increase societal and economic impact. VARIO (2026) likewise underlines that highly qualified talent is a crucial precondition for translating scientific strengths into innovation and economic valorization. Against this background, it is relevant to understand how employers perceive the skills of PhD holders and which factors shape these perceptions. The findings presented in this ECOOM-brief show that employers in companies with R&D activities are remarkably consistent in their perceptions of PhD holders: differences across sectors and R&D&I profiles appear to be limited, whereas experience with PhD holders is associated with more positive perceptions of the value PhD holders can bring to companies.

#### **Our findings point to three important takeaways**

First, employers rate PhD holders particularly highly on "professional attitude & cognitive capacity". Across companies, there is a relatively positive and stable perception regarding PhD holders' expertise, learning ability, initiative, and innovation orientation. These strengths are widely recognized, regardless of sector or R&D&I intensity.

Second, "pragmatism & business skills" remain the primary area of attention. Notably, companies with experience in collaborating with PhD holders, as well as respondents who themselves hold a PhD, tend to judge the presence of these skills more critically than others.

Third, it is clear that *unknown* makes *unloved*. Companies that currently employ, or have previously employed, PhD holders assess their "professional attitude & cognitive capacity" and their "agility & goal orientation" more positively than companies without such experience. The largest differences in perception therefore appear not to exist between sectors, but rather between companies with and without experience with PhD holders.

#### **What do these findings mean for policy?**

A first policy reflection is that the skills of PhD holders appear to be broadly applicable. After all, we find very few differences between

sectors or between companies with different R&D&I profiles. This suggests that the added value of PhD holders is not confined to specific knowledge-intensive niches but is relevant to a wide range of companies. Policy initiatives aimed at stimulating the entry of PhD holders into the non-academic labor market therefore do not need to focus exclusively on specific sectors.

A second reflection concerns the role of experience. Companies that already employ PhD holders assess their “professional attitude & cognitive capacity” and their “agility & goal orientation” more positively. This suggests that unfamiliarity remains an important barrier. Our findings suggest that contact between companies and PhD holders not only facilitate knowledge exchange but also contribute to more positive and more realistic perceptions regarding PhD holders. Policy instruments that promote those interactions between companies and PhD holders therefore remain relevant. Examples include Baekeland mandates, innovation mandates, internships, *job shadowing*, and collaborative research projects. In addition, instruments such as VLAIO support and other collaboration programs can lower the barrier for companies to gain a first experience with PhD holders. Additional analyses (not reported) further suggest that larger companies with R&D-activities are more likely to have experience with employing PhD holders. This indicates that the more positive perceptions observed among larger companies may, at least in part, be related to this prior experience. Strengthening opportunities for initial contact and collaboration could therefore be an important lever, in particular for smaller companies.

Further, our results suggest that policy measures that support a first hire may be particularly valuable. Companies with experience employing PhD holders assess their competencies more positively than companies without such experience. Instruments that reduce the risks associated with a first hire, such as wage subsidies, innovation grants, or research mandates, can therefore serve as important levers for knowledge diffusion and knowledge valorization. This finding is also closely aligned with a point recently emphasized by the SERV (2026): a stronger capacity for valorization depends not only on the production of new knowledge, but also on the ability of organizations to effectively absorb and utilize that knowledge. From this perspective, instruments that encourage companies to recruit PhD holders can be seen as investments in companies' absorptive capacity. VARIO (2026) likewise emphasizes that scientific strengths do not automatically translate into economic value and highlights the importance of entrepreneurship, talent, and a strong innovation ecosystem in effectively translating knowledge into innovation and valorization.

Finally, the results confirm the importance of continued investment in transferable skills during the PhD. Although employers recognize the professional and cognitive strengths of PhD holders, pragmatism & business skills remain an area of attention. Particularly noteworthy is the finding that those who have collaborated with PhD holders, or who hold a PhD themselves, express less positive views regarding the presence of pragmatism and sufficient business skills. This suggests that further efforts, during the PhD track, are needed to familiarize researchers with business environments, entrepreneurship, and the expectations of non-academic employers. Initiatives that bring

researchers, during their PhD, into contact with companies, for example through entrepreneurship training, internships, *job shadowing*, and collaborative research projects, can help align mutual expectations more effectively.

### **What do these findings mean for employers?**

For employers, our findings primarily point to the broad employability of PhD holders. They bring more than deep subject-specific expertise alone. Employers with experience in working with PhD holders particularly value their learning ability, autonomy, innovation-oriented mindset, and ability to tackle complex problems. These competencies are becoming increasingly important in an economy characterized by rapid technological change and knowledge-intensive activities. At the same time, the results encourage realistic expectations. Several employers express reservations regarding “pragmatism & business skills”. This should not necessarily be viewed as a deficiency. Such skills are often developed *on the job* and within a specific business context. Just like companies invest in onboarding new employees to familiarize them with technical or organizational processes, they can also invest in strengthening business insight, market knowledge, and customer orientation among PhD holders, tailored to the vision and mission of their own organization.

Our findings also suggest that employers and PhD holders would benefit from more opportunities for interaction prior to potential hiring. Universities, research institutions, and various intermediary organizations already provide opportunities to connect with PhD talent through for example job markets, job shadowing, company internships, guest lectures, collaborative research projects, and PhD mandates carried out in collaboration with companies. Such interactions offer employers the opportunity to develop a more realistic understanding of the competencies of PhD holders, while researchers, in turn, gain more accurate insights into the expectations, decision-making processes, and dynamics of companies. This closer interaction can also help align mutual expectations more effectively. Employers often seek employees who can respond quickly to specific business needs, whereas PhD holders are typically trained in an environment where thoroughness, accuracy, and in-depth analysis are central. Both perspectives are valuable, but they sometimes require translation to each other's context. Regular interactions between companies and researchers during the PhD can make such differences visible and open for discussion even before the transition to the labor market takes place. In ECOOM-brief 67, we explicitly examine these potential differences in perceptions and expectations. More specifically, we ask to what extent PhD students in Flanders have an accurate understanding of what employers think about the skills, and therefore the employability, of PhD holders. The perceptions that PhD students hold about employers are far from trivial, as they influence the choices they make and their employability (cf., Muurlink et al., 2024). Consider, for example, the decisions they make about whether or not to develop certain skills. During the recruitment process, explicitly discussing mutual expectations regarding autonomy, results orientation, innovation, commercial objectives, and career development may also contribute to a successful collaboration.

Finally, the results suggest that companies without experience in employing PhD holders may be missing opportunities. Their perceptions are generally less positive than those of companies that already collaborated with or currently employ PhD holders. For employers active in R&D&I, taking the step toward a first collaboration or recruitment may therefore be worthwhile. Indeed, the findings of this study indicate that direct experience is often associated with a more favorable assessment of the skills that PhD holders bring into the company. In a context in which companies are becoming increasingly dependent on knowledge, innovation, and learning ability, PhD holders can represent an important source of human capital and play a strategic role in strengthening a company's innovation capacity.

## REFERENCES

Bebiroglu, N., Wille, L., van der Weijden, I., Boman, J., Bran, A., Mortier, A., Huyghe, V., & Levecque, K. (2026). PhD Holders in the Eye of Employers Outside Academia. In E. Löfström, I. van der Weijden, K. Inouye, & S. S. E. Bengtsen (Eds.), *Transitions in Researcher Education and Careers* (pp. 157-182). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003785262>

BELSP0 (n.d.). *Bedrijfsvoorheffing O&O*. Retrieved on July 13, 2026. [https://www.belspo.be/belspo/fiscal/fisc\\_nl.stm](https://www.belspo.be/belspo/fiscal/fisc_nl.stm)

Bongers, F., Rienstra, Y., Leonique, K., & Groot Beumer, T. (2018). *Evaluatie van de Omkadering van Jonge Onderzoekers (OJO) managementsamenvatting*. Dialogic. [https://www.ewi-vlaanderen.be/sites/default/files/2023-03/evaluatie\\_2018\\_omkadering\\_jonge\\_onderzoekers\\_ojo\\_managementsamenvatting.pdf](https://www.ewi-vlaanderen.be/sites/default/files/2023-03/evaluatie_2018_omkadering_jonge_onderzoekers_ojo_managementsamenvatting.pdf)

De Grande, H., De Boyser, K., Vandeveld, K., & Van Rossem, R. (2014). From academia to industry: Are doctorate holders ready? *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 5(3), 538-561. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-014-0192-9>

Diependaele, M. (November, 2024). *Beleidsnota 2024-2029. Economie, wetenschap, innovatie en industrie*. <https://www.vlaanderen.be/publicaties/beleidsnota-2024-2029-economie-wetenschap-innovatie-en-industrie>

ECOOM-brief 48 – Wille, L., Levecque, K., & Huyghe, V. (2024). *The Survey of Employers: how do non-academic employers in companies with R&D activity view doctorates?* ECOOM HR in R&D.

ECOOM-brief 59 – Huyghe, V., Levecque, K., & Mortier, A. (2026). *The perspective of companies with R&D activities regarding the skills of PhD holders in Flanders*. ECOOM HR in R&D.

ECOOM-brief 60 – Huyghe, V., Levecque, K., & De Beuckelaer, A. (2026). *What employers really see: hidden patterns in the skills of PhD holders*. ECOOM HR in R&D.

ECOOM-brief 67 – Levecque, K., Huyghe, V., & De Beuckelaer, A. (2026). *Mismatch of perceptions? PhD students and employers about the skills of PhD holders*. ECOOM HR in R&D.

ECOOM HR in R&D (z.d.-a). *Junior researchers within the academic sector*. Retrieved on July 13, 2026. <https://www.ecoom.be/nodes/junioronderzoekersbinnendeacademischesector/en>

ECOOM HR in R&D (z.d.-b). *PhD holders within the academic sector*. Retrieved on July 13, 2026. <https://www.ecoom.be/nodes/doctoraathoudersbinnendeacademischesector/en>

ECOOM HR in R&D (z.d.-c). *PhD holders outside the sector*. Retrieved July 13, 2026. <https://www.ecoom.be/nodes/doctoraathoudersbuitendeacademischesector/en>

Mortier, A., Matthys, J., Levecque, K., Verlinden, L., & Wille, L. (2022). *A PhD and entrepreneurship : what value does a PhD bring to entrepreneurship?* UGent. <https://biblio.ugent.be/publication/01H14D1SGPFHTZXRN3C30XDDWA>

Muurlink, O., Chen, L., Boorman, R., Pearson, D., & Cohen, G. (2024). Stakeholder perceptions of what industry wants from doctoral students: a systematic literature review. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 43(4), 952–965. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2023.2269871>

OECD (2023). Promoting diverse career pathways for doctoral and postdoctoral researchers. *OECD Science, Technology and Industry Policy Papers*, 158, OECD Publishing, Paris. <https://doi.org/10.1787/dc21227a-en>.

SERV (2026). *Naar een valorisatiekrachtig Vlaams O&O&I-systeem*. [https://www.serv.be/sites/default/files/documenten/SERV\\_20260629\\_001\\_systeem\\_ADV.pdf](https://www.serv.be/sites/default/files/documenten/SERV_20260629_001_systeem_ADV.pdf)

Stassen, L., Levecque, K., & Anseel, F. (2016). *PhDs in transition : what is the value of a PhD outside academia?* UGent. <https://biblio.ugent.be/publication/8613201>

VARIO (2026). *Strategische keuzes voor Vlaanderen (Advies 47)*. [https://www.vario.be/files/VARIO\\_adviezen-en-rapporten/2026\\_FEBRUARI\\_VARIO\\_ADVIES\\_STRATEGISCHE-KEUZES-VOOR-VLAANDEREN.pdf](https://www.vario.be/files/VARIO_adviezen-en-rapporten/2026_FEBRUARI_VARIO_ADVIES_STRATEGISCHE-KEUZES-VOOR-VLAANDEREN.pdf)

VLAIO (2026). *Vrijstelling doorstarting bedrijfsvoorheffing*. Retrieved July 13, 2026. <https://www.vlaio.be/en/node/2827>

—  
*Disclaimer: This ECOOM-brief reports findings of scientific research conducted by ECOOM HR in R&D. Analyses and interpretations are the responsibility of the authors. They are not formal policy positions of the Flemish Government and Flemish authorities.*  
 —

## Appendix 1

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Professional attitude & cognitive capacity                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are experts</li> <li>Can work autonomously</li> <li>Are initiative takers</li> <li>Are perseverant</li> <li>Have a strongly developed learning ability</li> <li>Have an innovative mindset</li> </ul> |
| Pragmatism & business skills                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prefer speed and pragmatism over accuracy and correctness</li> <li>Have sufficient business skills/insight</li> </ul>                                                                                 |
| Agility & goal orientation                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are sufficiently able to work together/in a team</li> <li>Can easily adapt to the pace of business</li> </ul>                                                                                         |

- Can easily work on matters outside their specialty
- Can easily apply their knowledge and translate it into practical implications and solutions
- Work in a sufficiently results-oriented manner