

Overcoming barriers that limit the impact of ecological research

Carlos Cano-Barbacid^{1,2,3*}, James F Cahill^{4†}, Helen M Regan^{5†}, Talya D Hackett^{6,7†}, Jacob N Barney⁸, Isabel Donoso^{9,10,11}, Franz Essl¹², Emili García-Berthou², Tina Heger^{13,14,15}, Lotte Korell^{16,17,18}, Ingolf Kühn^{16,18,19}, Demetra Rakosy^{16,18,20}, Kristiina Visakorpi²¹, and Núria Roura-Pascual²²

Ecology and conservation researchers have diverse goals that often include both personal career aspirations and desires to enhance the well-being of the natural world and its inhabitants. Perception of ecological research by ecologists typically involves a triad—linking goals, research, and impact. Yet the realities of scientific practice are substantially more complicated due to numerous constraints that limit the ability of researchers to conduct ecological research and to have a genuine impact. Many of these barriers can be mitigated, leading to more effective contributions to society and biodiversity conservation. Here, we outline frequently encountered constraints in ecological research institutions and, by drawing upon many practices used internationally, we identify feasible mitigations and highlight examples of negative consequences that can occur in the absence of effective mitigation strategies. Finally, we propose changes to aspects of the culture and reward systems that would allow ecological research as a discipline to more effectively achieve societal, environmental, and personal goals.

Front Ecol Environ 2026; 24(1): e70016, doi:[10.1002/fee.70016](https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.70016)

Individuals choose academic research careers in ecology and conservation biology for numerous reasons, and unlike many other disciplines in biology, ecological research seldom yields direct and immediate financial benefits to researchers. Instead, the research motivations of ecologists are frequently rooted in a combination of personal interests and the desire to achieve a fundamental understanding of the relationships between living organisms and their environment (Reiners *et al.* 2013).

In a nutshell:

- Ecological researchers pursue goals encompassing societal, environmental, and personal aims
- Constraints, perverse incentives, and unexpected events can limit the translation of research activities into impactful outcomes and personal achievements
- Here, researchers from different countries and career stages propose mitigation strategies and identify examples of negative consequences that can arise when these mitigations are not adopted
- Changes to the prevailing culture and reward system in ecological research can foster effectiveness in achieving both environmental and personal goals within this discipline

Moreover, many ecologists feel an imperative not only to develop practical solutions to current major environmental challenges but also to train highly qualified professionals. However, the effectiveness of ecological research in achieving these objectives is often questionable (eg Butchart *et al.* 2010). Research progress is frequently hindered by both internal constraints (those arising within the research and institutional environments) and external constraints (those imposed from outside academia, most notably by governments and funding agencies). External pressures may include national and international political agendas and the priorities of research funders (eg Kozlov and Ryan 2025). These higher-level political barriers are often influenced by the interests of ruling parties, and while we acknowledge their detrimental impact, they remain beyond the direct control of individual researchers. Here, we focus instead on internal academic constraints that exert an ongoing influence on research practices but that can be mitigated through individual or institutional action.

Academic life can be competitive, precarious, and sometimes financially unrewarding (Hamermesh 2018). This, together with important mental-health issues such as stress, anxiety, and burnout, leads many researchers to leave academia (Kis *et al.* 2022; Nicholls *et al.* 2022). Of those who stay, many compromise their original goals or pursue them in the time that remains after completion of their daily professional responsibilities, driven by the belief that science is worth personal sacrifices (Kucirkova 2023).

Casual conversations with colleagues suggest common feelings of disconnection between aspirations and true research impact, yet few discussions in the literature focus on identifying common barriers or mitigations (but see Receveur *et al.* [2024]). These impressions are supported by reduced job satisfaction of

¹Departamento de Biodiversidad y Biología Evolutiva, Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales, Madrid, Spain* (carlos.cano@mncn.csic.es); ²GRECO, Institute of Aquatic Ecology, University of Girona, Girona, Spain; ³Department of River Ecology and Conservation, Senckenberg Research Institute and Natural History Museum Frankfurt, Gelnhausen, Germany; ⁴Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada; ⁵Department of Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal

(continued on last page)




Figure 1. Overview of constraints (yellow) influencing research in ecology and conservation biology, highlighting their consequences (blue) for ecological research and for societal, environmental, and personal goals, and exploring potential mitigation measures (green). Figure created by Isabel Donoso and Carlos Cano-Barbacil, with input from all authors, using icons from Keynote (<https://www.apple.com/keynote>) except for the “Evaluation of research” icon (Hilmy Abiyu; <https://freeicons.io>; CC BY 3.0).

those in academia as compared to industry-employed researchers (Woolston 2021). Here, we aim to provide a preliminary toolkit to help academic researchers realign their personal and scientific goals with the outcome and impact of their research by providing mitigation measures across three categories (Figure 1): (1) evaluating research for hiring and career progression, (2) supporting impactful training and mentorship, and (3) addressing administration and bureaucratic obstacles. This subset of topics may not apply to everyone’s experience, but they may offer a foundation for adaptation relevant to other circumstances. Although researchers, especially those in the early-career stage, may feel powerless to effect any change in the academic system at large, we suggest implementing a best-practice framework to identify constraints, highlight their consequences, and invoke mitigations at both individual and institutional levels. Thus, we can enact modest changes that will enable more effective ecological research and ultimately facilitate achievement of societal, environmental, and personal goals. Although some recommended mitigations may lack universality at a global scale due to macro-level political constraints, the ideas presented here are intended to serve as a starting point to shape more meaningful and effective ecological careers.

■ Evaluating research for hiring and career progression

Constraints and consequences

Evaluation of research outputs is central to academia and influences decisions regarding hiring, career progression,

institutional recognition, acquisition of grants, and qualification for or receipt of third-party awards. In research institutions, reward decisions are frequently based on individual researchers’ performance, predominantly valuing peer-reviewed publications and grant activity (Lawrence 2016). However, in the evaluation of a researcher’s contribution within and outside their specific research domain, the specific content of research outputs, including their direct impact and value, are apparently overlooked. Instead, simple quantitative metrics, such as publication count and journal impact factors, often dominate evaluation processes, aiming to make candidate evaluation easier, faster, and (presumably) more objective (Pontika *et al.* 2022). Thus, major career progression outcomes are strongly influenced by acceptance decisions of a particular set of journals, rather than extensive impact assessment (Neff 2018).

This projection of assessment to journal acceptance has created a system where publications are viewed as supporting career progression, rather than as dissemination tools for primary research (Lawrence 2016). Combined with short-term funding and contracts, this shift in the role of scientific publication encourages researchers to undertake reliable, shorter-term projects instead of riskier, longer-term research (Park *et al.* 2023). The latter, however, is required to solve global challenges (Werner 2015). Thus, the current reward system unintentionally discourages transdisciplinary research and collaborations with researchers from less wealthy countries, limiting the global relevance of scientific research (Nuñez *et al.* 2021). Instead, it favors meta-analyses or short studies

known for yielding rapid and impactful results (Cadotte *et al.* 2012), as evidenced by the increasing number of grant programs funding synthesis projects (eg calls from the US National Science Foundation, German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research [iDiv], and British Ecological Society). High publishing costs further exacerbate inequities by creating barriers for researchers with limited resources, especially those in less wealthy countries, constraining their research impact and potentially their career progression (Williams *et al.* 2023).

Moreover, reliance on simple metrics fails to recognize other valuable contributions, which include teaching, public and policy engagement, relationships with local stakeholders, publishing datasets or analytical tools, or descriptive taxonomic work. This misrepresents the societal and economic outcomes of research when assessing its impact (Lawrence 2016).

Mitigations

Mitigating perverse career incentives requires fundamentally shifting research evaluation away from publisher-derived metrics and toward societally—and scientifically—valuable work (Hicks *et al.* 2015). For instance, the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) has called for a move away from metric-based evaluation of research output since 2012. Nevertheless, the number of published papers and journal impact factors still remain important determinants for many hiring and advancement decisions (Pontika *et al.* 2022). To address this issue, we propose three actions.

First, institutions should be explicit in the types of impact they value and make this information easily accessible. To align the values of the institution with the impact of the candidate, researchers should explain how their work contributes to these values through narrative CVs. This approach would ensure mutual understanding between the researcher and the institution regarding what is valued, and it highlights impacts invisible to conventional citation metrics. In addition, for evaluation committees, the inclusion of external members with expertise in tangible impacts can provide diverse and impartial perspectives. These external members could include academics from different disciplines and members from key sectors and local communities with expertise on the research topic.

Second, alternative metrics, beyond citations and impact factors, are needed to evaluate research. Recognizing a paper's "disruptiveness," which measures its integration of disciplines, could promote novel, risky, and impactful research (Park *et al.* 2023). Although this may be more difficult to apply to early-career researchers, it is likely helpful when making decisions about career progression. Encouraging science that engages in solving grand ecological challenges is also important. Metrics considering policy impact or application can also encourage research addressing major ecological challenges.

Finally, evaluation processes should also recognize other service activities (Moher *et al.* 2020). Institutions often

encourage these activities but fail to reward them proportional to their impact. Fair evaluation could assign weightings for research, teaching, public engagement, policy impact, and service activities, based on institutional mission and values. For example, the University of Glasgow in the UK rewards peer review and journal editing as promotion criteria, whereas Macquarie University in Australia follows a five-category promotion policy that incorporates broader contributions to the university and community. Other merits include publishing software, datasets, code, and other analytical tools as "publications", or rewarding work beyond participation in academic journals and conferences (Hicks *et al.* 2015; Moher *et al.* 2020).

Supporting and recognizing impactful training and mentorship

Constraints and consequences

Good scientific training and mentorship should help scientists to develop the skillsets needed to foster their research and fulfill their goals (Hund *et al.* 2018). However, many ecologists report dissatisfaction with their training, due to the mismatch between current (and future) requirements of an academic position (eg publishing, deep statistical knowledge, mentoring, lecturing, fundraising, team leadership, communication) and current training received (Touchon and McCoy 2016; Farrell *et al.* 2021). For instance, as ecological questions, databases, and methodological approaches become increasingly complex and interdisciplinary, many early-career ecologists feel that they do not have the technical and interpersonal skills required to contribute effectively to large collaborative projects (Farrell *et al.* 2021). In addition, the interests of early-career—and even senior—researchers often clash with rigid university programs, which are often compartmentalized, hindering multidisciplinary, despite its benefits for student development and employability (Wang *et al.* 2022).

Finally, mentoring, although increasingly essential for career progression, is generally time consuming and challenging, especially given that most academics lack formal training in mentorship (Emery *et al.* 2019). This is particularly the case when early-career researchers advise undergraduate or new graduate students, or within small research groups and institutions where interactions with other senior and mid-career researchers are limited. These constraints are exacerbated in countries and institutions with reduced career development opportunities, and with a scarcity of qualified teachers, learning materials, or even mentorship programs, leading to an uneven playing field for job opportunities globally.

Mitigations

Addressing the challenges in ecological training requires a multifaceted approach. First, shifting to skill-based learning can empower future ecologists with the competencies needed for employment. Incorporating both hard skills (eg study

design, statistical analysis) and soft skills (eg project, people, and financial management) into the curriculum from an early stage is imperative. Courses should adopt a practical orientation, simulating real-world research scenarios rather than following traditional, theoretical approaches. For instance, “living labs”—that is, user-centric innovation milieus built on everyday practice and research, aiming to create sustainable values—can serve as learning environments where students gain practical experience (Almirall and Wareham 2011), bridging the gap between theory and real-world application (Bergvall-Kareborn and Stahlbrost 2009).

Second, research institutions and mentors should not only embrace guiding standards, creating best practice guides in ecological mentoring, but also adopt “personal development plans” during the doctoral, postdoctoral, and junior faculty stages. Embracing these practices, together with efforts to connect trainees and early-career researchers with collaborative opportunities, can advance professional capacity and reinforce cognitive synergy (Clegg and Bradley 2006). For example, the [European Competence Framework for Researchers](#) helps faculty to develop transversal skills and higher education institutions to adapt their training programs to meet researcher needs. Likewise, some institutions such as [Columbia University](#) have developed best-practice guides for faculty mentoring. Implementation of these guidelines should be evaluated regularly, much in the way as is done for undergraduate teaching assessments. Similar to the reward system, metrics solely based on the number of doctoral or postdoctoral students supervised do not adequately capture mentorship quality, as they fail to account for the diverse career trajectories pursued by these individuals, which can provide a more comprehensive evaluation of the mentor’s impact and guidance.

Finally, universities should promote transdisciplinarity in both institutional structures and ecological research (Scholz 2020). Environmental challenges are driven by different factors (ecological, but also social, political, physical, and so forth), which traditionally have been examined separately through the lenses of different disciplines (Holm *et al.* 2013). Adopting holistic perspectives involving multiple stakeholders is necessary to address global challenges; thus, research institutions must reinforce interactions between traditionally separated disciplines and society (Hein *et al.* 2018). Potential actions could include promoting institutes or networks across different faculties or mixing members within departments. The establishment of ecological societies beyond countries with established traditions can also promote transdisciplinarity and mitigate geographic disparity.

■ Addressing administration and bureaucratic obstacles

Constraints and consequences

Administration and service involve managing research, teaching, organizational functions, and the formulation and execution of policy at university or research institutions.

Administrative tasks are a key component of the expected duties of most academics and encompass a wide range of responsibilities, including lab safety, curriculum development, hiring, misconduct oversight, and research grant management. All such responsibilities are subject to evolving demands for compliance, reporting, and cross-institutional collaboration, contributing to the growing administrative burden and diverting substantial time away from an academic position’s core functions (Woelet 2023). For example, principal investigators in the US spent 44% of their time performing administrative tasks mandated by federal funding agencies (Mosley *et al.* 2020). Institutional budget constraints also mean that tasks that were traditionally carried out by administrative staff now often fall to academics, reducing time for creative research—the aspects that academics were drawn to in the first place (Schneider 2020). Many institutions have introduced software for compliance and reporting, or so-called “robotic bureaucracy”; although designed to streamline compliance accounting, they shift responsibility from administrators to researchers, further increasing their administrative burden (Bozeman *et al.* 2020). Valuable time taken away from research and teaching leads to a reduction in research discovery and innovation, and an erosion of educational quality. Less time to train students, postdocs, and other personnel leads to lost opportunities and unmet potential. For graduate students and postdocs, particularly those in under-represented groups, it also promotes a lack of desire to pursue careers in academia, perpetuating bias as a “lifetime problem” (Llorens *et al.* 2021).

The individualistic nature of research labs and productivity-focused structure fosters an adversarial system with perverse incentives, creating inequities in administrative loads among colleagues. With the institutional desire to achieve diversity in administrative committees outpacing the recruitment of a diverse body of faculty, under-represented faculty, particularly women and visible minorities, tend to face greater administrative burdens earlier in their career than their counterparts (Llorens *et al.* 2021), hindering advancement and causing burnout—the “minority tax” (Trejo 2020). These inequities in service expectations exacerbate an already challenging environment for under-represented faculty in which to succeed (Cronin *et al.* 2021; Llorens *et al.* 2021). Burnout and erosion in quality of life associated with high administrative loads result in faculty failing to advance through the ranks and ultimately leaving academia.

Mitigations

Reducing the administrative burden to a level that lies within the expectations of the position and what is necessary for the function of the institution is largely determined by the upper administrative level (or above), as the constraints trickle down to researchers. The first step should be to fully account for researchers’ time spent on service activities, how service loads are allocated across academics within a unit, and the

impact on the time devoted to other academic pursuits such as conducting research, writing grant proposals, developing curricula, and mentoring students (Woelert 2023). Institutions should perform cost–benefit analyses to ensure researchers' time aligns with institutional and governmental goals.

University administrators and researchers alike should be aware of how administrative burdens affect individuals' activities and the overall mission of the university or research institute. Researchers should also recognize that the benefits derived from shared governance structures come with responsibilities that require equitable distribution (Curnalia and Mermer 2018). Therefore, clear, equitable, and appropriate service expectations should be defined in hours per month or as a percentage of working hours. To reduce reporting and oversight time, institutions should hire, train, and retain more staff and coordinate efforts to avoid redundant reporting.

Measures should be enacted to ensure equitable administrative loads for established researchers, while protecting early- and mid-career staff from excessive burdens, allowing them to build their research and teaching programs (Reese *et al.* 2021). Long-term mentoring of junior and under-represented faculty should be departmental and institutional priorities as a means to reduce bias and overload. Regular department/institute chair training can foster a culture of shared accountability toward service that has collective benefits. Finally, reimagining reward and incentive structures to appropriately value service work according to the time invested would go a long way toward acknowledging its importance to research functioning.

■ Conclusions

Ecologists often have high intrinsic motivation and choose the life sciences as a research topic because of its inherent attractiveness rather than for economic profit or fame. However, barriers can generate perverse incentives that lead to suboptimal working conditions and learning environments (eg extended working hours, greater workload, reduced work–life balance) and decreased quality of research outcomes. This reduces researchers' intrinsic motivation along their careers, making academia a high-stress working environment (Nicholls *et al.* 2022). As a result, burnout has become a major issue, particularly among doctoral students and early-career researchers (Mattijssen *et al.* 2020; Forrester 2023).

The measures outlined here offer an initial framework to combat researcher burnout, enabling more efficient work while maintaining high-quality research and mentorship. Institutions and administrators are urged to prioritize researchers' basic needs, minimize simultaneous activities, and implement mental well-being tools. On an individual level, researchers should try to reconnect with their passion and prioritize activities that not only lead to the desired outcome but also offer immediate rewards or satisfaction along the way (Fishbach and Woolley 2022). By making the steps toward the

goal enjoyable and personally fulfilling, individuals increase their likelihood of following through on their objectives. Fostering an environment that promotes the well-being of researchers at all levels is crucial to combat burnout and to catalyze disruptive and high-quality research.

■ Acknowledgements

This work is the result of collaborations formed during the 2022 ANdiNA workshop (<https://andinabbar.weebly.com>), which received financial support from the Helmholtz-Centre for Environmental Research–UFZ. Authors received additional funding from the following sources to attend the workshop and prepare this publication: CC-B benefited from a postdoctoral contract (ref JDC2023-052358-I), funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation, and Universities (MICIU/AEI/10.13039/501100011033) and the FSE+; JFC's participation was supported by the NSERC Discovery Grants program; ID further acknowledges funding by the EU's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme (Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement #101068643), an Ikerbasque fellowship and the María de Maeztu Excellence Unit 2023–2027 ref CEX2021-001201-M, funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033; EG-B's participation was supported by the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation, and Universities (MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033) and the EU (NextGenerationEU/PRTR) through project PID2019-103936GB-C21; TH acknowledges funding by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft DFG (project #455913229); and NR-P's participation was supported by the 2017–2018 Belmont Forum and Biodiversa+ joint call for research proposals, under the BiodivScen ERA-NET COFUND program, and with the funding organization Agencia Estatal de Investigación (grants AEI PCI2018-092966). We also thank R Cousens, M Williams, and the other 2022 ANdiNA workshop participants for their contributions. *Author contributions:* CC-B, JFC, HMR, TDH, and NR-P conceptualized the study and coordinated the project; CC-B and NR-P prepared the final manuscript, with support from the coordination team and ID; ID played an active role drafting the “In a nutshell” section and preparing the graphical material in collaboration with CC-B; all other coauthors contributed to at least one section of the manuscript and reviewed the final version.

■ Data Availability Statement

No data were collected for this study.

■ References

- Almirall E and Wareham J. 2011. Living labs: arbiters of mid- and ground-level innovation. *Technol Analysis Strateg* 23: 87–102.
- Bergvall-Kareborn B and Stahlbrost A. 2009. Living lab: an open and citizen-centric approach for innovation. *Int J Innovat Reg Develop* 1: 356–70.

- Bozeman B, Youtie J, and Jung J. 2020. Robotic bureaucracy and administrative burden: what are the effects of universities' computer automated research grants management systems? *Res Policy* **49**: 103980.
- Butchart SHM, Walpole M, Collen B, *et al.* 2010. Global biodiversity: indicators of recent declines. *Science* **328**: 1164–68.
- Cadotte MW, Mehrkens LR, and Menge DNL. 2012. Gauging the impact of meta-analysis on ecology. *Evol Ecol* **26**: 1153–67.
- Clegg S and Bradley S. 2006. Models of personal development planning: practice and processes. *Brit Educ Res J* **32**: 57–76.
- Cronin MR, Alonzo SH, Adamczak SK, *et al.* 2021. Anti-racist interventions to transform ecology, evolution and conservation biology departments. *Nat Ecol Evol* **5**: 1213–23.
- Curnalia RML and Mermer D. 2018. Renewing our commitment to tenure, academic freedom, and shared governance to navigate challenges in higher education. *Rev Commun* **18**: 129–39.
- Emery N, Hund A, Burks R, *et al.* 2019. Students as ecologists: strategies for successful mentorship of undergraduate researchers. *Ecol Evol* **9**: 4316–26.
- Farrell KJ, Weathers KC, Sparks SH, *et al.* 2021. Training macrosystems scientists requires both interpersonal and technical skills. *Front Ecol Environ* **19**: 39–46.
- Fishbach A and Woolley K. 2022. The structure of intrinsic motivation. *Annu Rev Organ Psych* **9**: 339–63.
- Forrester N. 2023. Fed up and burnt out: “quiet quitting” hits academia. *Nature* **615**: 751–53.
- Hamermesh DS. 2018. Why are professors “poorly paid”? *Econ Educ Rev* **66**: 137–41.
- Hein CJ, Ten Hoeve JE, Gopalakrishnan S, *et al.* 2018. Overcoming early career barriers to interdisciplinary climate change research. *WIREs Clim Change* **9**: e530.
- Hicks D, Wouters P, Waltman L, *et al.* 2015. Bibliometrics: the Leiden Manifesto for research metrics. *Nature* **520**: 429–31.
- Holm P, Goodsite ME, Cloetingh S, *et al.* 2013. Collaboration between the natural, social and human sciences in global change research. *Environ Sci Policy* **28**: 25–35.
- Hund AK, Churchill AC, Faist AM, *et al.* 2018. Transforming mentorship in STEM by training scientists to be better leaders. *Ecol Evol* **8**: 9962–74.
- Kis A, Tur EM, Lakens D, *et al.* 2022. Leaving academia: PhD attrition and unhealthy research environments. *PLoS ONE* **17**: e0274976.
- Kozlov M and Ryan C. 2025. How Trump 2.0 is slashing NIH-backed research—in charts. *Nature* **640**: 863–65.
- Kucirkova NI. 2023. Academia's culture of overwork almost broke me, so I'm working to undo it. *Nature* **614**: 9.
- Lawrence PA. 2016. The last 50 years: mismeasurement and mismanagement are impeding scientific research. In: Wassarman PM (Ed). *Current topics in developmental biology*. Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.
- Llorens A, Tzovara A, Bellier L, *et al.* 2021. Gender bias in academia: a lifetime problem that needs solutions. *Neuron* **109**: 2047–74.
- Mattijssen L, van Vliet N, van Doorn T, *et al.* 2020. PNN PhD survey: asking the relevant questions—mental wellbeing, workload, burnout, research environment, progress of the PhD project, considering to quit. The Hague, the Netherlands: Promovendi Netwerk Nederland.
- Moher D, Bouter L, Kleinert S, *et al.* 2020. The Hong Kong Principles for assessing researchers: fostering research integrity. *PLoS Biol* **18**: e3000737.
- Mosley L, Forsberg J, and Ngo D. 2020. Reducing administrative burden in federal research grants to universities. Washington, DC: IBM Center for The Business of Government.
- Neff MW. 2018. Publication incentives undermine the utility of science: ecological research in Mexico. *Sci Publ Policy* **45**: 191–201.
- Nicholls H, Nicholls M, Tekin S, *et al.* 2022. The impact of working in academia on researchers' mental health and well-being: a systematic review and qualitative meta-synthesis. *PLoS ONE* **17**: e0268890.
- Núñez MA, Chiuffo MC, Pauchard A, and Zenni RD. 2021. Making ecology really global. *Trends Ecol Evol* **36**: 766–69.
- Park M, Leahey E, and Funk RJ. 2023. Papers and patents are becoming less disruptive over time. *Nature* **613**: 138–44.
- Pontika N, Klebel T, Correia A, *et al.* 2022. Indicators of research quality, quantity, openness, and responsibility in institutional review, promotion, and tenure policies across seven countries. *Quant Sci Stud* **3**: 888–911.
- Receveur A, Bonfanti J, D'Agata S, *et al.* 2024. David versus Goliath: early career researchers in an unethical publishing system. *Ecol Lett* **27**: e14395.
- Reese TA, Harris-Tryon TA, Gill JG, and Banaszynski LA. 2021. Supporting women in academia during and after a global pandemic. *Sci Adv* **7**: eabg9310.
- Reiners WA, Reiners DS, and Lockwood JA. 2013. Traits of a good ecologist: what do ecologists think? *Ecosphere* **4**: 86.
- Schneider SL. 2020. 2018 faculty workload survey. Washington, DC: Federal Demonstration Partnership Foundation.
- Scholz RW. 2020. Transdisciplinarity: science for and with society in light of the university's roles and functions. *Sustain Sci* **15**: 1033–49.
- Touchon JC and McCoy MW. 2016. The mismatch between current statistical practice and doctoral training in ecology. *Ecosphere* **7**: e01394.
- Trejo J. 2020. The burden of service for faculty of color to achieve diversity and inclusion: the minority tax. *Mol Biol Cell* **31**: 2752–54.
- Wang S, Marr LC, Contreras LM, *et al.* 2022. The challenges in finding your home as a multidisciplinary scientist. *Cell* **185**: 2623–25.
- Werner R. 2015. The focus on bibliometrics makes papers less useful. *Nature* **517**: 245.
- Williams JW, Taylor A, Tolley KA, *et al.* 2023. Shifts to open access with high article processing charges hinder research equity and careers. *J Biogeogr* **50**: 1485–89.
- Woelert P. 2023. Administrative burden in higher education institutions: a conceptualisation and a research agenda. *J High Educ Policy Manage* **45**: 409–22.
- Woolston C. 2021. Stagnating salaries present hurdles to career satisfaction. *Nature* **599**: 519–21.

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and is not used for commercial purposes.

Biology, University of California, Riverside, Riverside, CA; ⁶Department of Biology, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK; ⁷Department of Biological Sciences, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK; ⁸School of Plant and Environmental Sciences, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA; ⁹BC3—Basque Centre for Climate Change—Klima Aldaketa Ikergai, Scientific Campus of the University of the Basque Country, Leioa, Spain; ¹⁰Ikerbasque, Basque Foundation for Science, Bilbao, Spain; ¹¹Mediterranean Institute for Advanced Studies, Esporles, Spain; ¹²Division of BioInvasions, Macroecology and Global Change, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; ¹³Leibniz Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries, Berlin, Germany; ¹⁴Freie Universität Berlin, Institute of Biology, Berlin, Germany; ¹⁵TUM School of Life

Sciences, Technical University of Munich, Freising, Germany; ¹⁶Department of Community Ecology, Helmholtz-Centre for Environmental Research—UFZ, Halle, Germany; ¹⁷Department of Species Interaction Ecology, Helmholtz-Centre for Environmental Research—UFZ, Leipzig, Germany; ¹⁸German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research, Halle-Jena-Leipzig, Leipzig, Germany; ¹⁹Geobotany and Botanical Garden/Institute of Biology, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, Halle, Germany; ²⁰Thünen Institute of Biodiversity, Braunschweig, Germany; ²¹Department of Biology, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway; ²²Departament de Ciències Ambientals, Facultat de Ciències, Universitat de Girona, Girona, Spain; †these authors contributed equally to this work