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INTRODUCTION

In Australia as elsewhere, despite equal employment opportunity legislation and policies (for example, Affirmative Action [Equal Employment Opportunity for Women] Act, 1986), women in academia, are still under-represented. At the same time, research productivity is an important factor in career advancement in academia, and promises to become even more so as institutions worldwide place greater emphasis on research output in response to government pressures. More and more universities are embarking on explicit research monitoring processes which will be used to differentiate academic performance in applications for promotion (e.g. see Perry, 2005). The imperative for research publication is a serious pressure for all academics, and is acutely felt by women already under-represented in the academic arena. It is in this context that this paper is reporting and evaluating a recent strategy to increase research of women academics. At the University of Wollongong a mentoring and collaborative network, the Women in Commerce Research Platform (WICRP), was initiated by senior female academics in the Faculty of Commerce with the explicit support of the Employment Equity and Diversity (EED) Unit and the Dean of the Faculty of Commerce.

In this paper, we describe the WICRP and evaluate it in the context of prior research related to the specific challenges faced by female academics. The WICRP is presented as research as praxis (Lather 1991), thus taking a feminist perspective. Further, we consider this research as praxis being conscious of the methodological and disciplinary backgrounds of the
participants. Our early findings are presented and are broadly consistent with prior research of women academics. We discuss the potential impact of specific strategies to support academic women in research and in particular the role of research as praxis and its contribution to the ideal of community (Young, 1990). We consider the next phase of WICRP and reflect on the possible reasons for non-participation and whether WICRP could or should attract these women.

PRIOR RESEARCH

In this section we briefly present aggregated statistical analysis of women in academia in Australia, women in commerce in academia at the University of Wollongong and discuss this in relation to prior work on women in research. Table 1 shows lower representation of women in the higher academic ranks in Australian universities. Table 2 refers to a specific university and a specific faculty and reflects a consistent picture of under-representation of women in commerce at higher ranks at the University of Wollongong. Aggregated statistical data of this kind, whilst being illuminating does not provide explanations for these profiles.

At the level of both national and institutional comparisons, various studies have found that male academics demonstrate higher levels of research output than women (e.g. Long, 1990, 1992; Cole & Zuckerman, 1984; McDowell & Smith, 1992; Dwyer, 1994; Creamer, 1998; Toutkoushian, 1998). On the other hand, there are some studies that have found contrary findings (e.g. Davis & Astin, 1987; Omundson & Mann, 1994). For example, the issue of performance indicators as a measurement of research output has implications for female staff and may explain the differences in output as more of a measurement issue (Deane et al, 1996). Studies of research citations, however, suggest that women’s research, while of lower quantity, is not of lower quality, and articles by women are just as likely to be cited as those by men (Long, 1992).

The literature has identified a number of potential barriers to academic women in advancing their research careers as effectively as their male colleagues. For example, studies of faculty workload such as those by Astin et al. (1991), Russell (1991) and the U.S. National Center for Education Statistics (1994) have found that academics in the U.S. spend in excess of 50 hours a week on job-related work, and that women spend more time on teaching than do men. These differences may be due to women’s greater representation in teaching-based institutions, which may offer less opportunity for research. Also, when women did enter the higher levels in academia their minority status often resulted in being appointed to several committees, alienating them from their research (Deane et al, 1996). There are also difficulties in drawing firm conclusions which arise from the fact that time-use studies are typically based on self-report data. As Toutkoushian (1999) points out, women may be less inclined to report informal meetings as being job-related work, and may also not report time spent on academic work during vacation periods. Men and women define job-related activities differently, making these findings unreliable. Yucer (1984) also points out that there has been little research on the factors behind how academics choose to allocate their work time. So, just as with the differential patterns surrounding women’s representation in the academic ranks, it is difficult to know whether differences in time allocation are due to women preferring to spend more time on teaching, or whether institutions assign heavier teaching loads to women than to men (Toutkoushian, 1999, p 694; Deane et al, 1996).
The editorial of a forthcoming special edition of *Women’s Studies International Forum* on women in higher education (Cotterill & Letherby, 2005), points out the need to address the reticence and ambivalence which has traditionally contributed to women’s reluctance to apply for senior positions. This same lack of confidence may also affect women’s performance in research, both in terms of carrying out research and getting it published. In the workplace in general, strategies to help women advance their careers have included mentoring by senior colleagues, creating opportunities for collaborative work, and networking. The WICRP is an example of such a strategy and is discussed below.

**THE WOMEN IN COMMERCE RESEARCH PLATFORM (WICRP)**

The under-representation of women in academic positions in the faculty of commerce was considered an important issue to target by the University of Wollongong’s Employment, Equity and Diversity (EED) unit. Together with the support from the Dean of Commerce, a meeting of women in commerce interested in research was called. At that meeting it was decided to consider a Women In Commerce Research Platform (WICRP) with the aim of creating a mentoring and collaborative network to support research. The WICRP was initially funded for a trial period between October 2004 and June 2005 and has been renewed for another 6 month period. Funding is for an administrative assistant who is a current research student. Apart from direct costs for running the meetings, the funds went to the research student for her time spent on administrative tasks for the WICRP (sending emails, maintaining email lists, preparing agendas, organizing room bookings etc). The funds went into her research account, so that they can be applied directly to activities which would support her research, such as funding for conference travel.

The platform is in the form of meetings and initially these meetings were held every two months for two hours. Meetings were structured to include three components. First, an update on research issues was given by a WICRP participant who was also on the University’s Research Committee and Faculty’s Research Committee. There was also EED news about initiatives and policies by the director of the EED Unit. Secondly, one or two of the participants presented an individual profile outlining one of their current research projects, identifying potential for collaboration both within the Faculty and with industry. The presenters also identified personal areas of success and the kind of support they could offer to other women in the Faculty. The third component of the meetings was discussion/feedback of ideas to develop the research. This discussion ranged from addressing methodology, theory, data, journals to target as well as appropriate grant schemes to consider.

It was agreed that an eight month trial of the platform would be conducted between October 2004 and June 2005. In the first and the last meeting of the WICRP trial a short survey was conducted with the women in attendance. The aim of the first survey conducted in October 2004 was to establish the type of support they were seeking from a mentoring platform, which problems they face, what prevents them from undertaking research and how they evaluate the supportiveness of the University and Faculty environment. The aim of the subsequent survey conducted in June 2005 was to determine if any changes had occurred in the evaluations over the trial period and to provide an opportunity for the women to give feedback about their experiences with the WICRP.
In total, 26 useable questionnaires were completed. Of these, 17 responses were from the ‘benchmark survey’; and 9 resulted from the subsequent ‘follow-up’ survey. Of the 9 respondents to the follow-up survey, 8 had completed both. Although this may be considered a very small sample size, it actually covers a significant proportion of the 32 female academic staff within the Faculty of Commerce. The survey also had open ended and closed questions, thus overall there was quantitative and qualitative data collected.

The qualitative section of the two research surveys consisted of four questions: 1) what could be done to improve the respondent’s research performance; 2) what could be done to increase the respondent’s enjoyment of research; 3) whether the respondent felt that there were any barriers and/or structural challenges which impede the ability to conduct research; and 4) whether the respondent faced any particular challenges as a woman working within the Faculty of Commerce. The follow-up survey incorporated six additional questions pertaining to the WICRP in particular. Questions asked included thoughts on the WICRP, whether to continue the initiative, whether the respondents were prepared to actively contribute to the WICRP, whether any new collaborations or publications had resulted and general questions as to the positive and negative aspects of the WICRP.

In reflecting on the outcomes of this trial platform, it was decided to write a joint paper which specifically reviewed the first eight months of WICRP. This involved putting the experiences and findings from the WICRP in the context of existing literature. This process highlighted our methodological and theoretical diversities common within our disciplines. In particular, members of the writing team brought both positivist and post-positivist empirical and theoretical perspectives. In many ways this reflects that we are still “in a postpositivist period in the human sciences, a period marked by much methodological and epistemological ferment” (Lather, 1991, p 50). Rather than turn this paper into a methodological and epistemological debate we have chosen to present our quantitative and qualitative findings together with our reflections of the WICRP experience as a demonstration of research in praxis (Lather 1991). Later we discuss how WICRP as an example of research as praxis can be used towards an ideal of community (Young 1990) for research.

RESEARCH AS PRAXIS

The aim of the WICRP was to increase our individual and collective research in commerce. The issue of research is problematic for the faculty (both men and women). Excessive staff student ratios (of the order of 30 effective full time students per full time equivalent staff) are often cited as contributing factors to explaining the commerce faculty’s research output being significantly lower than other faculties in the university. In this sense, we as researchers saw our participation in WICRP as a proactive way to address a problematic and important issue. The members who decided to write this paper on WICRP were taking the opportunity as researchers to do what we as teachers often do, that is, “reflect on and make conscious the strategies and conditions they use as a learner in that curriculum area” (Turbill, 2002, p 98). That is, writing, reflecting and investigating the WICRP implicitly meant that as researchers we were praxis-oriented. It also meant that as researchers we were also the subjects of our research. Rather than this being a exercise with “rampant subjectivity” (Lather, 1991, p 52) or “imposing meanings on situations” (Lather, 1991, p 59) it enables us to be consciously aware that transformation has an imperative for reflexivity.

For researchers with emancipatory aspirations, doing empirical work offers a powerful opportunity for praxis to the extent that it enables people to
change by encouraging self-reflection and a deeper understanding of their particular situations (Lather, 1991, p 56).

Our reflections of our experience and findings were drawn from both benchmark and the follow-up surveys. Although the participation during the pilot period of WICRP varied, comparative figures are given only for those participants who answered both the benchmark and follow-up surveys. The insights from these surveys, including open ended questions are presented in the following categories: findings consistent with prior research, research experience of the participants and evaluation of the working environment.

**FINDINGS CONSISTENT WITH PRIOR RESEARCH**

The findings under this heading can be said to reflect issues with time for research, gender specific issues as well as networking, mentoring and support for research.

1. **Time issues**

The majority of participants indicated issues with time allocation. Of particular importance was the inability to get ‘block’ time for research and also the interference of teaching and administrative tasks with research time and included comments:

- ‘more block time rather than interspersed by so much admin and teaching’
- ‘too many constant distractions. Not enough time for in depth reading and sustained periods of concentration/working’.

Although time constraints for research does not appear to be particularly gender related, a study by Probert (2005) found that women with children most often cited time constraints as a major deterrent for completing research. This is supported by other studies, which found that females in general have more responsibilities for ‘non-work’ activities than do males (Fu & Shaffer, 2001; Probert, 2005). Females often conduct research during traditional non-work time (Toutkoushian, 1999; Smith, 2000) while performing caring or other home duties. These non-work activities can greatly impede the time that is available for research.

In regards to the benchmark survey there was some difference between junior and senior researchers as to time issues, with senior women being more affected by this particular problem. The follow up survey showed more differences between junior and senior researchers. Out of the 6 senior women respondents, 5 (83%) raised time as an issue, whereas only 1 of the 3 junior respondents (33%) indicated time to be a problem. This finding could be explained by an exploratory study of young professionals investigating the integration of work and non-work (Wilson et al, 2004). This study found that there was little difference in the segregation of work and non-work between males and females with the exception of the only mother in the study. This indicates the socially expected norm of the female as the primary caregiver thus necessitating a greater need to establish boundaries between work and non-work (Wilson et al., 2004). If these boundaries are minimised through initiatives such as flexible working conditions (minimal set working hours, working from home) then work and non-work segregation becomes blurred allowing for non-work to intrude on work and vice versa. Another explanation for the high level of expressed time concerns among senior female academics might be their increased level of committee participation expected of women in senior positions to enable equitable representation, as was found by Deane et al (1996).
ii. Gender issues
A number of issues were raised under this category, including: family obligations and choices between children and career, lack of women mentors and role models and the need to prove oneself as a woman academic, to the more general stereotyping and intimidating male domination at the workplace. It interesting to note that one senior researcher responded to the question about whether, as a woman, she faced particular challenges working within the faculty with,

‘yes, but no more than I would have in any workplace.’

In this sense, the role of the EED unit in the university is both specific and generic to the workplace.

iii. Networking, mentoring and support issues
Although numerous publications are available on the lack of networking and mentoring opportunities for women in the workplace (e.g. Pini et al., 2004; Simpson, 2000; Oakley, 2000) this did not appear to be a major issue for most senior respondents. With the exception of one senior researcher who wanted more opportunities to work with and assist others (particularly junior staff) only junior respondents indicated a decrease of research performance and enjoyment due to lack of mentoring and network opportunities. The main issue for both junior and senior researchers was to do with academic support for the topics of interest, as well as financial and administrative support. One senior respondent stated that

‘the topics in which I am interested in do not appear to have much support within the faculty’;

with a junior researcher writing that

‘research interest not valued if not ‘commercial’.

Lack of financial support has been cited by Probert (2005) to be of more concern for men than it is for women. She found that female academics were more concerned with time issues. In any case, our findings are largely consistent with Probert (2005).

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE OF PARTICIPANTS
Participants of WICSP were asked how long they have been working in the Faculty, how they perceived their position as a researcher and whether or not they had published in journals and conferences and whether they had been successful in the past in attracting research grants. The results are provided in Table 3. As can be seen from Table 3, 59% of the women who participated in WICRP described themselves as relatively junior. This is encouraging given that the platform was aimed at mentoring younger, less experienced researchers. On the other hand, the proportion of senior women is higher than is represented by the faculty (see table 2) and is consistent with the fact that senior female researchers established and led the platform.

Almost all participants (94%) have attended a research conference. Over three quarters (76%) have published in refereed proceedings and 65% have published in journals. Half of the participants have been successful in applying for internal grants, and 29% were successful in external grants. These results are consistent with sequencing of steps in the research experience, that is, starting with attending a conference, followed by presenting and publishing in conference proceedings and finally developing a paper submission to journals and getting published.

Participants were asked to state which aspects of their academic jobs they enjoyed most. The majority (88%) of women participating in the research platform indicated that they are most
interested in research. This is consistent with a group which self-selected as being interested in research. However, this data does not say anything about those who did not participate in WICRP and this is discussed later.

EVALUATION OF WORKING ENVIRONMENT

Survey questions were asked about: opportunities to learn about research; opportunities for collaboration; opportunities for getting advice and feedback; networking and support at the faculty level and at the university level. As only 8 participants had responded to both the benchmark and follow-up survey we did not have sufficient data to present reliable analysis of variance. There seemed to be a higher response in the follow-up survey for all these items. The only score in the follow-up survey which was lower than the benchmark survey was with respect to participants considering male mentors for research. This suggests that research platforms which are for women only may better serve as mentoring opportunities.

RESEARCH AS PRAXIS AND WICRP

The WICRP represents research as praxis. It draws on insights from three levels; namely surveys, the writing of this paper as a reflexive device and implications for the ideal of community. In response to the question, ‘what was particularly good about the WICRP’, an overwhelming 89% responded with increased networking and/or mentoring opportunities. There were suggestions on improvement for the current format of the WICRP and included more regular meetings and broadening the base to include other faculties and/or research areas and interest groups. Out of the 9 respondents, 8 indicated they were prepared to actively contribute to the WICRP either as presenters or organisers after this pilot period. One of the 9 respondents stated that the initiative had resulted in a new collaboration with another three respondents stating that there were some possibilities for future collaborations and publications.

The writing of this paper as a reflexive device as well as a research endeavour served to highlight a number of issues/outcomes. The first of these is that the WICRP required specific administrative and financial support and in this sense the women in this platform were careful to keep their time focused on research and research related activities. The second point is to do with collaboration and the imperative to share ideas and accommodate (or at least suspend) methodological and theoretical research differences. The third point is to do with the explicit and implicit assumptions of such a platform, that is, that a community of researchers is possible and can be self fulfilling. The platform or community does create a space where women from different disciplines (despite being in the same faculty) could listen to each other and share ideas about each others’ current research projects and build on these collaboratively.

However, in seeking an ideal for community Young (1990) also noted the politics of difference. This WICRP did not attract all academic women in the faculty of commerce and this need not be a failure. Although we have not investigated the reasons women chose not to attend, there would no doubt, be insights to their decision. The ideal of community may be seen as a suspension of diversity which may be untenable for some. There would be women researchers who do not want to differentiate themselves from male researchers or at least would find such a public dichotomy uncomfortable or counter productive to the earlier efforts
by women in academia. As already mentioned, we have suspended any methodological and theoretical debates of the kind that differentiate between positivist and post-positivist research. In this paper, we would argue that there was more to gain by exploring the possibility of coherence. However, this coherence, in order for it to be empowering and enduring, must have space for robust debate.

Yeatman (1990) referred to a “community of agents whose agency constructs the world in which we live” thus enabling “self-interpretation and legitimation” (p 281). Although this can be applied to the sphere of work and family and the differentiation which is assigned to these (Yeatman 1990) it may need to be applied to how research, research related activities, teaching, administration and community involvement are differentiated and/or valued with respect to promotions.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study did identify issues consistent with the extant literature addressing structural inequalities and gendered choices (Probert, 2005). The issue of time and the issue of defining work/non-work were identified as major challenges. The level of administrative workload experienced by the senior academic women was also a significant concern. Gender issues were difficult to contextualise in this study and the results were ambiguous. Networking and mentoring were perceived as important along with institutional support to assist women academics.

Identifying the factors surrounding under-representation of women in senior academic positions is a complex issue, however there exists a common acknowledgement of the need for mentoring, the opportunity for collaborative work and networking as a strategy. This study indicated that the WICRP did provide this opportunity, especially at the faculty level. Further, it provided opportunities for collaboration and mentoring as well as the dissemination and discussion of information about research and EED. The WICRP has continued beyond the initial trial period after consultation with the members. The format of the meetings has changed in that the meetings are more frequent but shorter in duration. The importance of an administrative assistant who organises the agenda etc for the meetings was noted and so continued. This is an example of the explicit support that a faculty can offer to encourage research initiatives. The two themes of collaboration and dissemination of information were also maintained in the new format.

The writing of a paper about WICRP was as important reflexive device which enabled a number of issues for further research to be brought to the fore. Research as praxis can be away to remain conscious of our processes and outcomes which can inform our research as well as teaching. The process of writing a joint paper about the shared experience of WICRP can be seen as working towards an ideal of community. At the same time this community for research needs to enable robust debate about methodological and theoretical differences in order to be coherent and enduring. It does point to problematising differentiations between work and family to be better reflected in academic practices as well as non-academic. More specifically, the renewed focus on research output for career progression may require a problematisation of the differentiation between research, teaching, administration and community involvement.
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### Table 1: 2004 Full time equivalents (FTE) for Full-Time and Fractional Full-Time Academic Staff in Australia by Gender and Classification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Above Senior Lecturer</th>
<th>Senior Lecturer (Level C)</th>
<th>Lecturer (Level B)</th>
<th>Below Lecturer (Level A)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>6006</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>5418</td>
<td>2851</td>
<td>5928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Department of Education, Science and Training, 2004.)

### Table 2: Staff profile by levels and equity groups of Faculty of Commerce and the University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level E</th>
<th>Level D</th>
<th>Level C</th>
<th>Level B</th>
<th>Level A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female:male % at faculty</td>
<td>17:83</td>
<td>33:67</td>
<td>33:67</td>
<td>26:74</td>
<td>53:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female:male % at university</td>
<td>15:85</td>
<td>25:75</td>
<td>30:70</td>
<td>47:53</td>
<td>42:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: adapted from Employment, Equity and Diversity Unit, University of Wollongong, Staff profile by levels and equity groups report 2005)

### Table 3: Experience of Participating Female Researchers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Position</td>
<td>Relatively junior</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relatively senior</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in the Faculty of Commerce</td>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 or more years</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Experience</td>
<td>Attended an academic conference</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Published in proceedings</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Published in a journal</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained internal funding</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained external funding</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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