

CHARLES STURT
UNIVERSITY



FOLLOW-UP SURVEY REPORT ON

ACADEMIC WOMEN IN RESEARCH

BY

SHANTHI RAMANATHAN
EQUAL OPPORTUNITY
DIVISION OF HUMAN RESOURCES
CHARLES STURT UNIVERSITY

2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	4
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
RECOMMENDATIONS	8
PREAMBLE	9
1. Demographics of respondents	10
1.1 Response by campus.....	10
1.2 Response by faculty.....	11
1.3 Response by Employment status	11
1.4 Response by qualifications	13
1.5 Response by years of service.....	13
QUANTITATIVE DATA	15
2. Analysis of Involvement in Research	15
2.1 Analysis by Faculty	15
2.2 Analysis by qualifications	17
2.3 Analysis by academic level	19
2.4 Analysis by employment status	21
3 Analysis of research funding and partnerships	23
3.1 Individual versus collaborative research	23
3.2 Research partnerships.....	23
3.3 Research funding.....	24
4. Analysis of confidence in undertaking research	25
4.1 Strengths.....	25
4.2 Weaknesses	25
QUALITATIVE FINDINGS	27
5. Impact of research related activities on research output	27
5.1 Impact of supervision of research students on research output.	27
5.2 Impact of membership on research committees on research output	29
5.3 Impact of research centre membership on research output.....	30
6. Difficulties in reaching research goals	31
6.1 Lack of time.....	31
6.2 Lack of mentors and a mentorship program.....	33
6.3 Lack of collaborators, both internal and external and like-minded researchers.....	34
6.4 Lack of an active research culture	35
6.6 Low self-confidence	36

6.7	Lack of research support	36
6.8	Lack of funding	37
7.	Greatest areas of need.....	38
7.1	Time	38
7.2	Support	39
7.3	Resources	42
7.4	Culture.....	43
8.	Role of the Centre for Research and Graduate Training.....	44
9.	Conclusion	47
10.	References	48
11	Appendices	49
	Appendix 1: Survey Instrument.....	49

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Response by University campus	10
Table 2: Response by Faculty	11
Table 3: Employment Status by Faculty	12
Table 4: Nature of Appointment by Faculty	12
Table 5: Academic Levels by Faculty	13
Table 6: Qualifications by Faculty.....	13
Table 7: Years of Service at CSU by Faculty	14
Table 8: Current Involvement in Research by Faculty	15
Table 9: Time Spent on Research by Faculty	15
Table 10: Number of Current Projects by Faculty	16
Table 11: Other Research Involvement by Faculty	16
Table 12: Time Spent on Research by Qualifications	17
Table 13: Number of Projects by Qualifications	17
Table 14: Membership on Research Committees by Qualifications	17
Table 15: Membership of Research Centre by Qualifications.....	18
Table 16: Undertaking a Higher Degree by Qualifications	18
Table 17: Supervision of Postgraduate Students by Qualifications	18
Table 18: Current Involvement in Research by Academic Level	19
Table 19: Time Spent on Research by Academic Level	19
Table 20: Membership of Research Centre by Academic Level	20
Table 21: Membership on Research Committee by Academic Level	20
Table 22: Studying for Higher Degree by Academic Level.....	20
Table 23: Involvement in Research by Employment Status.....	21
Table 24: Involvement in Research Related Activities by Employment Status	21
Table 25: Involvement in Higher Degree Study or Supervision by Employment Status	22
Table 26: Involvement in Research.....	23
Table 27: Research Partners.....	23
Table 28: Research Funding	24
Table 29: Confidence in Various Research Tasks	25

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The need for this survey was articulated by Ms Sarah McCormick, Human Resources Coordinator (Equal Opportunity) and Professor Gail Whiteford, Director of the Research into Professional Practice, Learning and Education (RIPPLE) Centre. I thank Ms McCormick and Ms Anna Bounds, Manager, Organisational Development for the opportunity to be involved in this project under the Equal Opportunity portfolio.

The survey instrument used was modified from the last CSU Academic Women in Research Survey conducted in 1993. I thank Ms Dolores Dawson for the use of the instrument, Ms Shirley Crowley for re-typing the survey, Ms McCormick and Professor Whiteford for their input into the modification of the survey and to Ms McCormick and Ms Crowley for mailing the print survey to all continuing and fixed term academic staff at CSU.

This report and its recommendations are a result of the participation of eighty-eight academic women at CSU who gave generously and freely of their time. I hope your experiences, issues, sentiments and suggestions have been accurately and adequately captured and summarised.

The analysis of the quantitative data would not have been possible without the assistance of Ms Louise Marshall from the Division of University Properties who gave freely of her time to familiarise me with the creation and manipulation of Pivot Tables in Microsoft Excel.

Many of the tables in this report was also a result of the support and contribution of Mr Graeme Lasky from the Division of Marketing and Communications who assisted me in converting the data to SPSS and helped me negotiate my way through the program. Thank you for so generously sharing your time and knowledge.

To Ms Bounds and Professor Whiteford, both of whom have reviewed drafts and made many useful suggestions for improvement, I hope this report will be a catalyst for the type of revolution you would both like to see in this area, one that will take academic women at CSU to new heights in their research.

And last but not least, to Sarah Locke, Administrative Assistant, Organisational Development for your meticulous care and patience in formatting this report.

Shanthi Ramanathan
September 2003

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is a report of a survey conducted by Equal Opportunity, Division of Human Resources, to highlight the demographics, involvement, experiences, barriers, needs and aspirations of academic women at Charles Sturt University with regards to their research.

Demographics of Respondents

A print survey was distributed to approximately 220 academic women across all CSU sites. A total of 88 responses were received indicating a 40% response rate. Key demographics include:

- 92% of respondents came from the three campuses of Albury, Bathurst and Wagga Wagga.
- 44% were from the Faculty of Health Studies
- 93% were employed as full-time staff of the University
- 7% of respondents were in part-time positions, working between 0.3 to 0.8 of a full-time load.
- 90% were in continuing positions.
- 10% at Associate Lecturer A, 61% at Lecturer B, 19% at Senior Lecturer C and 10% in Professorial positions.
- 86% had completed either a Masters or a Doctorate and two respondents had completed a Graduate Certificate
- 75% had worked at the University for more than four years
- 44% had worked at CSU for over seven (7) years

Research Involvement

- 81% of respondents were involved in some form of research.
- 71% spent less than 20% of their work time on research (this includes the 19.3% of respondents who are not involved in research at all)
- 49.4% were involved with a research centre
- 28.7% were involved with a research committee
- 25% were supervising a research student
- 35.6% were studying towards a higher degree
- The 20 percent that spent over 20% of their time on research had completed a postgraduate degree. Of these, 16% had a Masters and the remaining 84% had a PhD.
- The higher the qualification of a respondent, the greater their involvement in research, both by time spent on research and number of simultaneous projects. They are also more likely to participate on research committees, research centers and supervise research postgraduates.
- Lecturer As and, to a lesser extent, Lecturer Bs seem to favour independent research, while those at Senior Lecturer, Associate Professor and Professor positions were more likely to be working collaboratively in their current research.
- At least 35% of respondents do not appear to have active research partnerships with their respective industries.
- Academic women at CSU still rely on a fairly narrow funding base when it comes to their research. Close to half (46%) of respondents rely solely on either their own funds or CSU grants to finance their research.
- The two areas of highest confidence for academic women at CSU with regards to research are delivering research findings and collecting data.
- The three areas of least confidence relate to applying for grants, supervision of research students and writing journal articles
- Those who lacked confidence in the three areas and other were predominantly in Lecturer A & Lecturer B positions and relatively new to the University (and presumably to academia).

Key issues raised in the qualitative comments of respondents

- There are discrepancies in the understandings around what constitutes research amongst CSU's academic women. Clearly, some respondents perceive research output as only relating to their own research whereas for others, research includes both their own individual or collaborative research projects and research involving their postgraduate students. Those that hold a more inclusive view of research output incorporating student research supervision, report a more positive perception of their supervision experience.
- Academic women who contribute their time and expertise on research committees experience further workload pressures due to the time they commit to this additional activity. Some of these women perceive their contribution to be beneficial to their research output while others either do not see any relationship between their research committee representation and their research or perceive their representation to have a negative impact on their research productivity.
- Academic women experience either a positive impact or no impact on their research output by research centre membership. There is no negative impact on research productivity as a consequence of association with a research centre.
- Most academic women at CSU struggle to manage a variety of work responsibilities (teaching, marking, administrative, management, supervision and research) and personal and family commitments. The combined stress of heavy workloads and out-of-work commitments has a negative impact on their research productivity.
- Many academic women at CSU experience a lack of support by way of mentors in relation to their research development. This lack of suitable mentors poses a barrier to them reaching their research goals. Many do not belong or associate with a network of researchers, either within or outside the University.
- Some academic women are keen to be involved in collaborative research.
- Some academic women perceive a lack of a research culture at CSU which they experience as an overall lack of support and encouragement in relation to their research endeavours.
- There are academic women at CSU who lack the necessary research skills, knowledge and experience and self-confidence to achieve their research goals.
- Some academic women at CSU experience a lack of research support in many areas that impacts negatively on their research output.
- Some academic women at CSU have difficulty securing funding to undertake research or participate in research-related activities such as attendance at conferences.

The results of this survey, and in particular the qualitative comments of respondents, seem to indicate that the impact of the 1994 Women in Research (WIR) Program and the corresponding benefits of an active Women in Research Network during the mid 1990s is at best, marginal. Ten years on, the same issues such as a lack of time, lack of collegial support, lack of resources and the absence of an active research culture still seem to plague and hinder a significant proportion of academic women at CSU from achieving their research goals. Indirectly, the most profound realisation of repeating this survey ten years on is that a one-off program and initiative like the 1994 Women in Research Program is insufficient to make long-term, sustainable organisational and cultural change required for academic women to contribute equitably to research at CSU. What is needed is a more holistic, long-term program resourced at an appropriate level with commitment from the highest levels of the organisation. A clear and definite role for the Centre for Research and Graduate Training with regards to such a program should also be determined. In addition to this overarching recommendation, the following seven recommendations are offered as specific outcomes of this survey.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

That Charles Sturt University needs to identify and implement practical steps to ease the current workload of academic women as a key component in its research development efforts.

Recommendation 2

That Charles Sturt University explores the implementation of a viable, adequately supported and adequately resourced mentoring scheme for women researchers, building on the current initiatives of the Women in Research Network.

Recommendation 3

That the current *Review of Research at CSU* evaluates how research achievement is encouraged, recognised and valued at the University, particularly as it relates to meeting the support and development needs of academic women. Such an evaluation should also aim to develop models for research measurement that take into account the diversity of researchers, their disciplines and their other responsibilities and commitments.

Recommendation 4

The current *Review of Research at CSU* evaluate the effectiveness of current networking initiatives around research, particularly for academic women, with a view to introducing new and innovative ways of encouraging greater research networking.

Recommendation 5

That the Centre for Research and Graduate Training explore the provision of research support in the areas of statistics, development of collaborative research relationships and grant writing, particularly as it relates to the needs of academic women. In addition, that the University ensures the research support and development needs of academic women, as expressed in this report, are clearly reflected in the allocation of resources in this area.

Recommendation 6

That the current *Review of Research at CSU* begins to identify and articulate some elements of an active research culture and corresponding performance indicators in this area. Such an effort should aim to involve a cross-section of researchers at the University in order to ensure that a diversity of opinions and views are taken into account.

Recommendation 7

That the current *Review of Research at CSU* involve a review of the aims/roles/ responsibilities of the Centre for Research and Graduate Training with a view to increasing its profile and aligning its services to the needs of academic women.

PREAMBLE

In 1992, a survey of academic women was undertaken by the Equal Opportunity Unit of Charles Sturt University to support an application made for staff development funding for a Women in Research Program. Funding was granted and a program and network established at the University to encourage and support women undertaking research. Activities in this area ceased in the late 1990s.

Ten years on, a similar survey has been undertaken by Equal Opportunity to ascertain progress made in this area both as a result of the 1994 Women in Research Program and other initiatives at CSU. In addition to the quantitative data collected in the 1992 survey, four qualitative questions were added to the 2003 survey to gain a better understanding of academic women's experiences with regards to research. It is hoped that the results of this survey will support and inform efforts to revive a Women in Research Network and Program in 2003 as well as provide valuable information to the *Review of Research at CSU* currently being conducted by the Centre for Research and Graduate Training.

This survey was conducted across the four campuses of the University, as well as Goulburn and Canberra where CSU has a significant presence. All women employed either as continuing or fixed-term academic staff were surveyed. At the time of the survey, a total of 219 women were on the academic staff establishment of the University.

1. *Demographics of respondents*

A print survey was distributed to approximately 220 academic women across all CSU campuses. A copy of the survey is attached as Appendix A to this report. A total of 88 responses were received ie **40% response rate**. This was significantly lower than the 57% response rate for the last survey conducted in 1993. Possible reasons for this could be a combination of factors.

First, given that not all academic women currently undertake or are interested in undertaking research, this response rate is probably an indication of the proportion of female academic staff who are currently either research active or are interested in undertaking research in the future.

Second, the results of this survey and discussions held at the CSU Women in Research Forum on 3 July 2003 also highlight that many academic women are struggling under the combined pressures of heavy work, personal and family commitments. This lack of time in itself could be a major barrier to participation in such a survey.

Lastly, there seems to be a level of apathy and lack of confidence that collection of data and the consequent findings actually translate into meaningful outcomes. This could also be a contributing factor to academic women's reluctance to be involved in such an exercise.

Nevertheless, the data collected in this survey comes from a reasonable cross-section of academic women at CSU and offers a rich and valuable insight into their research experiences and needs.

1.1 **Response by campus**

Of the 88 respondents, a majority came from the three campuses of Albury, Bathurst and Wagga Wagga, making up almost 93.2% of the total respondents. This spread seems to reflect the staff compliment at each of the campuses. Aside from the significantly larger number of female academics at the three sites, it is also possibly a reflection of either a more active research culture, better research infrastructure or a combination of both of these factors given the age and level of establishment at these campuses in comparison to the other locations.

Table 1: Response by University campus

	Frequency	Percent
Albury	21	23.9
Bathurst	28	31.8
Wagga	33	37.5
Dubbo	2	2.3
Goulburn	2	2.3
Canberra	2	2.3
Total	88	100.0%

1.2 Response by faculty

Unlike the 1993 survey, where there was a fairly even distribution of responses from the five faculties, close to half the 2003 survey respondents were from the Faculty of Health Studies. This is partly explained by the greater proportion of female academic staff (64%) in the Faculty of Health and possibly an indication of an active research culture within the Faculty. Although the Faculty of Science and Agriculture has the lowest proportion of female academics (20%), the response rate to the survey was the highest (53.1%), possibly also indicating an active research culture within that Faculty. At the other end of the spectrum, both the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Commerce showed a lower response rate to the survey (26-27%) than the average rate (40%). Without more specific research, it is difficult to determine the cause for this lack of response to the survey by female academics in these two Faculties. There is probably some value in correlating this data with any statistics available from the Centre for Research and Graduate Training in this area, to gain a better understanding of research cultures within Faculties.

Table 2: Response by Faculty

	No of respondents	Percentage of respondents by faculty	Number of female academic staff in faculty	Percentage of female academic staff by faculty	Response rate by faculty
Arts	15	17.0%	55	35%	27.2%
Commerce	6	6.8%	23	29%	26.1%
Education	12	13.6%	35	50%	34.3%
Health Studies	38	43.2%	73	64%	52.1%
Science and Agriculture	17	19.3%	32	20%	53.1%
Total	88	100.0%	219	100.0%	

1.3 Response by Employment status

As with the 1993 survey, most respondents were employed as full time staff of the University (93%) with approximately 7% of respondents in part-time positions, working between 0.3 to 0.8 of a full-time load. Between faculties, the differences are negligible given the small number of respondents in part-time positions.

Table 3: Employment status by Faculty

	Employment status		Total
	Full time	Part time	
Arts	12	3	15
Commerce	6		6
Education	12		12
Health Studies	37	1	38
Science and Agriculture	15	2	17
Total	82 (93.2%)	6 (6.4)	88 (100%)

A majority of respondents were in continuing positions with only approximately 10% on fixed-terms. As with the 1993 survey, the results are fairly consistent with data in the 2001 Equal Opportunity Annual Report, which indicates that approximately 18% of all female academics are on fixed term contracts. There was no significant difference between Faculties, apart from a slightly higher percentage of fixed term staff within the Faculty of Science and Agriculture that cannot be explained without more specific research.

Table 4: Nature of Appointment by Faculty

	Nature of appointment		Total
	Continuing	Fixed term	
Arts	13	2	15
Commerce	5	1	6
Education	12		12
Health Studies	34	4	38
Science and Agriculture	13	4	17
Total	77 (87.5%)	11(12.5)	88 (100%)

The proportion of respondents along the academic appointment scale in this survey closely mirror the percentages in the 2001 Equal Opportunity Annual Report but showed some positive changes to the 1993 survey data, namely a five-fold increase in the number of respondents in professorial positions. Approximately equal proportions of respondents were on the two ends of the scale with 10% being Level A Lecturers and 10% Associate Professors or Professors, while a large proportion were concentrated in the middle levels of the scale with 61% at Lecturer B and 19% at Senior Lecturer level. These percentages are almost identical to the summary data on female academic staff reported to the Office of the Director of Equal Opportunity in Public Employment (ODEOPE) in 2002. There has been, however, some major improvements in the level of female academic staff from the 1993 survey data. The proportion of female academics at Lecturer A level has dropped from 20% to 10% and been matched with a corresponding increase in respondents at the higher end of the academic scale (14% to 19% at Lecturer C and 2% to 10% at Level D & E).

Table 5: Academic Levels by Faculty

	Position/Level				Total
	Lecturer A	Lecturer B	Senior Lecturer C	Associate Professor/ Professor D&E	
Arts	1	10	1	3	15
Commerce		4	2		6
Education	3	5	3	1	12
Health Studies	4	23	7	4	38
Science and Agriculture	1	12	4		17
	9 (10%)	54 (61%)	17 (19%)	8 (10%)	88 (100%)
1993 %	20%	64%	14%	2%	100%

1.4 Response by qualifications

A bulk of the respondents had a higher degree qualification. Approximately equal proportions of respondents (42-43%) had completed either a Masters or a Doctorate and two respondents had completed a Graduate Certificate. The Faculty of Arts and Science and Agriculture had the highest proportion of respondents with a Doctorate while the Faculty of Commerce had the lowest proportion of respondents with a PhD. Given the small numbers involved in the survey from the Faculty of Commerce, it is difficult to draw any real conclusions apart from the need for CSU to be review current incentives, encouragement and support available to female academic staff wanting to pursue a higher degree. This is reflected further on in this report with the positive relationship between level of qualifications and research involvement.

Table 6: Qualifications by Faculty

	Qualifications				Total
	Bachelor	Graduate Certificate	Masters	Doctorate	
Arts	1		4	10	15
Commerce	1		4	1	6
Education	2		6	4	12
Health Studies	4	2	19	13	38
Science and Agriculture	3		5	9	17
	11 (12.5%)	2 (2.5%)	38 (43%)	37 (42%)	88 (100%)

1.5 Response by years of service

As with the 1993 survey, approximately three-quarters of respondents had worked at the University for more than four years. Only 12.5% had been at the University for less than one year

and a similar proportion (14.8%) had been at CSU for between one and three years. The new appointees were fairly evenly spread across Faculties with a proportionately larger number of new appointees that responded to the survey coming from the Faculty of Science and Agriculture. New appointees were also more likely to be fixed-term rather than continuing staff. The most significant point the data on years of service raises is that a significant proportion of respondents (44%) have worked at CSU for over seven (7) years. Consequently, their responses should reflect a fairly well informed and longitudinal perspective on research at CSU from the perspective of a female academic.

Table 7: Years of service at CSU by Faculty

Faculty	Time at CSU					Total
	< 1 year	1-3 years	4-6 years	7-10 Years	> 10 years	
Arts	2	1	4	6	2	15
Commerce		1	1	1	3	6
Education	3	2	1	3	3	12
Health Studies	2	6	16	9	5	38
Science and Agriculture	4	3	3	5	2	17
	11 (12.5%)	13 (14.8%)	25 (28.4%)	24 (27.3%)	15 (17%)	88 (100%)

QUANTITATIVE DATA

2. *Analysis of Involvement in Research*

2.1 Analysis by Faculty

Overall, almost 81% of respondents to the survey were involved in some form of research. All respondents from the Faculties of Commerce and Education were involved in research, however, the most significant results by way of Faculty breakdowns was that a significantly high proportion of the survey respondents from the Faculty of Science and Agriculture (53%) reported not being currently involved in research. Given that the proportion of female academics in that Faculty was significantly lower than the others, it is of concern that such a significant proportion of those employed as academics within that Faculty are not research active. This is an area worthy of further investigation as part of efforts to promote research amongst female academics.

Table 8: Current involvement in Research by Faculty

	Yes	No	
Arts	13 (87%)	2	15
Commerce	6 (100%)		6
Education	12 (100%)		12
Health Studies	31(82%)	7	38
Science and Agriculture	9 (53%)	8	17
Total	71 (80.7%)	17 (19.3%)	88 (100%)

A clear majority of respondents (71%) from all the Faculties spent less than 20% of their work time on research. This includes the 19.3% of respondents who are not involved in research at all. An interesting aspect of the time spent on research by Faculty data is that three of the four respondents who spent 50% or more of their time on research came from the Faculty of Science and Agriculture. This seems to suggest that, although the proportion of female academics from that Faculty that are research active appear low, 75% of those that are research active spend 50% or more of their time on research. It is highly likely that these respondents are employed as researchers rather than teaching staff.

Table 9: Time spent on Research by Faculty

TIME SPENT ON RESEARCH	ARTS	COMMERCE	EDUCATION	HEALTH STUDIES	SCIENCE & AGRICULTURE	
< than 10%	8	2	7	19	9	45
11-20%	5	2	3	12	4	26
21-30%	1	1	2	4	1	9
31-40%				1		1
41-50%		1		2		3

> than 50%	1				2	4
Total	15	6	12	38	17	88

This is also reflected in the data on number of projects by faculty with the Faculty of Science and Agriculture boasting the highest proportion of prolific female researchers undertaking 4 or 5 projects simultaneously. This was also evident, to a lesser extent, within the Faculties of Health Studies and Education.

Table 10: Number of Current Projects by Faculty

Number of current projects	Arts	Commerce	Education	Health Studies	Science & Agriculture	
0	3		1	8	8	20
1	6	2	3	13	4	28
2	6	3	3	9	2	23
3			2	2		4
4		1	3	3	1	8
5				3	2	5
Total	12	6	11	30	9	88

When it came to research related activities like participation of research committees and centers, personal study towards a research higher degree and supervision of students by Faculty, the results were fairly non-conclusive. Close to half of the respondents (49.4%) were involved with a research centre with the highest percentage coming from the Faculty of Arts, followed by the Faculty of Science and Agriculture. Only approximately one-quarter of respondents were involved with a research committee (28.7%) or supervising a research student (25%) and a third with studying towards a higher degree (35.6%). The Faculty of Commerce had the highest proportion of respondents studying for a higher degree and, as a logical consequence, none supervising research students. This could also be an indication that the female academics within that Faculty are, on average, less qualified than their counterparts, or that those that responded to the survey represent a less qualified section of female academic staff in that faculty.

Table 11: Other Research involvement by Faculty

		Arts	Commerce	Education	Health Science	Science & Agriculture	
Member of a Research Centre	Yes	10	2	6	16	9	43
	No	5	4	6	22	7	44
Membership on a Research Committee	Yes	5	2	4	12	2	25
	No	10	4	8	26	15	63
Studying towards a Higher Degree	Yes	3	4	5	16	3	31
	No	12	2	7	20	13	51
Supervising Students	Yes	5		4	11	2	22
	No	10	6	8	27	15	66
Total		15	6	12	38	16	87

2.2 Analysis by qualifications

A relationship is apparent between the level of qualification of respondents and the time they spend on research. While a clear majority of respondents (80%) spent less than one fifth of their working time on research, the 20 percent that spent over 20% of their time had completed a postgraduate degree (Masters or Doctorate). Of these respondents, 16% had a Masters and the remaining 84% had a PhD. This indicates that the higher the qualification of a female academic, the greater the likelihood that she is involved in research. The data also suggests that female academics undertaking research for more than 50% of their time are highly likely to have completed a PhD.

Table 12: Time spent on Research by Qualifications

QUALIFICATIONS	BAC	GC	MAS	PhD	Grand Total
< than 10%	5	2	26	12	45
11-20%	6		9	11	26
21-30%			2	7	9
31-40%				1	1
41-50%			1	2	3
> 50%				4	4
Grand Total	11	2	38	37	88

The results were similar for number of projects, with a majority (88%) of those undertaking three or more research projects simultaneously having completed either a PhD or a Masters.

Table 13: Number of Projects by Qualifications

QUALIFICATIONS	BAC	GC	MAS	PhD	
1	8		13	7	28
2	1		10	12	23
3			1	3	4
4	1		2	5	8
5		1		4	5
Total	10	1	26	31	68

Insofar as other research related indicators went, there was a difference between the relationship of qualifications to the four areas surveyed. Having a Masters or PhD was clearly linked to a higher probability of membership on a research committee and participation in a research centre. Of the 25 respondents who were members of a research committee, 23 held a postgraduate qualification (92%) and of the 43 respondents who were members of a research centre, 38 held a postgraduate qualification (88%).

Table 14: Membership on Research Committee by Qualifications

QUALIFICATIONS	BAC	GC	MAS	PhD	TOTAL
YES	1	1	11	12	25
NO	10	1	27	25	63
	11	2	38	37	88

Table 15: Membership of Research Centre by Qualifications

QUALIFICATIONS	BAC	GC	MAS	PhD	TOTAL
YES	5		14	24	43
NO	6	2	24	12	44
	11	2	38	36	87

On the other hand, as would be expected, all those undertaking higher degrees possessed a Masters qualification or below and these accounted for more than half the respondents in all three categories (Bachelor, Graduate Certificate or Masters). It was also interesting that almost 65% of respondents that did not possess a Doctorate are currently involved in some form of study towards a higher degree. Further research into the proportion of these female academics who are undertaking their postgraduate studies by research and those that are enrolled through CSU would be a useful indicator as to the level of support that needs to be made available to support female academics undertaking a research higher degree at CSU.

Table 16: Undertaking a Higher Degree by Qualifications

QUALIFICATIONS	BAC	GC	MAS	PhD	
YES	8	1	20	0	31
NO	3	1	16	36	54
	11	2	36	36	85

As was expected, all of the 21 respondents who are currently supervising postgraduate students possess a Masters or a PhD. Probably the more significant point is that only 25% of respondents are currently supervising postgraduate students. Given that postgraduate completions are a crucial factor in the funding of Universities and have potential to contribute significantly to the research output and portfolio of CSU, further investigation into the proportion of female academics involved in postgraduate supervision and the issues they face would be beneficial in informing initiatives to increase the number of female postgraduate supervisors.

Table 17: Supervision of Postgraduate Student by Qualifications

QUALIFICATIONS	BAC	GC	MAS	PhD	
YES			5	16	21
NO	11	2	33	21	67
	11	2	38	37	88

In summary, the higher the qualification of a respondent, the greater their involvement in research, both by time spent on research and number of simultaneous projects. They are also more likely to participate on research committees, research centers and supervise research postgraduates. Given this, there are direct benefits to the research output of the University to be realized by increasing the level of qualifications of female academic staff.

2.3 Analysis by academic level

The influence of Academic Level on research involvement and associated activities varied. Over 30% of respondents at Lecturer B were not involved in any research, whereas 100% of respondents at Associate Lecturer A were involved in research. This may suggest that either respondents at Associate Lecturer A who were not involved in research did not participate in the survey, or that early career academics have more enthusiasm and desire to be involved in research. It is also possible that those respondents at Lecturer B have greater administrative responsibilities than their Associate Lecturer A counterparts, are busy with higher degree study or concentrate more on improving their teaching, all of which has the potential to take time away from research. Further investigation is required to verify if this phenomenon really exists and to better understand this apparent trend. A majority of respondents at Senior Lecturer C, Associate Professor D and Professor E were also involved in research which is probably reflective of a combination of factors such as their greater skills and experience in research, their more extensive research networks and a need to maintain a steady research and publication record for career progression purposes.

Table 18: Current involvement in Research by Academic Level

	ASSOC LECTURER A	LECTURER B	SENIOR LECTURER C	ASSOC PROF/PROF D&E	
NO		13	3	1	17
YES	9	41	14	7	71
	9	54	17	8	88

When it comes to time spent on research, however, respondents at Lecturer B and Senior Lecturer C were more likely to spend more than 20% of their time on research. Of the 17 respondents that spent over 21% of their time on research, 14 were at these two levels. This suggests that those at Lecturer B and Senior Lecturer C are more likely to have an in-depth involvement in their research as opposed to those at Associate Professor D and Professor E who are more likely to have access to research assistance. In addition, those at Associate Professor D and Professor E have probably got greater administrative and managerial responsibilities that limit the time they devote to research.

Table 19: Time spent on Research by Academic Level

	ASSOC LECTURER A	LECTURER B	SENIOR LECTURER C	ASSOC PROF/PROF D&E	
< than 10%	5	29	8	3	45
11-20%	4	20		2	26
21-30%		3	5	1	9
31-40%				1	1
41-50%			2	1	3
> 50%		2	2		4
	9	54	17	8	88

As far as involvement in a research centre goes, there seems to be some correlation between those at Professor E and Associate Professor D and membership of a research centre. All but 1 respondent at Associate Professor D and Professor E were members of a research centre (87.5%) whereas, for those at Senior Lecturer C and below, less than 50% were members of a research centre. Further research is required to understand this relationship and if it has any potential impact on research participation.

Table 20: Membership of Research Centre by Academic Level

	ASSOC LECTURER A	LECTURER B	SENIOR LECTURER C	ASSOC PROF/PROF D&E	
YES	4	25	7	7	43
NO	5	29	9	1	44
	9	54	16	8	87

When it came to membership on research committees, there seems to be an apparent relationship between those at Senior Lecturer C and research committee membership. Approximately 58% in this group claimed membership on research committees whilst the percentage was 25% or under for all the other levels. This finding was reflected in the 1993 survey and seems to suggest that academics at this level have greater administrative loads which, in some cases, precludes membership on research committees. In contrast, Lecturers at levels A & B are more likely to be required to concentrate on teaching duties and administration in relation to those duties.

Table 21: Membership on Research Committee by Academic Level

	ASSOC LECTURER A	LECTURER B	SENIOR LECTURER C	ASSOC PROF/PROF D&E	
YES	1	12	10	2	25
NO	8	42	7	6	63
	9	54	17	8	88

As was expected, the likelihood of involvement in study towards a postgraduate degree decreases as academic levels increase. This is not surprising as a majority of those at Senior Lecturer C and Associate Professor D/Professor E already hold qualifications at a Masters or Doctorate level.

Table 22: Studying for Higher Degree by Academic Level

	ASSOC LECTURER A	LECTURER B	SENIOR LECTURER C	ASSOC PROF/PROF D&E	
YES	6	21	3	1	31
NO	3	30	14	7	54
	9	51	17	8	85

2.4 Analysis by employment status

It appears that employment status has no relationship to research involvement either by time or number of projects. If anything, respondents holding continuing positions are half as likely to be involved in research (20%) compared to their counterparts on fixed-term (10%). The data on number of projects by employment status was fairly inconclusive. These findings mirror closely those of the 1993 survey.

Table 23: Involvement in research by employment status

		Continuing	Fixed term	Total
	NO	16	1	17
	YES	61	10	71
No of Projects	1	24	4	28
	2	20	3	23
	3	2	2	4
	4	8	0	8
	5	4	1	5

Insofar as involvement in research related activities go, there were some differences between fixed-term and continuing staff. Only one of the 11 respondents on fixed-term reported membership on a research committee (9%) whereas approximately one third (31%) of respondents holding continuing positions reported research committee involvement. On the contrary, a higher proportion of fixed-term staff reported research centre membership. Almost three quarters of respondents on fixed-term (73%) reported research centre membership whereas only 47% of continuing staff were attached to a research centre. Without further investigation, it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions about the impact of employment status on involvement with research centres and research committees. However, it does appear that fixed-term staff are less likely to participate on research committees, and given that their length of employment is, on average, shorter than continuing staff, this may account for their lack of representation. Given that research centre membership is less discriminatory in terms of length of employment, academic level and research seniority and track record, it is highly unlikely that the differences apparent in the data reflect any real differences.

Table 24: Involvement in research related activities by employment status

		Continuing	Fixed term	Total
Committee	YES	24	1	25
	NO	53	10	63
Centre	YES	36	8	44
	NO	41	3	44
		77	11	88

And finally, employment status appears to have no apparent relationship to involvement in higher degree study but continuing staff are three times as likely (27%) as fixed-term staff (9%) to be involved in supervising a postgraduate student. Given that the period of candidature of a postgraduate student could realistically extend beyond the fixed-term period of an academic staff member, academic staff members on fixed-terms are disadvantaged in terms of opportunities to supervise postgraduate students. This is an issue worthy of further consideration given that there are still a number of academic women on fixed-term contracts.

Table 25: Involvement in higher degree study or supervision by employment status

		Continuing	Fixed term	Total
HD Study	YES	28	3	31
	NO	49	8	54
Supervision	YES	21	1	22
	NO	56	10	66
		77	11	88

3 Analysis of research funding and partnerships

3.1 Individual versus collaborative research

Several questions in the survey focused on level of research collaboration, research partnerships and research funding. When it came to involvement in research, there was a fairly even spread across the three categories with a third being involved in individual research, a third in collaborative research and a third doing both. Further analysis reveals that those at Associate Lecturer A and, to a lesser extent, those at Lecturer B, seem to favour independent research, while those at Senior Lecturer C, Associate Professor D and Professor E were more likely to be working collaboratively in their current research. Given that collaborative research becomes more viable as a researcher gains experience and become accepted into a larger network of researchers, it is not surprising that those undertaking research independently are more likely to be less qualified, occupy the lower levels on the academic scale and organisational hierarchy. This trend was also reflected in the results of the 1993 survey.

Table 26: Involvement in research

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Individually	25	28.4	31.3
Collaboratively	25	28.4	31.3
Both	30	34.1	37.5
Total	80	90.9	100.0
Missing	8	9.1	
	88	100.0	

3.2 Research partnerships

The results with regards to research partners were harder to analyse, given that almost half (48%) of respondents reported using a combination of partners and another 11% reported involving all three types of partners. Almost 35% of those that research collaboratively have partners from within academia (25% from within the University and 9% from outside the University). Only 6.8% reported research partnerships solely with related industry partners, but given the significant number that reported using all or a combination of partners, these results are at best inconclusive. Probably the most significant fact is that at least 35% of respondents do not appear to have active research partnerships with their respective industries. Given that a move towards greater research collaboration with industry could only auger well for CSU, taking into account the potential resources and expertise that the industry sector can contribute towards research, there may be an opportunity for the current *Review of Research at CSU* to investigate barriers academic women face in their dealing with industry partners and means for overcoming these barriers. This point presents itself again in the qualitative data.

Table 27: Research partners

	Frequency	Percent
At CSU	22	25.0
Another University	8	9.1

Related industry	6	6.8
All	10	11.4
Combination	42	47.7
Total	88	100.0

3.3 Research funding

The data on research funding indicates that academic women at CSU still rely on a fairly narrow funding base when it comes to their research. Close to half (46%) of respondents rely solely on either their own funds or CSU grants to finance their research. Given the pressure on all Universities to constantly broaden and diversify their research funding base and increase government and industry support for research, the data from this survey suggest that for academic women at CSU, there is probably a need for further assistance with obtaining external funding. This could include assistance with research proposal formulation and identifying suitable sources of funding, but further investigation is required to determine the exact needs in this area and how best to meet them.

Table 28: Research funding

	Frequency	Percent
Own funds	21	23.9
CSU grant	20	22.7
Government	10	11.4
Industry	9	10.2
Other	4	4.5
Combination	24	27.3
Total	88	100.0

4. Analysis of confidence in undertaking research

The final section of quantitative questions centred around academic women's confidence in undertaking selected research tasks from their own self assessments. Based on a nine-point scale ranging from (0) not at all confident to (8) completely confident, respondents were asked to rate themselves on ten research tasks. Given that the mid-point of the scale was a rating of (4), the means results provided in the table below seem to indicate that on average, academic women at CSU who responded to the survey were on the bottom half of the confidence scale on all the research tasks surveyed.

Table 29: Confidence in various research tasks

	Developing ideas	Applying for grants	Collecting data	Collaboration and consultation	Administration	Analyzing results	Developing new skills	Delivering findings	Writing journal articles	Supervision of research students
Valid	88	88	88	88	88	85	87	88	88	87
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	1
Mean	3.6932	2.7614	3.7727	3.6477	3.2386	3.3412	3.4828	3.8182	3.3977	3.0805

4.1 Strengths

The combined data indicates that overall, the two areas of highest confidence for academic women at CSU are delivering research findings and collecting data. Unlike the 1993 survey, where almost two thirds of respondents rated themselves as having low confidence, most respondents to the 2003 survey were fairly confident about their ability to deliver their research findings. Those who lacked confidence were predominantly in Lecturer A positions and relatively new to the University (and presumably to academia). Collecting data was another area of fairly high confidence with those reporting low confidence being predominantly from the Faculty of Commerce and/or those with a Bachelor's degree. Another two areas of moderate confidence were developing research ideas and collaboration and consultation. Most participants were fairly confident about developing research ideas and again, it was those in Lecturer A positions that would appear to be fairly new to academia who were lacking confidence in this area. When it came to collaboration and consultation, the high confidence levels reported were surprising given that many participants reported a lack of collaboration as a barrier to achieving their research goals. This indicates that academic women are generally confident about collaborating with like-minded researchers and colleagues but have a difficulty finding such people.

4.2 Weaknesses

The three areas of least confidence relate to applying for grants, supervision of research students and writing journal articles. Almost 70% of respondents from across all faculties, levels of qualification and academic levels reported a lack of confidence in applying for grants. This is reflected in the qualitative findings in terms of barriers to research productivity. The numbers of respondents who lacked confidence in this area were also mostly at Lecturer A & B Levels and

quite clearly those that did not have a postgraduate qualification. Clearly, this is an area to target for research development, particularly for early career researchers.

As far as supervision of students went, a large proportion of respondents (62%) reported a lack of confidence in this area which is not surprising as only 25% of respondents are currently involved in postgraduate supervision. Women in the Faculty of Arts seem to have the highest confidence in this area which may be an area worthy of further exploration to determine reasons for this high level of confidence. Once again, it is those at Lecturer A & B level and those who possess a Bachelor's degree as their highest qualification that report the lowest confidence and this is well worth considering in research development initiatives in this important area.

One final area where a low level of confidence was recorded by a large portion of participants was in the area of writing journal articles. Unlike the 1993 survey, where 64% of those surveyed indicated that it was not an area of concern for them, many respondents, particularly those at Lecturer A level and with a Bachelor's degree as their highest qualification, lacked confidence in this area. This is another area to be considered for research development.

QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

In order to further illuminate the findings of the 2003 Academic Women in Research Survey and the quantitative results presented above, four qualitative questions were added to the 2003 Survey. It was believed that this qualitative data would assist the University to gain a better understanding of issues that impact on research output by academic women at CSU. These questions were:

- 1. Please specify how your involvement in a CSU Research Centre, on a University/Faculty/School Research Committee or with supervising a research postgraduate has impacted on your research output.**
- 2. Please identify any difficulties you have encountered and/or are encountering in achieving your personal research goals**
- 3. What is your greatest area of need with regard to research at CSU?**
- 4. What support do you currently receive from the Centre for Research and Graduate Training?**

A summary of key comments made by respondents to each of the questions appears below. No attempt has been made to correlate responses to particular demographic characteristics of the respondents such as campus, Faculty, position, qualifications, employment status, years of service at CSU or current research involvement. Given this, the findings are broadly informative rather than prescriptive. A more detailed analysis based on the demographic characteristics mentioned above may provide a clearer understanding of these academic women's experiences and be more influential in terms of initiatives in this area.

5. Impact of research related activities on research output

5.1 Impact of supervision of research students on research output.

In relation to supervision of research postgraduates, respondents were clustered into three distinct groups based on their perceptions of the impact of supervision on their research output. The most positive of this group perceived their postgraduate students' research as directly contributing to their research output through increased publications, research assistance and the creation of preliminary data that could be used to obtain funding for further investigation. They reported:

"Student research projects hugely important to my research output."

"I publish often with my PhD students eg. 3 papers last year with a CSU PhD student. There is a direct impact on research output."

"I have several journal publications and conference papers with students I'm supervising. This has increased my output"

"Enhances my output by joint publications with students."

“Increases output. Can be included in conceptualisation of research but others do the “nitty gritty”, requiring less time from me personally. Honours (Bachelor level) tend to take a lot of time through the entire process but you still get product. It’s akin to forcing you to make time for research (by virtue of the fact you have responsibilities to the students). Also, Bachelors Honours research can assist with providing you with preliminary data with which to apply for funding.”

The second group saw supervision as having both positive and negative impacts on their research output. Supervision made demands on their time that could be devoted to increasing their personal research output. However, they recognised that their students’ research also had the potential to contribute to their research output through greater publication or stimulating research ideas.

“Time spent on supervision initially reduces my output but later increases output as students publish their research – often with me as co-author.”

“Takes time and therefore lessens time available for own research. However, I feel that being involved with this side of research is vital because it also stimulates ideas and thinking to work with research students.”

The third group saw supervision of research students as having little impact or a negative impact on their research output:

“While I quite enjoy supervision, time wise, it is very demanding. This means less “Uni” time to work on my own research and consequently less output.”

“Very little - Masters dissertations are distance education and while they may relate to my research area, they benefit teaching (ie. Research training) more than research per se.”

“Higher degree supervision limits my ability to undertake individual/group research.”

“Supervision also impacted on my time for my own research somewhat.”

As explained earlier no correlations have been drawn between respondents’ qualitative comments and other demographic factors. Given this, it is difficult to draw conclusions about the variance in perceptions regarding the impact of postgraduate supervision on research. Having said that, the following issues are clearly identified in the responses to this question:

Issue 1

There are discrepancies in the understandings around what constitutes research amongst CSU’s academic women. Clearly, some respondents perceive research output as only relating to their own research whereas for others, research includes both their own individual or collaborative research projects and research involving their postgraduate students.

Issue 2

Those that hold a more inclusive view of research output incorporating student research supervision, report a more positive perception of their supervision experience.

Given the current emphasis in the funding formula for postgraduate student completions, these findings suggests that this is an area worthy of further investigation as part of the current Review of Research at CSU. A desirable outcome may be that the perception of postgraduate supervision in relation to research productivity, as it is measured at CSU, is consistent across the organisation. Another area that could benefit from further inquiry is a more in-depth analysis of the factors that make postgraduate supervision beneficial to research productivity for some women academics and how to maximise these factors. This knowledge has the potential to improve the postgraduate supervision experiences of women academics across the University.

5.2 Impact of membership on research committees on research output

The second research-related activity surveyed was membership on research committees. Once again, there was a range of responses. Several comments were fairly negative in terms of impact on research output. .

“For approximately 6 years, I was the Presiding Officer of the Research Development Committee for [my School] which mostly has immature researchers. This role impacted very negatively on my own research output as much time was consumed with admin and mentoring work for the faculty’s Higher Degrees Committee”

“I am the Presiding Officer of our Research Development Committee. I find the RDC duties often mean I spend more time consulting with others re their research rather than concentrating on my own.”

“It doesn’t – if anything it takes more time away than I have to give.”

A second cluster of comments were impartial, citing little or no impact on research output.

“Nil – the research committee is an ethics committee to assess research ethics of students.”

“I have unfortunately very little involvement with the research committee although I am a member so it has had no impact whatsoever on my output.”

“Only just nominated to be a member of the research committee. No impact yet.”

One respondent acknowledged no impact but credited this to her short time on the committee and expressed plans for her membership to have an impact in the near future.

“I have recently become co-chair of a research committee so there has been no change yet but plans are underway.”

Two other respondents express the negative impact that research committee membership has had on their research time but acknowledge that it is an important and beneficial undertaking and could have a positive flow-on impact on their research. They reported:

“When I was on the committee of a now defunct research group, I spent a lot of time on that which detracted greatly from my own research – but I didn’t mind as I thought it was important.”

“The impact has been positive even though these commitments reduce my time available for research. The networking aspect has been a plus and the involvement in a variety of research-related activities has a beneficial, flow-on effect for my research output.”

Responses to this question were limited in number which is not surprising given that women are still largely under-represented on many University decision-making committees (Equal Opportunity Annual Report 2002, Figure 1). Having said that, some of the comments strongly suggest that

Issue 3

Academic women who contribute their time and expertise on research committees experience further workload pressures due to the time they commit to this additional activity.

Issue 4

Some of these women perceive their contribution to be beneficial to their research output while others either do not see any relationship between their research committee representation and their research or perceive their representation to have a negative impact on their research productivity.

Given that it is equally important to support academic women to achieve both their personal research goals and develop research leadership, it may be beneficial for CSU to explore the possibility of providing additional support and incentives to women that are appointed to research committees. Also, given that membership on these committees is in fact contribution to research management and leadership at the University, it needs to be appropriately recognised and acknowledged.

5.3 Impact of research centre membership on research output

The third and final research-related activity surveyed was the impact of research group/ centre membership on research output. The first group of comments speak of a positive impact on research output:

"Membership of Johnstone Centre facilitates my research output."

"Centre for Cultural Risk Research project on Fear of Crime was the basis for four significant subsequent publications."

"Teaching commitments make it difficult to be active in CAPPE although that membership has facilitated a research project."

"As a 'novice researcher' the help, support and guidance assisted me in successfully completing my ethics application and obtaining a small CSU seed grant."

A second cluster of comments ranged from no impact to limited impact of research centre membership on research output. An overwhelmingly majority of these comments came from members of the new research group RIPPLE (Research into Professional Practice, Learning and Education):

"Centre membership currently unrelated to research."

"Not at all – I have not yet made use of my Farrer Centre membership."

"No impact at all in a positive or negative way."

"As yet unknown- a new member of RIPPLE."

"I have just started with RIPPLE. Not sure about impact in relation to this."

“Research is a new endeavour for me so I can’t say at the moment what impact being a member of RIPPLE has for me.”

“I am a member of RIPPLE but it has not yet had an impact on my research output.”

“I have only just joined RIPPLE – so have had limited exposure to RIPPLE and other researchers. Limited impact as yet.”

Overall, the comments of respondents indicate that:

Issue 5

Academic women experience either a positive impact or no impact on their research output by research centre membership.

Issue 6

There is no negative impact on research productivity as a consequence of association with a research centre.

Many of those who reported little or no impact have either not “*made use*” of their membership or are members of a centre that is still in its infancy. Given this, there is clearly opportunity for new research centres such as RIPPLE and older and more established centres to devote some resources to helping individual members achieve their research goals. This has the potential to ensure that research centre membership translates directly into greater research output rather than remain something that “*looks good on my CV*”. Also, given that a significant number of the respondents are members RIPPLE, there is opportunity to look specifically at how RIPPLE’s activities can contribute not just to overall research productivity as a Centre, but specifically to meeting the individual research needs of its members.

6. Difficulties in reaching research goals

The next qualitative question delved into the difficulties that respondents encountered in reaching their research goals. Many respondents wove multiple factors into their responses so a decision was made to tease out the various factors and allocate them to the different categories. In some instances this has meant that a paragraph of text has been dissected and reported separately. Nevertheless, the comments have not been changed or their meaning altered by this process.

6.1 Lack of time

The greatest factor impeding the attainment of research goals, as reported by almost all of the respondents, was the lack of time. Many talked about the sheer lack of time in their workday for research related activities. The following excerpts talk specifically about the impact of juggling heavy workloads, in particular teaching, supervision and administration, coupled with the burden of family and other responsibilities:

“The main problems are time and the practicalities of juggling my job, my research and my domestic responsibilities.”

“Main issue is time and balancing research supervision, course coordination, teaching and other administrative expectations of the University.”

“Heavy administrative loads coupled with PhD research and large teaching cohorts.”

“Trying to manage teaching and admin workloads, family social commitments AND research is difficult.”

“Insufficient time required to teach/ prepare/ work/ administration. No time for thinking and research.”

“Biggest issue is time. Staffing load and admin work combines to grow and research suffers.”

“My position has an extremely high workload (highest for the program) and needs lots of mind space for dealing with important and urgent tasks – bitsy ones! I get little time to prepare for teaching and less for research because of the management and admin responsibilities of my job.”

One respondent reports specifically about how ongoing consultancies provide funds to CSU but actually take up time that could be devoted to research:

“Time and workload – ongoing consultancies deliver funds to the Uni but stop (academic)research. Understaffed: teaching /marking takes up time.”

While another academic writes about the lack of “blocks of time” during semester for research:

“Time!! Teaching load gets 1st priority (after family) than whatever is left is to research and other non-teaching commitments. My major problem is very heavy internal teaching load thus no blocks of time during semester.”

Yet another respondent claims her barriers include the need for “quality” reporting which she clearly feels is unnecessary and harassment and victimisation of CSU Finance Officers, presumably about her research:

“My difficulties are caused by increasing teaching and administrative loads, by ‘quality’ reporting which is a process which is absurd and of no value and by harassment and victimisation by CSU Finance Officers.”

One respondent talks specifically about the lack of time to undertake publishing of her research, an undertaking that has the potential to greatly benefit her and CSU’s research profile. She says:

*“Having time to write journal articles and persist with non-acceptances (especially when trying to achieve publications in prestigious/international journals) is almost impossible”
“That is one of my research goals.”*

Another talks about the lack of time for creative writing.

“Work related tasks override creative time for research writing and engaging in extra research or even time to apply for grants.”

One respondent in particular, talks about the availability of small pockets of time rather than a dedicated block of time required for many activities associated with research

“Time is too short and only available in small pockets of opportunity. I can really only manage to do my teaching administration and community involvement activities in the time available for work.”

while another talks about the positive impact that having some block time has on her research..

“The main difficulty is time. As a long time Head of School, time for research is quite limited. I’ve recently received a block of time which has given my research a kick start.”

One respondent presents a solution to her dilemma when she resigns from her administrative role, an action she believes had the direct result of increasing her research output:

“Involvement in administration had a negative impact on my research output. I have resigned from admin duty as co-director and now find that my research output has significantly increased.”

And one respondent is positive about negotiating time release from other duties:

“Getting approval to spend 30% time on a major research project in Laos – time to travel, do fieldwork, analyse data and write up. Will negotiate time release for teaching and marking.”

Another respondent suggests the development of a standard workload formula as a possible solution to the lack of time for research

“High teaching load but this applies to all staff. The Uni would benefit from a standard workload formula that includes research and admin rather than just EFTSU or resource based teaching.”

While another merely acknowledges that she does her own research in her “own time”

“Time – as coordinator of one of the largest CSU courses (Diploma of Policing Practice) most of my time is in an administrative role. Most research I do is in my own time.”

From the numerous responses that cite a lack of time as a major barrier to research output and productivity, it is evident that

Issue 7

Most academic women at CSU struggle to manage a variety of work responsibilities (teaching, marking, administrative, management, supervision and research) and personal and family commitments. The combined stress of heavy workloads and out-of-work commitments has a negative impact on their research productivity.

These facts are clearly documented in the literature (Burton, 1997; Deane et al, 1996; Castleman, 1995). Given this, there maybe an opportunity in the *current Review of Research at CSU* to examine if current indicators used to measure performance of academic women, accurately and realistically reflect both their work and family commitments. In addition, such indicators need to account for the diversity of their disciplines, Faculties, Schools and the particular point they are in their research career.

6.2 Lack of mentors and a mentorship program

Many respondents also talked about a lack of suitable mentors and a clear process for obtaining support and assistance from experienced researchers as having a negative impact on the achievement of their research goals. A selection of comments appear below:

“No one is available to mentor in my areas of interest.”

“Lack of mentoring and networks at CSU.”

“Lack of mentoring at CSU and a lack of recognition of existing research skills and knowledge.”

“I would like to work with a more experienced researcher but don’t really know how to do this without ending up doing a project I don’t really want to do. I’m not clear how to go about setting up something like this.”

“No mentors, particularly my 2 years at Bathurst School of IT. The old teaching college staffs are just waiting to retire and do nothing. Rare to have someone to help me develop my academic research skills, or to work with.”

The above comments suggest that

Issue 8

Many academic women at CSU experience a lack of support by way of mentors in relation to their research development. This lack of suitable mentors poses a barrier to them reaching their research goals.

6.3 Lack of collaborators, both internal and external and like-minded researchers.

The lack of mentors is further compounded by a lack of collaborators and like-minded researchers who have the potential to contribute to the development of novice and early-career researchers. Respondents reported:

“There is a lack of people to collaborate with.”

“Loss of collaborative scientists through resignation from CSU. This is being addressed through advertising new positions.”

“Finding people with similar research interests is difficult.”

“Lack of critical mass of like researchers at CSU and external collaborators take so much effort and time to find.”

“Finding research collaborators in the same field of research.”

“Looking for suitable research topics and colleagues to work with. Prefer collaborative research. Lack of postgraduate students to supervise.”

As one respondent reflects, at CSU, there are

“ Limited team research opportunities.”

The comments of respondents in relation to the lack of collaborators and like-minded researchers suggest that

Issue 9

Many academic women at CSU do not belong or associate with a network of researchers, either within or outside the University.

Issue 10

Some academic women are keen to be involved in collaborative research.

6.4 Lack of an active research culture

For some respondents, a major impediment to achieving their research goals is an overall lack of intellectual community and active research culture at the University. An indication for this, according to some respondents, is the lack of research supervisors, lack of research support funding, lack of opportunities for spontaneous academic exchange and the isolation of some campuses.

“CSU is not research focused. Very limited number of qualified supervisors. Limited dollars to support researchers.”

“The lack of an intellectual community at CSU (research culture). In Albury, no staff room and little exchange of ideas.”

“Lack of research culture – research not encouraged at all.”

“Lack of opportunities in my school for spontaneous academic exchange and research issues.”

One participant captured this sentiment particularly succinctly when she says:

“Research not seen as a priority at CSU. Course related administration and teaching is always a higher priority.”

The comments in this area suggest that

Issue 11

Some academic women perceive a lack of a research culture at CSU which they experience as an overall lack of support and encouragement in relation to their research endeavours.

6.5 Lack of research experience and knowledge

For several of the respondents, particularly those who are either research inactive or new to the research scene, a lack of experience and knowledge in this area prove major impediments to them achieving their research goals.

“Lack of experience especially in collaborative research.”

Started research late in my career – more oriented to teaching. I need peer support.”

“Work commitments hinder development of further studies and research. I am very much a beginner at this.”

“I don’t have the time to think re: research especially as I have no prior experience in this area.”

“Great pressure pushed on new academics to be research active within probationary review period despite these new academics having some of the heaviest teaching loads. Feeling lost as to what research support networks/ mentorship is available and how to access such support. Hoping to feel more confident once attend Research Colloquium this year.”

“I do not have sufficient quantitative research skills and don’t have the time or money to address this. I am in two minds about whether it is worth the effort at this stage of my

career but as I am called upon to teach research methods without sufficient academic support, I suppose I had better do something about it."

The above comments suggest that

Issue 12

There are academic women at CSU who lack the necessary research skills, knowledge and experience to achieve their research goals.

6.6 Low self-confidence

The lack of experience and knowledge can also be compounded by another problem for novice and new researchers and that is the issue of confidence. As some point out, low self-confidence can be a major barrier to research participation:

"Need assistance and encouragement to write and be confident about ideas. Fine verbally but been too shattered by past negative experience to put articles or drafts "out there"

"Low self confidence is my biggest problem."

"In my school, supervision of higher degrees seems to be given to the CSU staff who are ex-police, and I do not feel my PhD counts for much in this regard."

The lack of expertise mentioned in the previous section are further compounded by a lack of self-confidence. Their comments suggest that

Issue 13

There are academic women at CSU who lack the self-confidence necessary to undertake research.

6.7 Lack of research support

A range of responses also indicated the lack of support ranging from statistical analysis to administration of research projects as being major barriers to research success. The first group of comments relate to research design and statistical support:

"No access to expertise on appropriately designing project. No confidence in statistically analysing data.

"Problems with statistical analyses. Lack of administration support for research."

"Research design and statistical support needed."

"Statistics support. I need to improve own statistics skills."

One respondent wrote about the lack of support for conference attendance

"Lack of support from School/Faculty to attend conferences. I was not allowed to attend and present at my main conference in 2001 because of teaching commitments."

while another highlighted the lack of research assistants

“Lack of availability of research assistants. I raised this at VCAC and am talking to Reg Shaw about it. In the past, lack of support at school level – this no longer applies.”

and a third raised the issue of full text articles:

“Poor provision of journal full text access.”

For the rest, a general lack of support was seen as a key barrier.

“Minimal University support for Albury campus i.e. Lack of EO presence and seminars or forums held in Wagga and Bathurst.”

“Lack of University support for researchers on outside funding with fixed term appointments.”

“Research infrastructure in our school is lacking.”

For a couple of respondents, the lack of equipment and appropriate facilities pose problems. From their limited comments it is difficult to draw any conclusions apart from the presumption that their research is highly technical.

“Lack of equipment for research.”

“Limited access to appropriate facilities.”

The comments grouped together in this area were fairly extensive including research expertise by way of statistical and research design support, research administration, research assistants, attendance at conferences, provision of information to support research, equipment and facilities and general research infrastructure. One respondent also highlighted the lack of support for researchers on external funding in non-continuing positions. In summary,

Issue 14

Some academic women at CSU experience a lack of research support in many areas that impacts negatively on their research output.

6.8 Lack of funding

And last but not least, several respondents highlighted the lack of funding for research as being a major impediment to their participation in research.

“Struggle to have qualitative and new research approaches funded by CSU grants – conservative research committee.”

“Difficulties in identifying and achieving funding for modest projects. (Perhaps a grants officer working across faculties eg. RIPPLE could do a lot of that ‘leg work’.”

“No funding to attend seminars or conferences.”

“Research grant funding (external) for my discipline area is almost impossible to obtain.”

The comments in this area suggest that:

Issue 15

Some academic women at CSU have difficulty securing funding to undertake research or participate in research-related activities such as attendance at conferences.

In summary, there are many impediments to research output that impact negatively on the achievement of research goals by academic women at CSU. In this next section which covers the areas of greatest need with regards to research, a synthesis of the ideas expressed by the respondents to the survey are presented. Encapsulated in their comments are suggestions of how to overcome some of the barriers highlighted above.

7. Greatest areas of need

The third qualitative question required respondents to reflect on what they perceived to be their greatest needs in relation to research participation and productivity. The following is a synthesis of their comments which have been grouped under four key headings – time, support, resources and culture.

7.1 Time

In relation to time, many respondents listed additional time for research as their greatest need. Others provided more detail with regards to their specific needs in relation to time. Several respondents cited teaching and marking relief as key strategies to improving their research output:

“Part-time marking assistance would be really useful.”

“Main need is teaching relief to focus on research projects.”

While other saw administrative support as being crucial:

“Some support re teaching and especially re admin would assist enormously.”

“Admin support to reduce time spent on menial tasks – mind space.”

“Adequate administrative support so I don’t take all week to beg for mandatory teaching.”

“I need a personal assistant to manage my administrative load.”

Two respondents in particular, raised the concept of “block time” and the need for block release from other duties to be able to progress their research

“I would appreciate the freedom to take 1 or even 2 weeks block release from Uni (during semester/Christmas) to make substantial progress on research projects. I find it very frustrating the stop/start nature of work when on campus due to interruptions from students/colleagues etc.”

“Time to conduct research not related to PhD. Dedicated, protected, block- time each week for research.”

while another requested a research assistant to assist with the simpler (less important) aspects of research

“A good research assistant to help with interviews and data entry (not that I believe in handing over important work to a research assistant – clients don’t like that anyway)”

Many other respondents raised the issue of workloads, citing their greatest need as the reduction of academic workloads. They also saw the recognition of its impact on research productivity as important:

“Having an academic workload that genuinely allowed a proportion of time for research related activities consistent with the weight allocated to research and scholarly activities in, for example, a Level B to C promotion.”

“Recognition that workload impacts on ability to conduct research.”

“Workload allowance and financial support to accommodate that.”

“How nice it would be for those of us with demonstrated output to have larger allowances in workload to continue to increase that research output.”

One respondent requested release from day-to-day duties as her greatest need. She did not, however, list her specific duties which would presumably be teaching, student contact, marking and possibly some administration.

“Release from day-to-day duties to concentrate on research project.”

It is clear that the need for greater time allocations for research and for “block time” to be “designated” for research is acutely felt by most academic women at CSU. Suggestions made by the survey respondents include marking relief, administrative support, research assistance, personal assistance, block release during semester and release from day-to-day duties. Having said that, how their workload can be designed to fit in the myriad of obligations and still allow reasonable time for research productivity will differ from one academic to the next, depending on her individual circumstances. Providing SSP (Special Studies Program) may benefit a mid-career academic with a research track record and limited family responsibility. On the other hand, providing some marking relief and a seed grant may be more beneficial to an early-career researcher with young children.

Recommendation 1

That Charles Sturt University needs to identify and implement practical steps to ease the current workload of academic women as a key component of its research development efforts.

7.2 Support

In the area of support, mentoring was described as one of the greatest need areas by several participants. They talked mainly about access to mentors/supervisors whom they collectively defined as someone who is qualified, who can guide and supervise, who has particular skills such as publication and networking and a research track record and someone who has a similar content and methodological interest as the mentee.

“I need supervision...including easy access to other researchers and mentors.”

“Mentoring is very important and I think those who are qualified should give their names and the area that they can be supportive and helpful to research centres.”

“To have easy access to a research mentor who has similar content and methodology interest to me.”

“Assistance in translating ideas into real and achievable research projects; someone to guide me in seeking publication and developing professional networks (mentor?).”

“Opportunity to make a contribution to a research activity managed by a senior researcher eg. Collect literature/ prepare précis of literature/collect data/ discuss findings. The opportunity to undertake discrete, manageable projects that contribute to a larger piece of research. I believe that, given the current time constraints, this is the only reasonable expectation that I can hold re my research output.”

Two respondents also painted a rather disturbing impression of the current situation in terms of research mentoring. The first highlights what she terms as “abuse by research leaders”

“Mentoring and collaboration would be useful (as opposed to abuse by research leaders.”

While the second implies that junior staff currently provide mentoring and act as role models to less research- active senior staff. She says

“Why not push senior staff to undertake research so they then can be mentors/role models to junior staff – instead of the other way around.”

The responses above combined with the fact that mentoring as a research development strategy for academic women has been trialled, evaluated and recommended as a useful model by several Australian universities; indicates that CSU needs to explore the implementation of a mentoring scheme for women researchers (Casson & Devos, 2001; Casson & Devos, 2003)). Given that mentoring as a support strategy is currently being considered in the context of various other equal opportunity initiatives such as the Indigenous Employment Strategy and Women in Leadership program, it is probably timely to advance such an initiative. The recent resurrection of the Women in Research Network could also contribute positively to the development and implementation of such a mentoring scheme, particularly if it was adequately supported and resourced by the University.

Recommendation 2

That Charles Sturt University explores the implementation of a viable, adequately supported and adequately resourced mentoring scheme for women researchers, building on the current initiatives of the Women in Research Network

The next area under support seen as an area of need relates to encouragement and recognition. One participant talks about the need for encouragement and support from like-minded researchers.

“Encouragement. It would be great to talk with people doing similar kinds of research. I am writing an art history thesis which means qualitative research using archives, documentation, and interviews – mixed methodology. So many people I talk to are using more positivist approaches or social research of a more applied kind.”

Another talks about the difficulty of getting recognition and support for a less known area of research

“We are service teachers in a school. The sort of research we do is not really supported. We are encouraged to change our area to more professional practice based areas – not cellular biomedical areas, which isn’t easy.”

While a third respondent highlights the lack of recognition received by research-only-staff which she believes leads to a lack of support for their research.

“Recognition of the contribution those research-only staffs make to the research output of the University, and corresponding support”.

Recommendation 3

That the current *Review of Research at CSU* evaluates how research achievement is encouraged, recognised and valued at the University, particularly as it relates to meeting the support and development needs of academic women. Such an evaluation should also aim to develop models for research measurement that take into account the diversity of researchers, their disciplines and their other responsibilities and commitments.

A third area of need raised by participants relates to peer support and the need for improved networking with respondents mainly raising the issue of limited peers with similar interests and limited research networks. This links closely to the need for mentors and mentioned earlier in this section of the report.

“A database or similar to find out whose who, area of research and if they are available to assist “novice researchers’ with limited research networks.”

“Peer support. With small school the number of staff with similar interests is limited.”

“Often I work in isolation. Better networking would be great”

Several participants also requested statistical support and training

“Supervision and statistical support and training – problem solving, not general chats.”

“Statistical up-skilling and consultancy by appointment as opposed to at times organised by CSU.”

While others requested more generic research development support and training or in areas such as collaboration and publication.

“Actually having a series of workshops (such as research colloquium) to learn and feel more comfortable with academic research.”

“Specific training in effective research strategies, collaborative work, publication etc.”

Given that the lack of opportunity for networking and involvement in collaborative research is being highlighted by respondents as having a negative impact on the attainment of their research goals, the CSU needs to explore new and innovative means for encouraging greater networking around research. There also needs to be a greater understanding of how to develop collaborative research relationships, an area that may benefit from specialised training for novice researchers who are unfamiliar with undertaking collaborative research. In addition, the University needs to review the provision of research support such as statistical support to academic women to ensure that such support is accessible and appropriate to the needs of this important group.

Recommendation 4

The current *Review of Research at CSU* evaluate the effectiveness of current networking initiatives around research, particularly for academic women, with a view to introducing new and innovative ways of encouraging greater research networking.

7.3 Resources

The third area that overlaps with all the others relates to the provision and availability of resources to meet time, support and culture needs as they relate to research. In particular, respondents requested funding to attend conferences, engage assistants and free up teaching and marking time. They said:

"I could do with funding to attend conferences."

"Funding that may lead to outside funding- I mean funding to put together external funding proposals."

"Some funding to hire research assistants and free up time taken up in marking and teaching would be great."

"Funding to attend seminars at ANU and Sydney Uni."

Others talked about increasing University resources and infrastructure available for research, which they perceive as being currently inadequate:

"The increase of University resources generally- library workshops on a range of preparations offered at other Unis, recognition of academic research and its relationship to teaching and more recognition of the extensive time involved."

"Better or at least some plant research facilities. I am unaware of any support to CSU research staff. I know NSW Agriculture staff are provided with this service."

And finally, several respondents requested assistance with development of funding applications and searching for funding opportunities to increase the overall funds available for research. They said

"Someone to assist with development of funding applications, someone with time to search for funding opportunities, much less teaching. I was responsible for 14 small subject deliveries last year, six this semester, one involving a long research paper. My eyes collapsed from marking at the end of last year."

"Supervisor training and grant application training."

"Most projects I work on are small scale. It would be interesting to be involved in some grant writing for bigger projects."

One also talked about getting resources to fund an overseas student

"Getting a potential doctoral student from overseas to be funded for research. I am hoping to get a large ARC grant."

Research funding has a crucial impact both directly and indirectly on the University's ability to meet the research needs of its academic women. The availability of resources and equitable methods for allocating these resources are important considerations in efforts to free-up academic workloads and provide much needed research development support as suggested by the respondents to this survey. In addition, the issue of funding as it relates to securing additional funds for research is an area worthy of review as better and more efficient means of obtaining, allocating and utilising research dollars are developed. What is evident from the comments made in this area as well as data from the previous section of confidence levels is that at least some

academic women at CSU are keen to hone their grant writing skills and would be appreciate support in this respect.

Recommendation 5

That the Centre for Research and Graduate Training explore the provision of research support in the areas of statistics, development of collaborative research relationships and grant writing, particularly as it relates to the needs of academic women. In addition, that the University ensures the research support and development needs of academic women, as expressed in this report, are clearly reflected in the allocation of resources in this area.

7.4 Culture

The final cluster of needs is around the issue of research culture. One respondent specifically requests the development of an inclusive research culture that cut across boundaries between campuses and disciplines while another is concerned solely with the development of such a culture on the Albury campus.

“Development of an inclusive research culture across campuses and disciplines – centres at other locations should try to encourage staff from other locations.”

“Development of research culture at Albury campus.”

A third respondent expresses her view that a research culture should be gender-neutral and not just focus specifically on women but should be assisting and encouraging all staff

“Less emphasis by (research) centres and groups on women – more emphasis on assisting all staff to be actively involved in research if they wish.”

While a fourth raises the issue of the rigid construction of subjects/discipline areas which can lead to academics teaching and researching outside their areas of interest. This she feels, is counterproductive and makes research difficult and less enjoyable.

“A second major point is the need for the University to look at the ways in which construction of subjects/ discipline areas leads to people teaching and researching on the margins of their expertise, or even outside it. When this happens, teaching and research becomes very onerous and also much less satisfying.”

And last but not least, two respondent expressed their need for greater emphasis on research as distinct from supervision/ graduate studies (which they believe is a part of teaching).

“Greater recognition of research as distinct from supervision. Supervision is part of teaching, not research.”

“This Uni places more emphasis on graduate studies than they do on research. Grad Studies should really be a subset of research.”

The need for an inclusive research culture that recognises, supports and promotes research as a worthwhile academic pursuit cutting across discipline, academic level, faculty and campus is one expressed by many who responded to this survey. Unfortunately, the perceptions around a “research culture” are fairly subjective and difficult to measure or ascertain. The tangible by-products of such a culture include a large body of active researchers who are well supported and who represent a diversity of disciplines, academic levels, positions, career backgrounds and research levels and interests. Given that, it is probably useful for the current *Review into Research at CSU* to establish what constitutes an inclusive research culture and build on those factors that are identified as contributing to such an inclusive culture. There is also a need for

such a review to involve all academic and general staff who are currently involved or have aspirations to be involved in research, not just the “research leadership” or “research elite” at the University. As discussed earlier in this report, there are currently many differing views held about the intersection between research and postgraduate student supervision as it relates to research and teaching. The current *Review of Research at CSU* could be beneficial in clarifying this area to so as to minimise the current discrepancy in perceptions apparent in the responses to this survey.

Recommendation 6

That the current *Review of Research at CSU* begins to identify and articulate some elements of an active research culture and corresponding performance indicators in this area. Such an effort should aim to involve a cross-section of researchers at the University in order to ensure that a diversity of opinions and views are taken into account.

8. Role of the Centre for Research and Graduate Training

The fourth and last qualitative question asked as part of this survey related to the role of the Centre for Research and Graduate Training. Responses to this question were clearly divided. A proportion of respondents reported being unaware of the existence of CRGT or its role or services.

“Unaware of “support” mechanisms available.”

“I think the fact that I don’t know who they are says it all. I have not had the opportunity to seek out support, mainly due to time constraints and not knowing where to start.”

“Pardon my ignorance but what do they do?”

“I don’t know – I wasn’t aware of such a Centre having spoken mainly with the Prof for this in the school.”

“None that I know of or that makes a difference.”

A second and much larger group who knew of its existence and its role reported not having received any support from the Centre. One respondent in particular expressed her frustration at not being considered “research active”, despite currently completing her PhD.

“Nothing – I seek nothing.”

“Nil- my supervision involves course or masters projects. No involvement from CRGT.”

“Nothing. I am seriously offended by the research active criteria that means as someone actively completing a PhD, I am not counted as research active. I would have thought that it was in the University’s best interest for me to complete the Doctorate as soon as possible. To be research active I would have to take on yet another task and that would compromise my ability to complete on time.”

“I work with the CRGT as an academic leader and manager. I have not sought any support for individual research. “

“None. I get more assistance from the other University in the ARC project.”

“None so far. Both research and graduate studies are adequately supported by CRGT. When I finish my Masters, I will participate in these workshops.”

“Training opportunities – yet to be utilised when time permits.”

"Nothing apart from notices. Currently contradictory advice given to a postgraduate student I am supervising to that given by the Ethics Committee."

"Workshops are run but not on my campus."

Of those that did receive support, many had utilised expertise on research administration, grant application, consultancy and fixed terms, supervision of postgraduates, research fund administration, completion of internal audit forms,

"A lot in relation to my supervisory role with Doctoral students."

"Good infrastructure and intellectual property advice."

"Opportunity to consult for 30 minutes with senior researcher about grant application form."

"Some limited assistance with grant applications."

"Training. Help with grant applications."

"Research training workshops. Research fund administration."

"Courses are provided but it is difficult to get time and funding to attend them. Paul Burnett sends out notices re funding. Kirrily and Karen assist a bit with industry/uni research applications as their jobs require."

"Consultancy assistance/ fixed terms via Karen. General research related assistance."

"None at present, apart from administration assistance with applying for grants, completing OPA1 forms etc."

"Notifications of grants available"

"One-on-one advice with Karen Wood-Meyer."

"Assistance with small grant application."

"Willing to give help with SSP and ethics".

Several respondents reported having attended workshops, seminars and other professional development activities in the area of research run by the CRGT:

"They offer some good workshops I attend. I also run research workshops for them and I am paid funds into my research account."

"I attend the odd training session."

"Just some workshops I have attended. But more help and support could be provided in regards to grant writing proposals."

"Considerable help re grant preparation. CRGT have presented a number of their seminars at Goulburn to increase accessibility for staff."

"Training workshops (OPA, IP, and Budget) recently attended. Very good!"

“Attend relevant workshops.”

“Attended grant writing workshop in 2001.”

“Access to staff development activities.”

while a few respondents reported using the informative Research website

“Information via website.”

“I find the website quite helpful – but don’t really receive any support other than that. I have been to one or two training workshops.”

or benefiting from grants, awards and scholarships offered by the CRGT

“Key researcher grant. Research support scheme.”

“I have been accepted for the Staff Member Grant for PLD.”

“Awarded scholarship for PhD commencing 2nd semester in 2003.”

“Writing up award for Semester 2, 2003.”

“CSU competitive grant”

“Publications grant.”

“Community of scholars funding.”

“PhD funding for consumables. Stats support on periodic basis when consultant visits.”

The comments to this last qualitative question in the survey suggest that the current activities and services of the CRGT meet some of the research support and development needs of female academics at CSU. These key services found to be beneficial include advice giving, support from consultants, information dissemination (website and others), training and professional development activities and a range of CRGT administered grants, awards and scholarships. There is, however, room for improvement in the content, range and delivery of these important and much needed research support and development services which current fail to meet the needs of a significant portion of academic women. The responses to this survey also indicate that there is a pressing need for the CRGT to more actively publicise itself, its role and its objectives as the research hub of the University.

Recommendation 7

That the current *Review of Research at CSU* involve a review of the aims/roles/responsibilities of the Centre for Research and Graduate Training with a view to increasing its profile and aligning its services to the needs of academic women.

9. Conclusion

The results of this survey, and in particular the qualitative comments of respondents seem to indicate that the impact of the 1994 Women in Research (WIR) Program and the corresponding benefits of an active Women in Research Network during the mid 1990s is at best, marginal. There have been some positive and seemingly lasting changes to the demography of the female academic workforce at CSU. In 2003, in comparison to 1993, there are more academic women in professorial positions, on research committees, in continuing positions and supervising postgraduate students. All this has a positive spin-off for research output and productivity by women academics at the University. In addition, the comments from some respondents who participated in the 1994 WIR program indicate that the program and network contributed to the development and growth of their research careers and profiles.

Unfortunately, not all the benefits have been long-lasting and sustainable. Ironically, ten years on, the same issues such as a lack of time, lack of collegial support, lack of resources and the absence of an active research culture still seem to plague and hinder a significant proportion of academic women at CSU from achieving their research goals. Whilst the nine recommendations that have come out of this report address key areas of concern raised by the respondents to the survey, there is a need for a more holistic approach to this area. Indirectly, the most profound realisation of repeating this survey ten years on, is that a one-off program and initiative like the 1994 Women in Research Program is insufficient to make long-term, sustainable organisational and cultural change required for academic women to contribute equitably to research at CSU. What is needed is a more holistic, long-term program resourced at an appropriate level with commitment from the highest levels of the organisation. A clear and definite role for the Centre for Research and Graduate Training with regards to such a program should also be determined. Unless such a commitment is made by the University, there is a very real possibility that the same survey repeated again in 2013 will yield similar findings.

10. References

Burton, C ,1997, Gender equity in Australian University staffing, Canberra,AGPS, Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs.

Casson, C. & Devos, A., 2001, Enabling Women In Research: an evaluation of the first year of the WomenResearch 21 Program, University of New South Wales, Sydney.

Casson, C. & Devos, A., 2003, Researching women: an evaluation of the second year of the WomenResearch 21 Program, University of New South Wales, Sydney.

Castleman, T., Allen, M., Bastalich, W. & Wright P., 1995, Limited access: women's disadvantage in higher education employment, Melbourne, NTEU.

Charles Sturt University, 1993, Report on Academic Women in Research, Equal Opportunity Unit, CSU, Wagga Wagga

Deane, E., Johnson, L., Jones, G., & Lengkeek, N. , 1996, Women, Research & Research Productivity in the Post-1987 Universities: Opportunities and Constraints, Evaluations and Investigations Program. Higher Education Division, DEETYA, AGPS. Canberra.

11 Appendices

Appendix 1: Survey Instrument

SURVEY OF ACADEMIC WOMEN IN RESEARCH CHARLES STURT UNIVERSITY - 2003

QUESTION 1 At which campus/site are you located?

- Albury [1]
- Bathurst [2]
- Wagga Wagga [3]
- Dubbo [4]
- Goulburn [5]
- Canberra [6]
- Manly [7]

QUESTION 2 In which Faculty and School are you employed?

Faculty _____

School _____

QUESTION 3: What is your employment status?

Full-time [1] Part-time [2]

If part-time, please state fraction _____

QUESTION 4: What is the nature of your contract?

Tenure [1] Contract [2]

QUESTION 5: What position do you hold?

- Lecturer A [1]
- Lecturer B [2]
- Senior Lecturer [3]
- Associate Professor/Professor [4]

QUESTION 6: Please specify your highest qualification

QUESTION 7: How long have you worked at CSU?

- Less than 1 Year [1]
- 1 to 2 years..... [2]
- 3 to 5 years..... [3]
- 6 to 10 years..... [4]
- More than 10 Years..... [5]

QUESTION 8: Of the total number of hours you spend per week on University-related business what percentage is spent on research?

- 0 - 10% [1]
- 11 - 20% [2]
- 21 - 30% [3]
- 31 - 40% [4]
- 41 - 50% [5]
- more than 50% [6]

QUESTION 9: Are you currently involved in any research project?

- No..... [1] Yes..... [2]
- If yes, how many? _____

QUESTION 10: Is any of your research connected to study toward a higher qualification?

- Yes..... [1] No [2]
- If yes, please specify the qualification _____
-
-

QUESTION 11: Are you currently involved in research individually or collaboratively?

- Individually [1]
- Collaboratively [2]
- Both [3]

QUESTION 12: If you circled [2] or [3] above - is your research in conjunction with a team/individual?

At CSU..... [1]
At another university..... [2]
In the related industry..... [3]
Other (please specify)_____

QUESTION 13: How is your main research or, in the case of several projects, most of your research funded?

By own funds..... [1]
CSU "seed" grant..... [2]
Government..... [3]
Industry..... [4]
Other (please specify)_____

QUESTION 14: Are you a member of a CSU Research Centre?

Yes.....[1] No.....[2]

QUESTION 15: Are you a member of a research committee within your School or Faculty?

Yes.....[1] No..... [2]

QUESTION 16: Are you currently supervising any masters dissertations/theses?

Yes.....[1] No..... [2]

QUESTION 17: If you answered yes to any of the last three questions (15-17), please specify how your involvement impacted on your research output?

Please rate yourself on the following scale where [0] represents not at all confident and [9] represents completely confident? PLEASE CIRCLE

QUESTION 18: Developing your own research ideas

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

QUESTION 19: Applying for research grants

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

QUESTION 20: Collecting data

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

QUESTION 21: Collaborating and consulting with colleagues about research

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

QUESTION 22: Administering research projects

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

QUESTION 23: Analysing research results

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

QUESTION 24: Developing new research skills

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

QUESTION 25: Delivering research findings at seminars/conferences

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

QUESTION 26: Writing journal articles

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

QUESTION 27: Supervision of higher degree students

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

QUESTION 28: Please identify any difficulties you have encountered and/or are encountering in achieving your personal research goals

QUESTION 29: What is your greatest area of need with regards to research support at CSU?

QUESTION 30 What support do you currently receive from the Centre for Research and Graduate Training?

Thank you for participating in this survey. Please return to Shanthi Ramanathan, Division of Human Resources, Graham Building , Wagga Wagga Campus by Friday 25 April.

PLEASE NOTE: Information will be used in cumulative form only and will assist in forming the basis for development of professional development activities.

S:\Administrative\Human Resources\EO\Shanthi\Survey of academic staff undertaking research.