

Microscopy Today

2007 Salary Survey Results

Ron Anderson and Barbara Foster*


*Microscopy Today and *Microscopy/Microscopy & Education, Inc.*
microscopytoday@tampabay.rr.com
bfoster@mme1.com

Salary Surveys continue to create considerable interest. We still get requests for our 2004 salary survey results to this day¹. The current survey parallels the format of the 2004 survey, asking the identical questions to facilitate comparisons. The 2007 survey was sent by email to those Microscopy Today subscribers in the United States for whom we had email addresses. Respondents completed the survey on the internet² within an eight-day window in mid-May 2007. We needed 350 respondents in order to have results accurate to $\pm 3\%$; we had 674 respondents. The survey was anonymous. Thank you to all that participated.


The 2004 salary survey established that regional geographic differences in salary had essentially disappeared at that time. Accordingly, we did not ask respondents what state they resided in for this survey.




The data are reported graphically rather than in table format except for the instrument cross-correlation table. To read, simply follow the bars of interest. Each bar denotes the percentage of that population that reported a specific salary range. Overall, the individual histograms should tend towards a log-normal distribution. For example: the salaries of biologists in the first table. The pie-chart inserts shows the percentages of respondents in each case. Groups with a low percentage of participation will have distributions that differ in varying degrees from the expected log-normal distribution.


For the most part we are leaving it up to the reader to draw their own conclusions and interpretation of the data. Comparisons between this data and the 2004 data are useful. To facilitate these comparisons we have placed both the 2004 and 2007 data on our website: <http://www.microscopy-today.com> for PDF download.




Biological Sciences (biology, biotech, medicine, pharmaceuticals), Physical Sciences (materials science, Nanotechnology, semiconductors, forensics), and Traditional sciences (chemistry, physics, geology, earth and environmental sciences).







Numbers of Instruments in Respondent's Laboratories



The survey questions pertaining to instrument identification and usage, with two exceptions, will not be reported upon in *Microscopy Today*. Individuals interested in that data should contact Barbara Foster. The instrument data we deemed to be of interest to the readers of *Microscopy Today* are presented in the bar graph above and in the table on the next page.

Probably way down the list in importance to our readers, after salary data, is the desire to learn the present situation with regard to the number and types of instruments used by our respondents and the cross correlation of one group of instruments with another group in the same laboratory.

One very obvious conclusion in the number of instruments bar graph, that confirms the reader's intuitive sense, is the number of labs that use digital imaging acquisition and software for data collection. From the numbers in the table, 562 of the 674 respondents have entered the digital age. Subtract away corporate managers and vendor sales people from the 674 respondents and it is probably safe to say that nearly 100% of the microscopist users have gone digital.

It is also useful to note that respondents performing non-visible light microscopy remain strong customers of vendors selling light microscopes. 87% of W or LaB₆ SEM users also have stereo microscopes in their labs, etc. The conclusion an instrument manufacturer can draw from that is that just because a particular laboratory is known to be an electron microscopy facility, that does not mean that there are no opportunities to sell visible light microscopes as well as specimen preparation supplies, etc.

It is our intention to conduct a salary survey of microscopists every other year from this time forward. ■

1. R. Anderson and B. Foster, *Microscopy Today* 2004 Salary Survey Results, *Microsc. Today*, 14,1, 2004. Available from R.A. in PDF format.
2. The survey was executed by Zoomerang, A MarketTools Inc. Company, San Francisco, CA. <http://www.zoomerang.com>.

Instrument Cross Correlation Analysis														
	Stereo light microscopes	Upright light microscopes	Inverted light microscopes	Confocal microscopes	FTIR microspectro-photometer	Raman microspectro-photometer	Scanning Probe/AFM/NSOM	SEM (W or LaB6 filament)	FE-SEM	TEM/STEM (W or LaB6 filament)	FE-TEM/STEM	Analytical accessories (EDX, EELS, light spectroscopy, etc.)	Digital imaging equipment (camera, image acq. & proc. software)	Other
Stereo light microscopes	*505 75%	487 81%	311 80%	228 79%	124 90%	49 82%	125 78%	299 87%	196 79%	278 77%	110 69%	316 82%	562 79%	126 91%
Upright light microscopes	487 72%	487 100%	256 82%	196 86%	96 77%	40 82%	98 78%	222 74%	143 73%	219 79%	75 68%	226 72%	438 78%	96 76%
Inverted light microscopes	311 46%	256 53%	311 100%	157 69%	50 40%	15 31%	61 49%	134 45%	89 45%	125 45%	50 46%	136 43%	279 50%	62 49%
Confocal microscopes	228 34%	196 40%	157 51%	228 100%	30 24%	16 33%	57 46%	90 30%	67 34%	100 36%	37 34%	93 29%	211 38%	48 38%
FTIR microspectrophotometer	124 18%	96 20%	50 16%	30 13%	124 100%	40 82%	39 31%	91 30%	59 30%	46 17%	22 20%	99 31%	113 20%	21 17%
Raman microspectrophotometer	49 7%	40 8%	15 5%	16 7%	40 32%	49 100%	28 22%	36 12%	32 16%	30 11%	16 15%	42 13%	44 8%	11 9%
Scanning Probe/AFM/NSOM	125 19%	98 20%	61 20%	57 25%	39 32%	28 57%	125 100%	80 27%	77 39%	74 27%	47 43%	93 29%	109 19%	22 18%
SEM (W or LaB6 filament)	299 44%	222 46%	134 43%	90 40%	91 73%	36 74%	80 64%	299 100%	117 60%	157 57%	62 56%	226 72%	271 48%	51 41%
FE-SEM	196 29%	143 29%	89 29%	67 29%	59 48%	32 65%	77 62%	117 39%	196 100%	119 43%	75 68%	169 54%	181 32%	40 32%
TEM/STEM (W or LaB6 filament)	278 41%	219 45%	125 40%	100 44%	46 37%	30 61%	74 59%	157 53%	119 61%	278 100%	83 76%	163 52%	250 45%	46 37%
FE-TEM/STEM	110 16%	75 15%	50 16%	37 16%	22 18%	16 33%	47 38%	62 21%	75 38%	83 30%	110 100%	91 29%	100 18%	20 16%
Analytical accessories (EDX, EELS, light spectroscopy, etc.)	316 47%	226 46%	136 44%	93 41%	99 80%	42 86%	93 74%	226 76%	169 86%	163 59%	91 83%	316 100%	291 52%	62 49%
Digital imaging equipment (camera, image acquisition & processing software)	562 83%	444 90%	279 90%	211 93%	113 91%	44 90%	109 87%	271 91%	181 92%	250 90%	100 91%	291 92%	562 100%	102 81%
Other	129 19.10%	94 18.60%	62 19.90%	49 21.50%	21 16.90%	12 24.50%	22 17.60%	53 17.70%	40 20.40%	47 16.90%	20 18.20%	64 20.30%	104 18.50%	126 100.00%

* Total number of respondents who own row instrument.

** Total number of respondents who own column instrument.

*** Total number of respondents who own BOTH row AND column instrument.