

INTEGRATION OF FEMALE FACULTY
AT McMASTER

Prepared by:

Dr. Marcoussia Ahmed
Dr. Rhoda Howard
Dr. Isik Zeytinoglu
McMaster University

Dr. Margaret Denton
Social Data Research Limited

For:

The McMaster University Faculty Association
Status of Women Committee

September, 1989

Financial Support for this Study was Provided by
the Secretary of State

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Purpose of the Study	1
1.2 Faculty at McMaster	4
2.0 METHODOLOGY	11
2.1 Questionnaire Design	11
2.2 Sample	12
2.3 Response Rates	13
3.0 FINDINGS	16
3.1 Qualifications, Rank, Tenure and Appointment	16
3.1.1 Years of Teaching Experience	16
3.1.2 Highest Degree Level	19
3.1.3 Rank, Tenure and Appointment	22
3.1.4 Sociodemographic Characteristics, Female and Male Faculty	28
3.2 Professional Participation	31
3.2.1 Participation on Departmental, Program, Faculty or University Level Committees	31
3.2.2 Administrative Positions Ever Held	36
3.2.3 Other Types of Professional Participation	38
3.3 Teaching and Advising Students	41
3.4 Perception of Faculty Integration	48
3.4.1 At the Departmental Level	49
3.4.2 At the Faculty Level	50
3.4.3 At the University Level	53
3.4.4 About the Faculty Association	55
3.4.5 About Colleagues	55
3.4.6 Perceptions on the Work Environment in General	58

	<u>Page</u>
3.5 Social Contacts	67
3.5.1 Access to the Administrator	67
3.5.2 Use of McMaster Facilities	67
3.5.3 Socializing Outside Normal Working Hours	71
3.5.4 Informal Contacts With Colleagues of the Opposite Sex	71
3.6 Sexual Harassment	74
3.7 Factors Affecting Progress at McMaster	76
4.0 DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	78
4.1 Part 1: Structural Integration	79
4.2 Part 2: Attitude Survey	83
4.3 A Note With Regard to Visible Minorities	89
4.4 In Conclusion	89
APPENDIX A	
Questionnaire	
Letters	

LIST OF TABLES

		<u>Page</u>
TABLE 1.2.1	McMaster Faculty by Faculty and Sex, 1988/89	5
TABLE 1.2.2	Percentage of Female and Male Faculty in each Faculty, 1988/89	6
TABLE 1.2.3	McMaster Faculty by Rank and Sex, 1988/89	7
TABLE 1.2.4	Percentage of Each Rank that is Female or Male, 1988/89	8
TABLE 1.2.5	Percentage of Faculty in Each Rank Within Each Faculty, 1988/89	9
TABLE 1.2.6	Percentage of Females and Males at Each Rank Within Each Faculty, 1988/89	10
TABLE 2.2.1	Response Rates* by Rank and Sex	14
TABLE 2.2.2	Response Rates* by Sex and Faculty	15
TABLE 3.1.1A	Full and Part-Time Teaching Experience of Female and Male Faculty	17
TABLE 3.1.1B	Full and Part-Time Teaching Experience of Female and Male Faculty by Rank	18
TABLE 3.1.2A	Highest Degree Held by Female and Male Faculty by Rank	20
TABLE 3.1.2B	Year Received Highest Degree, Female and Male Faculty by Rank	21
TABLE 3.1.3A	Rank of Female and Male Faculty	23
TABLE 3.1.3B	Years at Present Rank, Female and Male Faculty by Rank	24
TABLE 3.1.3C	Tenured Female and Male Faculty by Rank	26
TABLE 3.1.3D	Years Tenure Received by Female and Male Tenured Faculty by Rank	27
TABLE 3.1.4	Sociodemographic Characteristics, Female and Male Faculty Respondents	29

		<u>Page</u>
TABLE 3.2.1A	Membership on Departmental, Faculty or University Committees, Female and Male Faculty, 1987/88	33
TABLE 3.2.1B	Chair of Departmental, Faculty or University Committees, Female and Male Faculty, 1987/88	35
TABLE 3.2.2	Administrative Positions Ever Held by Female and Male Faculty Members	37
TABLE 3.2.3	Significantly Different Other Types of Professional Participation, Female and Male Faculty, 1987/88	40
TABLE 3.3.1	Hours Per Week Spent Teaching or Advising Students, Female and Male Faculty	43
TABLE 3.3.2	Number of Students Taught or Advised, Female and Male Faculty, 1987/88	44
TABLE 3.3.3A	Graduate Student Supervisor by Female and Male Faculty, 1987/88	46
TABLE 3.3.3B	Graduate Student Supervision by Female and Male Faculty, 1987/88 in Departments with Graduate Programs	47
TABLE 3.3.4	Supervise PHD Students, Female and Male Faculty With PHD's, by Rank, in Departments with Graduate Programs Only, 1987/88	47
TABLE 3.4.1	Perceptions of Female and Male Faculty of Their Work Environment in the Department	51
TABLE 3.4.2	Perceptions of Female and Male Faculty of Their Work Environment in the Faculty	52
TABLE 3.4.3	Perceptions of Female and Male Faculty of Their Work Environment at the University Level	54
TABLE 3.4.4	Perceptions of Female and Male Faculty About the Faculty Association	56
TABLE 3.4.5	Perceptions of Female and Male Faculty About Their Colleagues	57

		<u>Page</u>
TABLE 3.4.6A	General Perceptions of Female and Male Faculty of Their Work Environment	61
TABLE 3.4.6B	Perceptions of Female and Male Faculty of Tenure and Promotion	62
TABLE 3.4.6C	Perceptions of Female and Male Faculty of Teaching	63
TABLE 3.4.6D	Perceptions of Female and Male Faculty of Salary	65
TABLE 3.4.6E	Perceptions of Female and Male Faculty of Decision-Making	66
TABLE 3.5.1A	Access to the Chair, Dean, Academic Vice-President, Female and Male Faculty	68
TABLE 3.5.2A	Use of McMaster Facilities, Female and Male Faculty	69
TABLE 3.5.2B	Use of the Faculty Club by Female and Male Faculty	70
TABLE 3.5.3	Socializing Outside Normal Working Hours	72
TABLE 3.5.4	Informal Contacts with Colleagues of the Opposite Sex	73
TABLE 3.6.1	Sexual Harassment, Female and Male Faculty	75
TABLE 3.7.1	Factors Affecting Progress at McMaster	77

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Directors of this study, Dr. Maroussia Ahmed, Dr. Rhoda Howard and Dr. Isik Zeytinoglu, would like to acknowledge the assistance of Dr. Margaret Denton of Social Data Research for her contribution to the study of the "Integration of Female Faculty at McMaster University". Social Data Research assisted in questionnaire design, administered the survey, analyzed the results and presented the findings in a draft report. The Directors suggested revisions to the draft report and formulated the recommendations contained in Section 4.0. Dr. Denton was assisted by the following members of her staff: Judy Gerencser, Lynda Hayward, Margaret Knott, Jennifer Oliphant, Beverley Parr, and Margaret Paterson.

The Directors would also like to thank Betty May Lamb and Joan Field, both administrative assistants of the Faculty Association for their assistance on this important study.

A number of faculty involved in the pre-test made useful suggestions for improvements to the survey instrument and we thank them for their input. In particular, we appreciate the assistance of Dr. C. A. Woodward and Dr. David Inman who gave valuable time to this study to help the consultant modify the survey instrument to be applicable to Health Sciences. We are grateful for the assistance of the members of the Status of Women Committee of the McMaster University Faculty Association, Dr. Julia O'Connor, Dr. Mary O'Connor, Dr. Vera Chouinard, and Dr. Jean Westermann.

We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of the administration for providing information for this study.

The Directors of the study would also like to thank the Secretary of State who sponsored this study.

Finally, we would like to thank all faculty members who completed the self-administered survey. We hope you will find the report to be both of interest and value.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The McMaster University Faculty Association Status of Women Committee commissioned Social Data Research Limited to conduct a mail survey of all full-time female faculty and a random sample of male faculty in the fall of 1988.

The purpose of the study was to ascertain the degree and quality of integration of McMaster University's female faculty members into the structure and organization of McMaster University. The study was meant to complement the recently completed report on employment equity at McMaster and a current study now being completed on salary equity.

Both structural measures and attitudinal measures of integration were considered. Structural measures included tenure and appointment, participation on committees, administrative positions ever held, teaching and advising students and other types of professional participation. Attitudinal measures referred to faculty's perceptions of their work environment, in general, and within their Department, Faculty, or the University as a whole. Faculty were also asked their opinions on collegial relationships.

The findings from the study indicate that female faculty, with a few exceptions, appeared to be fairly well integrated into the structure of the University. Female and male faculty, however,

differed in integration at the administrative level, in graduate advising, and in teaching summer and evening courses, as well as in their perceptions of a number of important factors related to their work environment. There were also suggested differences in graduate teaching and chairing hiring and tenure committees.

Female faculty tended to be somewhat younger, on average, than male faculty and to have fewer years of teaching experience. They were more likely to occupy the ranks of assistant professor or lecturer, and less likely to occupy the rank of full professor, than male faculty. Female faculty were not divided equally among the six Faculties. One-half of all female faculty were in Health Sciences, followed by one-fifth in Social Sciences and another one-sixth in the Humanities. Overall, relatively more males than females were tenured. This reflected the greater proportion of males at the level of full professor, as the proportions of males and females who were tenured at each rank were roughly equivalent. There were no significant differences in the types of nontenured appointments for men and women.

In proportion to their numbers, female and male faculty were equally likely to be members of departmental, program, Faculty and University-level committees. Both male and female faculty were familiar with the criteria and procedures for merit salary increases, tenure, promotion and hiring. There were no significant differences by sex in the proportions who gave

scholarly talks; held joint or associate appointment in another academic Department, School or Program; taught or held an administrative role in a special program; engaged in collaborative research with other members of McMaster Faculty; applied for McMaster University research funds; or were consulted by the Chair or Dean on important decisions that were to be made. These data show that females were, in most respects, as well integrated into the structure of the university as the males.

In 1987-88, both female and male faculty spent, on average, about sixteen hours per week teaching and advising students. On average, males spent more time than females advising and supervising graduate students, while females spent more time acting as student advisors. There was no difference in the number of hours spent teaching undergraduates by male and female faculty. The data suggest that males were also more likely than their female counterparts to be asked to be an examiner or Chair of a PHD defense in which they had not previously been involved.

The data show that females are less likely than males to have held administrative positions. In giving their opinions on opportunities for an administrative position, more women than men felt they were not given serious consideration for administrative positions.

Faculty were asked their perceptions on 57 items related to their work environment. While there were not significant differences by sex on many of the opinion items, a substantial number of items did show significant male-female differences. While sixty-five per cent of faculty endorsed the statement, "I work in an environment that is supportive to me", females were less likely than males to feel confident about their future at McMaster. In general, the findings indicate that both male and female faculty members felt more support from their Department than from their Faculty or the University as a whole. Women were less likely than men to feel supported at the level of the Faculty or the University. They were less likely than men to agree that they had the opportunity to serve on the types of Faculty level or University committees that they were interested in, or on important decision-making committees at all three levels. Very few women felt that their voice was heard in University level committee meetings.

Faculty's opinion on tenure and promotion, salary and decision-making was also sought. In general, female faculty were more likely to perceive difficulty for women in obtaining tenure, and less likely to agree that merit increases were awarded equitably in their department, than male faculty. Also, female faculty were less likely than their male counterparts to perceive that their point of view was given equal consideration to that of their colleagues concerning important decisions.

The report concludes with a number of recommendations that address male-female differences in structural integration and differences in the attitudes of female and male faculty to their integration into McMaster's affairs.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to ascertain the degree and quality of integration of McMaster University's female faculty members into the structure and organization of McMaster University as a whole. Integration refers to the participation of faculty in decision-making, administration, teaching, research, and other professional activities. As well, faculty's perceptions of their work environment, in particular their relationships with colleagues, administrators, and the university at large, will be considered as measures of integration.

The status of women at McMaster University, as at other universities, has been a concern since the early 1970's. In 1971, the Group for Equal Rights at McMaster petitioned the Senate to ensure equal rights and opportunities for women. The Senate responded to the petition by establishing a subcommittee -- The Equal Rights Review and Co-ordinating Committee -- to monitor progress on an on-going basis and to make periodic reports. In 1976, the Committee submitted a report which provided baseline information on the status of women at McMaster and made a number of recommendations regarding appointments, tenure and promotion, committee membership, administrative appointments, salaries and recruitment of female students.

In 1974, the Status of Women Committee completed a study on the "Determinants of Academic Salaries of Full-time Faculty" which indicated that salary differences favoured men. In 1979, women faculty who had held full-time appointments for at least three years were asked to nominate themselves for salary review. Thirteen women faculty chose to participate, and eight of them received salary increases. At present, the Vice President Academic reminds Deans annually to check whether salaries of women in their Faculties are in line with those of their male peers, and a second salary equity study is underway, but results are not yet available.

In 1986, McMaster decided to participate in the Employment Equity Program for Women, sponsored by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. An Employment Equity Co-ordinator was appointed, and along with an advisory Employment Equity Committee, completed a report which assessed and made a number of recommendations on the recruitment and appointment, tenure and promotion and advancement opportunities of academic staff.

In 1986, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women, McMaster University Faculty Association, chaired by Dr. Rhoda Howard, undertook a pilot study of social science faculty to investigate possible differences in the perceptions of female and male faculty at McMaster regarding their work environment. The study, which was directed by Dr. C.A. Woodward and Dr. D.L. Lamping (now

of McGill University), found some differences between men and women. Men perceived their work environment as more supportive than did women, and the women saw greater inequality regarding career advancement and tenure and promotion opportunities for themselves. The Committee recommended a survey of the entire faculty of the University to assess the extent to which the opinion held by Social Sciences Faculty members characterized the entire academic community at McMaster.

This study extends the pilot study undertaken in 1986 by the Faculty Association. It includes a survey of all female faculty at McMaster and a random sample of male faculty. The study seeks to take a step beyond those which examine pay differentials or discrimination in hiring or tenure at a university and describes gender differences in the integration of faculty at McMaster. A review of the literature suggests that this study may be the first of its kind to be completed in a Canadian university.

The report consists of four sections. The first section presents a profile of faculty at McMaster and describes differences in rank and faculty by sex. The second section outlines the methodology used to complete the study. The third section presents the findings, organized into seven parts: qualifications, rank, tenure and appointment; professional participation; teaching and advising students; perception of

faculty integration; social contacts; sexual harassment; and factors affecting progress at McMaster. The final section gives a discussion of the findings as they relate to differences in the integration of female and male faculty and suggests a number of recommendations.

1.2 Faculty at McMaster

Sex and Faculty

On July 1, 1988, there were 787 faculty members at McMaster, of whom 20% (154) were female and 80% (633) were male.¹ Faculty members were divided among six Faculties, with the largest being Sciences (24%), followed by Health Sciences² (22%), Social Sciences (19%), Humanities (17%), Engineering (11%) and Business (7%). Female members were not divided equally among the six (Table 1.2.1). Forty-nine per cent of all females were in Health Sciences,³ followed by 20% in Social Sciences and 16% in Humanities. The other Faculties had very few female members: 9% of female faculty were in the Sciences; 5% in Business; and 1% in Engineering. The percentages of males and females in each Faculty also varied considerably (Table 1.2.2). Almost one-half

¹Figures were supplied by the McMaster Faculty Association and refer to July 1, 1988.

²The figures for Health Sciences do not include full-time clinical faculty.

³The percentage of females in the full-time clinical faculty is much lower, in the range of 10-15%.

of all faculty members in Health Sciences were female (45%), while Social Sciences (20%) and Humanities (19%) had around one-fifth female. Thirteen per cent of Business faculty members were female. Sciences (7%) and Engineering (2%) had very few female faculty.

TABLE 1.2.1
McMASTER FACULTY BY FACULTY AND SEX, 1988/89

FACULTY	% OF ALL FEMALES	% OF ALL MALES	% OF ALL FACULTY
Health Sciences	49	15	22
Business	5	8	7
Social Sciences	20	19	19
Humanities	16	17	17
Sciences	9	28	24
Engineering	1	14	11
Total %	100	100*	100
Total N	154	633	787

* Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

TABLE 1.2.2
PERCENTAGE OF FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY IN EACH FACULTY,
1988/89

FACULTY	PERCENTAGES			TOTAL N
	Female	Male	Total	
Health Sciences	45	55	100	169
Business	13	87	100	55
Social Sciences	20	80	100	150
Humanities	19	81	100	133
Sciences	7	93	100	191
Engineering	2	98	100	89
Total %	20	80	100	787

Sex and Rank

Faculty members at McMaster hold various ranks from full professor to lecturer. Fifty-three per cent of all male faculty were full professors, as compared to 19% of all females (Table 1.2.3). About equal percentages of males (29%) and females (32%) were associate professors; 40% of females and 15% of males were assistant professors; and 8% of females and 2% of males were lecturers. The percentages of female and male faculty at each rank also varied. Eight per cent of all full professors were female (Table 1.2.4), as were twenty-one per cent of all associate professors, 39% of all assistant professors, and 55% of all lecturers.

TABLE 1.2.3
McMASTER FACULTY BY RANK AND SEX, 1988/89

RANK	PERCENTAGES		
	Female	Male	Total
Full Professor	19	53	46
Associate Professor	32	29	30
Assistant Professor	40	15	20
Lecturer	8	2	3
Other	1	1	1
Total %	100	100	100
Total N	154	633	787

TABLE 1.2.4
PERCENTAGE OF EACH RANK THAT IS FEMALE OR MALE, 1988/89

RANK	PERCENTAGES			TOTAL N
	Female	Male	Total	
Full Professor	8	92	100	363
Associate Professor	21	79	100	235
Assistant Professor	39	61	100	159
Lecturer	55	46	100	22
Other (research,directors)	25	75	100	8
Total %	20	80	100	787

Sex, Faculty and Rank

The percentages of faculty members at each rank varied across the six Faculties (Table 1.2.5). The data indicated that the Faculties with the largest proportions of full professors were Sciences (65%), and Engineering (63%), followed at some distance by Humanities (41%), Social Sciences (39%), Health Sciences (32%) and Business (29%). Those Faculties with relatively fewer members at the rank of full professor showed greater proportions at the assistant or lecturer rank (see Table 1.2.5).

The percentages of male and female faculty members at each rank also varied across the six Faculties (see Table 1.2.6). Within

each Faculty, females were more likely to be assistant professors or lecturers than were males, and males were more likely to be full professors than females.

TABLE 1.2.5
PERCENTAGE OF FACULTY IN EACH RANK WITHIN EACH FACULTY, 1988/89

RANK	FACULTY					
	Health Sciences %	Business %	Social Sciences %	Human- ities %	Sciences %	Engin- eering %
Full Professor	32	29	39	41	65	63
Associate Professor	33	31	37	41	19	19
Assistant Professor	31	27	19	18	14	15
Lecturer	3	13	5	1	1	1
Other	1	-	1	-	2	2
Total %	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total N	169	55	150	133	191	89

TABLE 1.2.6

PERCENTAGE OF FEMALES AND MALES AT EACH RANK WITHIN EACH FACULTY, 1988/89

RANK	FACULTY													
	Health Sciences		Business		Social Sciences		Humanities		Sciences		Engineering		Total	
	f %	m %	f %	m %	f %	m %	f %	m %	f %	m %	f %	m %	f %	m %
Professor	18	43	0	33	10	47	20	45	43	67	50	63	19	53
Associate Professor	36	31	0	35	30	38	44	40	7	20	50	18	32	29
Assistant Professor	40	24	57	23	47	12	32	15	43	12	0	15	40	15
Lecturer	5	1	43	8	13	3	4	0	0	1	0	1	8	2
Other	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	1	0	2	1	1
Total %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total N	76	93	7	48	30	120	25	108	14	177	2	87	154	633

2.0 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Questionnaire Design

The consultant worked closely with the Status of Women Committee of McMaster University Faculty Association to formulate a draft questionnaire which included measures of faculty integration. Most questions referred to the academic year 1987/88. As noted earlier, integration refers to the participation of faculty in decision-making, administration, teaching, research, and other professional activities along with faculty members' perceptions of their work environment. The questionnaire did not include measures of job performance, such as the number of publications; rather the study assumes equal competence of faculty members at each rank. A number of the opinion questions were taken from the earlier Status of Women Committee's survey of social science faculty (1986).

The draft questionnaire was pretested on twelve faculty members. They included both males and females from the different Faculties. Based on the results of the pretest and the comments from a number of interested faculty members, revisions were made to the questionnaire. In particular, the questionnaire was revised to capture more accurately the integration of faculty in the Health Sciences, since the organization of undergraduate and

graduate teaching and teaching responsibilities was quite different there than it was in the other five Faculties.

2.2 Sample

The questionnaire was sent to all 154 female full-time faculty at McMaster and to a random sample of 232 male full-time faculty. Full-time clinical faculty in health sciences were not included in the sample. Since it was anticipated that the male response rate would be somewhat lower than the female, male faculty were oversampled for the study to ensure approximately equal numbers of males and females. Although it may have been preferable to send questionnaires to all male faculty, budget constraints did not allow this option. A letter from the president of the University asking each faculty member to participate in the study was included with each questionnaire. Questionnaires were followed by a reminder letter approximately three weeks after the initial mailing. As well, the study was publicized in the McMaster Courier (an internal University newsletter).

The implication of using a random sample of male faculty meant that, on average, the male faculty were further along in their careers than were the female faculty.

2.3 Response Rates

Sex and Rank

Fifty-two percent of all faculty (n=202) included in the survey returned their questionnaires. The response rate varied by sex, rank and faculty. Sixty-five percent of female faculty and 44% of male faculty completed and returned their questionnaires. Assistant professors (60%) followed by associate professors (55%) were most likely to return their questionnaires (Table 2.2.1). Least likely to participate in the study were faculty at the rank of lecturer (50%) or full professor (46%). Male full professors were the least likely to return their questionnaires, and female full professors were the most likely to do so (41% and 69% respectively) (Table 2.2.1). Of the males, assistant professors had the highest response rates (53%). Of the females, those at the rank of lecturer were least likely to complete their questionnaires (50%).

Sex and Faculty

Response rates varied by Faculty; faculty members in Social Sciences (63%), Health Sciences (61%), and Business (60%) had the highest response rates, while those in Humanities (48%), Engineering (46%) and Science (37%) had the lowest (Table 2.2.2). The highest response rates for females were in Social Sciences (80%) and Business (71%). Among the males, the highest

response rates were in Health Sciences (62%) and Business (54%) and the lowest in Science (31%).

Representativeness of the Sample

Although the sample was representative of the faculty in most respects, it overestimated male assistant professors and lecturers. These sample biases do not, however, compromise the findings where comparisons were made between male and female faculty at each rank.

TABLE 2.2.1
RESPONSE RATES* BY RANK AND SEX

RANK	PERCENTAGES			TOTAL N	
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male
Full Professor	69	41	46	29	128
Associate Professor	65	46	55	49	61
Assistant Professor	65	53	60	62	40
Lecturer	50	50	50	12	2
Other (Research Directors)	100	0	67	2	1
Total	65	44	52	154	232

* The percentage of faculty in each group completing and returning their questionnaire

TABLE 2.2.2
RESPONSE RATES* BY SEX AND FACULTY

FACULTY	PERCENTAGES			TOTAL N	
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male
Health Sciences	61	62	61	76	37
Business	71	54	60	7	13
Social Sciences	80	49	63	30	37
Humanities	60	40	48	25	38
Sciences	64	31	37	13	70
Engineering	50	46	46	2	37
Total	65	44	52	154	232

* The percentage of faculty in each group completing and returning their questionnaire

3.0 FINDINGS

3.1 Qualifications, Rank, Tenure and Appointment

3.1.1 Years of Teaching Experience

Faculty were first asked a number of questions concerning their careers, including number of years of teaching experience, highest degree, tenure, year granted tenure, and year appointed to present rank. A number of significant differences in the teaching experiences of male and female faculty were found and are highlighted below.⁴

Male faculty had, on average, more years of full-time teaching experience than their female counterparts, while the opposite was true for part-time teaching experience. Male faculty had taught an average of 17 years full-time at a university and 14 at McMaster, as compared to 10 years and 8 years respectively for females (Table 3.1.1A). Female faculty had, on average, 2 years of part-time experience, as compared to 1 year for males. This difference in the number of years of full-time teaching experience held was greatest across the male and female full professors (See Table 3.1.1B).

⁴Significant differences are noted at the <.05 level unless otherwise noted in the text.

TABLE 3.1.1A
FULL AND PART-TIME TEACHING EXPERIENCE
OF FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY

	AVERAGE YEARS		TOTAL N		F*	SIG.
	Female	Male	F	M		
<u>Average number of years teaching:</u>						
Full-time	10	17	98	96	27.3	<.01
Part-time	2	1	100	102	5.7	<.01
Full-time at McMaster	8	14	97	97	27.9	<.01
Part-time at McMaster	1	1	100	102	1.6	NS

* A one-way analysis of variance was used to compute the F statistic

TABLE 3.1.1B
FULL AND PART-TIME TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF FEMALE AND MALE
FACULTY BY RANK

	AVERAGE YEARS		TOTAL N		F	SIG.
	Female	Male	Female	Male		
<u>Average number of years teaching full-time</u>						
Professor	18	23	19	50	3.7	<.05
Associate	12	13	33	29	.3	NS
Assistant & Lecturer	5	6	46	17	.9	NS
Total	10	17	98	96	27.3	<.01
<u>Average number of years teaching part-time</u>						
Professor	3	1	19	52	1.9	NS
Associate	3	1	33	29	7.3	<.01
Assistant & Lecturer	2	1	48	21	.1	NS
Total	2	1	100	102	5.7	<.01
<u>Average number of years teaching full-time at McMaster</u>						
Professor	15	18	18	50	2.7	NS
Associate	9	11	33	29	1.5	NS
Assistant & Lecturer	4	4	46	18	0.0	NS
Total	8	14	97	97	27.9	<.01
<u>Average number of years teaching part-time at McMaster</u>						
Professor	1	1	19	52	.3	NS
Associate	1	0	33	29	2.3	NS
Assistant & Lecturer	1	1	48	21	.3	NS
Total	1	1	100	102	1.6	NS

3.1.2 Highest Degree Level

Proportionately more male than female faculty members had a PHD (87%, 65%). Table 3.1.2A shows that the major gender difference was found at the associate professor level, where 93% of male faculty and 70% of female faculty held doctorates (Table 3.1.2A). The male-female difference in the proportion with PHDs may be partly explained by the fact that proportionately more of the female associate professors were holders of Masters of Science in Nursing, Masters of Health Sciences, and Masters of Science. Excluding faculty from Health Sciences, 83% of female and 93% of male faculty held doctorates.

Faculty members were also asked the year in which they received their highest degrees. Proportionately more males (45%) than females (13%) received their highest degrees prior to 1970, while proportionately more females (52%) than males (23%) received their highest degrees in the 1980s (Table 3.1.2B). This pattern reflects the greater proportion of males than of females at the rank of full professor at McMaster. Significant male-female differences in the year faculty received their highest degree were not found within each rank.

TABLE 3.1.2A
HIGHEST DEGREE HELD BY FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY
BY RANK

	PERCENTAGES			CHI-SQ.	SIG.
	Female	Male	Total		
<u>Total</u>					
PHD	65	87	76	12.604	<.01
Other	35	13	24		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	100	102	202		
<u>Professor</u>					
PHD	89	94	93	.029	NS
Other	11	6	7		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	19	52	71		
<u>Associate Professor</u>					
PHD	70	93	81	4.022	<.05
Other	30	7	19		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	33	29	62		
<u>Assistant Professor & Lecturer</u>					
PHD	52	62	55	.242	NS
Other	48	38	45		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	48	21	69		

TABLE 3.1.2B
 YEAR RECEIVED HIGHEST DEGREE, FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY
 BY RANK

	PERCENTAGES			CHI- SQ.	SIG.
	Female	Male	Total		
<u>Total</u>					
Prior to 1970	13	45	29	27.795	<.01
1970 - 1979	35	32	34		
1980+	52	23	37		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	99	96	195		
Missing N = 7					
<u>Professor</u>					
Prior to 1980	90	98	96	.724	NS
1980+	10	2	4		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	19	48	67		
Missing N = 4					
<u>Associate Professor</u>					
Prior to 1980	63	79	70	1.151	NS
1980+	37	21	30		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	32	28	60		
Missing N = 2					
<u>Assistant Professor & Lecturer</u>					
Prior to 1980	23	25	24	.000	NS
1980+	77	75	76		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	48	20	68		
Missing N = 1					

3.1.3 Rank, Tenure and Appointment

Proportionately more of the male faculty were at the rank of full professor (51%, 19%), while proportionately more of the female faculty were assistant professors or lecturers (48%, 21%) (Table 3.1.3A). About equal proportions of male and female faculty were associate professors (28%, 33%).

Female faculty had, in general, spent fewer years at their present rank than male faculty (Table 3.1.3B). A more detailed analysis indicated that the greatest difference was for professors: 56% of male professors had been more than eight years at their rank, as compared to 21% of female professors (Table 3.1.3B).

Overall, relatively more males (77%) than females (53%) were tenured (Table 3.1.3C). Again, this reflects the greater proportion of males at the level of full professor, as the proportions of tenured male and female faculty at each rank were roughly equivalent. Of those not tenured, 33% had contractually-limited appointments; 51% had term contracts and 15% had other types of appointments. There were no significant differences in the types of nontenured appointments for men and women.

Nearly 60% of all tenured faculty had received tenure prior to 1980, although this percentage varied significantly by sex.

Sixty-seven per cent of male tenured faculty, as compared to 40% of female tenured faculty, had received tenure by this date. This finding also reflects the greater proportion of males at the level of full professor, as the proportions of faculty receiving tenure prior to 1980 did not significantly vary within each rank (Table 3.1.3D). It is important to note that, on average, male professors differed in a number of important ways from their female counterparts. They had significantly more years of teaching experience, had been significantly longer at their rank, and were more likely to have PhDs. In these respects, males and females are not matched in background even when they are compared within the same rank.

TABLE 3.1.3A
RANK OF FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY

RANK	PERCENTAGES		
	Female	Male	Total
Professor	19	51	33
Associate Professor	33	28	31
Assistant & Lecturer	48	21	34
Total %	100	100	100
Total N	100	102	202

Chi-Sq. = 26.144 Sig. = <.01

TABLE 3.1.3B
YEARS AT PRESENT RANK, FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY
BY RANK

	PERCENTAGES			CHI-SQ.	SIG.
	Female	Male	Total		
<u>Total</u>					
More than 8	15	40	28	13.975	<.01
Less than 8	85	60	72		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	95	98	193		
Missing N = 9					
<u>Professor</u>					
More than 8	21	56	46	5.429	<.01
Less than 8	79	44	54		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	19	50	69		
Missing N = 2					
<u>Associate Professor</u>					
More than 8	17	30	23	.609	NS
Less than 8	83	70	77		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	29	27	56		
Missing N = 6					

TABLE 3.1.3B (Cont'd)
 YEARS AT PRESENT RANK, FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY
 BY RANK

	PERCENTAGES			CHI- SQ.	SIG.
	Female	Male	Total		
<u>Assistant Professor & Lecturer</u>					
More than 8	11	14	12	.001	NS
Less than 8	89	86	88		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	47	21	68		
Missing N = 1					

TABLE 3.1.3C
TENURED FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY
BY RANK

	PERCENTAGES			CHI-SQ.	SIG.
	Female	Male	Total		
<u>Total</u>					
Tenured	53	77	65	11.195	<.01
Not tenured	47	24	35		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	100	102	202		
<u>Professor</u>					
Tenured	95	98	97	.000	NS
Not tenured	5	2	3		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	19	52	71		
<u>Associate Professor</u>					
Tenured	76	79	77	.001	NS
Not tenured	24	21	23		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	33	29	62		
<u>Assistant Professor & Lecturer</u>					
Tenured	21	19	20	.000	NS
Not tenured	79	81	80		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	48	21	69		

TABLE 3.1.3D
YEARS TENURE RECEIVED BY FEMALE AND MALE TENURED FACULTY
BY RANK

	PERCENTAGES			CHI- SQ.	SIG.
	Female	Male	Total		
<u>Total</u>					
Prior to 1980	40	67	56	7.610	<.01
1980+	60	33	44		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	50	75	125		
Missing N = 6					
<u>Professor</u>					
Prior to 1980	65	82	78	1.302	NS
1980+	35	18	22		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	17	50	67		
Missing N = 2					
<u>Associate Professor</u>					
Prior to 1980	38	38	38	.000	NS
1980+	63	62	62		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	24	21	45		
Missing N = 3					
<u>Assistant Professor & Lecturer</u>					
Prior to 1980	0	25	8	.000	NS
1980+	100	75	92		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	9	4	13		
Missing N = 1					

3.1.4 Sociodemographic Characteristics, Female and Male Faculty Respondents

The ages of male and female faculty differed significantly. Males were more likely to be over the age of 50 (42%, 21%) and females were more likely to be 40 - 49 (48%, 38%) or less than 40 (31%, 21%). (Table 3.1.4).

No differences were found in the religions specified by males and females: 37% gave no religion; 35% were Protestant; 18% were Catholic; 7% were Jewish; and 4% gave another religion such as Moslem or Hindu.

Sixteen per cent of faculty identified themselves as a member of a visible minority, and more males than females were in this group (23%, 8%).

One-quarter of the faculty reported that they were single, separated, divorced or widowed. Fifty-six per cent of all faculty report child-rearing responsibilities, although female faculty were more likely to indicate they were the primary person in their family with such responsibilities (38%, 7%).

TABLE 3.1.4
SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS,
FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY RESPONDENTS

	PERCENTAGES			CHI-SQ.	SIG.
	Female	Male	Total		
<u>AGE</u>					
under 40	31	21	26	9.857	<.01
40-49	48	38	43		
50+	21	42	32		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	99	101	200		
<u>RELIGION</u>					
no religion	34	39	37	2.758	NS
Protestant	38	32	35		
Catholic	20	15	18		
Jewish	5	8	7		
Other	3	5	4		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	100	99	199		
<u>Member of a visible/ ethnic minority</u>					
Yes	8	23	16	7.657	<.01
No	92	77	84		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	100	99	199		
<u>Marital status</u>					
Not married	31	19	25	3.382	<.06
Married/cohabiting	69	81	75		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	99	100	199		

TABLE 3.1.4 (Cont'd)
 SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS,
 FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY RESPONDENTS

	PERCENTAGES			CHI-SQ.	SIG.
	Female	Male	Total		
<u>Child rearing responsibilities</u>					
Yes	50	61	56	2.199	NS
No	50	39	44		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	100	101	201		
<u>If "yes" to child rearing responsibilities: Are you the primary person in your family who has child rearing responsibilities?</u>					
Yes	38	7	21	35.909	<.01
No	0	44	24		
Shared equally	62	50	55		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	50	62	112		

3.2 Professional Participation

3.2.1 Participation on Departmental, Program, Faculty or University Level Committees

One measure of integration is the extent to which female and male faculty are members of committees. Committees are formed at the departmental or program level to make recommendations to the Chair on issues such as tenure, promotion, hiring, and graduate and undergraduate education. Members are either elected, appointed or volunteer to the various committees, depending upon the particular procedures used in each Department. At the Faculty level, members of relevant Departments are either elected or appointed to serve on committees to make recommendations to the Dean on issues such as tenure and promotion, graduate admissions, undergraduate and graduate education, awards and scholarships, and a whole host of other university faculty level concerns. And, at the level of the university, faculty members are also elected or appointed to numerous committees, such as Senate and Undergraduate Council, where issues related to the University as a whole are considered. Through committee membership, faculty members participate in the decision-making of the University. Of concern to this study is the question: Are female and male faculty equally likely to be members of departmental, program, Faculty or University-level committees?

Faculty members were asked if they were members of the following departmental or program committees in the academic year 1987-88:

- a) tenure committee or the tenure and promotions committee;
- b) hiring/selection committee;
- c) graduate or graduate education committee;
- d) undergraduate or undergraduate education committee;
- e) other departmental or program committees or offices (e.g., library representative, visiting speakers coordinator, post-professional education).

Overall, 75% of respondents reported that they were members of departmental committees (Table 3.2.1A). Thirty-one per cent sat on tenure and promotion; 34% on hiring; 26% on graduate; 27% on undergraduate and 48% on other types of committees, including library representatives and visiting speakers. The data showed no significant differences (at the .05 level) in the proportions of females and males sitting on departmental committees.

Faculty were also asked to list the committee membership held in their Faculties and at the university level in the academic year 1987-88. Forty-two per cent of all faculty members sat on faculty-level committees, and 22% were members of university-level committees. The proportions of females and males who sat on these types of committees did not differ significantly.

TABLE 3.2.1A

MEMBERSHIP ON DEPARTMENTAL, FACULTY OR UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES, FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY,
1987-88

MEMBERSHIP ON:	PERCENTAGES			NUMBER OF FACULTY			CHI-SQ	SIG.
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total		
AT LEAST ONE COMMITTEE	79	78	78	100	102	202	.009	NS
<u>Departmental Committees</u>								
Tenure and Promotion	32	30	31	89	87	176	.004	NS
Hiring	35	33	34	85	85	170	.026	NS
Graduate	23	29	26	83	84	167	.438	NS
(graduate programs only)	24	28	26	59	81	140	.180	NS
Under Graduate	31	23	27	86	82	168	1.044	NS
Other	55	41	48	98	99	197	3.168	<.07
At Least One Department Committee	78	73	75	98	99	197	.382	NS
<u>A Faculty Level Committee</u>	38	46	42	98	101	199	.942	NS
<u>A University Level Committee</u>	18	26	22	99	100	199	1.341	NS

Percentages do not sum to 100%. Each per cent is the proportion of faculty who are a member of a committee. The proportion of faculty who are not members is not shown.

Faculty members were also asked if they chaired any departmental, Faculty or University level committees. The percentage who sat as chair on each type of committee did not vary significantly by sex. The data do suggest that male faculty were more likely to chair departmental tenure and promotion or hiring committees and Faculty level committees, although these differences were not significant, probably because of the small number of cases (Table 3.2.1B).

TABLE 3.2.1B
 CHAIR OF DEPARTMENTAL, FACULTY OR UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES,
 FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY 1987-88

CHAIRS HELD ON:	PERCENTAGES			NUMBER OF FACULTY			CHI-SQ	SIG.
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total		
AT LEAST ONE COMMITTEE	33	35	34	100	102	202	.038	NS
<u>Departmental Committees</u>								
Tenure and Promotion	2	5	3	89	87	176	.197	NS
Hiring	2	7	5	85	85	170	.181	NS
Graduate	6	5	5	83	84	167	.000	NS
(grad programs only)	7	5	6	59	81	140	.009	NS
Under Graduate	4	6	5	86	82	168	.186	NS
Other	25	20	23	91	91	182	.504	NS
At Least One Department Committee	31	31	31	98	99	197	.000	NS
<u>A Faculty Level Committee</u>	4	8	6	95	97	192	.735	NS
<u>A University Level Committee</u>	3	4	4	98	96	194	.001	NS

3.2.2 Administrative Positions Ever Held

Many of the important administrative positions in the university are held by faculty members who may be elected or appointed to serve as Chairs or Associate Chairs of their Departments, Directors of Schools or Programs, Deans or Associate Deans, or as President or Vice President of the University. Holding an administrative position is clearly an important measure of integration. Faculty were asked if, in their academic careers, they had ever held an administrative position. Twenty-five percent of respondents have served as Chair; 6% as Associate Chair; 14% as Director of a school or program; and 5% as Dean (Table 3.2.2). The data show that males were more likely than females to have held an administrative position, including Chair, Associate Chair or other administrative positions in a Department/School/Program. The percentages of females and males having ever held an administrative position were compared at each rank. The data showed that male full professors were more than twice as likely as female full professors to have held an administrative position at the Department level in their academic careers (48% versus 21%, respectively), although this finding was not statistically significant, probably due to the small number of cases.

TABLE 3.2.2

ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS EVER HELD BY FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY MEMBERS

ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS	PERCENTAGES			NUMBER OF FACULTY			CHI-SQ	SIG.
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total		
Chair	16	33	25	94	99	193	6.889	<.01
Associate Chair	1	10	6	86	89	175	4.947	<.05
Directors of School/Program	12	16	14	91	88	179	.272	NS
Other Administrative in Department/School/Program	19	41	30	94	100	194	9.924	<.01
Dean, Associate Dean	4	5	5	98	99	197	.000	NS

3.2.3 Other Types of Professional Participation

Beyond committee membership and administrative duties, the study also addressed other means by which faculty are integrated into the university. These are listed below, along with the percentages of faculty participating in each activity. In 1987/88:

- * 30% held a joint or associate appointment in another academic Department, School or Program;
- * 18% taught or held a defined administrative role in a special program;
- * 47% gave scholarly talks to members of their Department, School or Program;
- * 43% were asked to be an examiner or chair of a PHD defense in which they had not previously been involved;
- * 24% applied for McMaster University research funds, and 57% of them received 100% of their request;
- * 50% engaged in collaborative research with other members of McMaster;
- * 62% of those engaged in collaborative research worked with members of the opposite sex;
- * 54% were consulted by the Chair on important decisions that were to be made;
- * 21% were consulted by the Dean on important decisions that were to be made;
- * 36% were familiar with the Department's budget;
- * 28% were consulted on the Department's budget;
- * 21% gave scholarly talks to members of their Faculty;
- * 15% gave scholarly talks to others within the University;
- * 42% were told of conferences of interest to them by their Chair;
- * 53% were told of grants of interest to them by their Chair;

- * 28% were required to teach summer or evening courses;
- * 45% were offered the opportunity to teach summer or evening courses for extra remuneration;
- * 65% were familiar with the criteria and procedures used to conduct yearly faculty evaluations for merit salary increases;
- * 84% were familiar with the criteria and procedures used to make promotion decisions;
- * 80% were familiar with the criteria and procedures used to make hiring decisions;
- * 89% were familiar with the criteria and procedures used to make tenure decisions.

Differences by sex were found on four of these measures of integration (Table 3.2.3). Male faculty were more likely than their female counterparts to be asked to be an examiner or chair of a PHD defense in which they had not previously been involved (50%, 34%) ($p < .06$); women were more likely than men to engage in collaborative research with members of the opposite sex (93%, 38%); males were more likely than females to be familiar with the department's budget (43%, 28%); and females were more likely than males to be required to teach summer or evening courses (38%, 19%). These differences varied somewhat by rank (although they were not significant within ranks, probably due to the small number of cases).

TABLE 3.2.3

SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT OTHER TYPES OF PROFESSIONAL PARTICIPATION, FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY
1987-88

	PERCENTAGES			NUMBER OF FACULTY			CHI-SQ	SIG.
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total		
Asked to be an examiner or chair of a PHD defense for which you had not previously been involved	34	50	43	76	88	164	3.535	<.06
Of those engaged in collaborative research, the proportion working with members of the opposite sex at McMaster	93	38	63	44	55	99	29.286	<.01
Familiar with department's budget	28	43	36	97	100	197	4.303	<.05
Required to teach summer or evening courses	38	19	28	58	63	121	4.436	<.05

The fact that only four of the twenty-two measures of faculty integration reported here showed significant sex differences indicates that female faculty are in most respects as well integrated into the university community as the male. The fact that male faculty were more likely than female faculty to be familiar with their Departments' budgets suggests the lack of integration of females at the administrative levels. The tendency for male faculty to be more likely than female faculty to be asked to be an examiner or a chair of a PHD defense for which they had not previously been involved ($p < .06$) may suggest that the School of Graduate Studies is not utilizing male and female faculty equally. Although the more junior level (on average) of female faculty may provide an explanation of both these findings, they nevertheless reveal areas in which the integration of female faculty may be improved.

3.3 Teaching and Advising Students

The job of a typical faculty member includes three major tasks: research, administration or committee work and teaching. This section examines the types of teaching responsibilities assigned to female and male faculty, and seeks to determine if there are systematic differences between the sexes in this regard.

In 1987-88, on average, both female and male faculty spent about sixteen hours per week in the classroom and in advising

graduate or MD students. The types of teaching responsibilities they had however did vary by sex (Table 3.3.1). Males spent more time on average than females advising graduate students and tended to spend more time teaching them ($p < .06$) (4.4 hours, 1.9 hours), teaching MD students ((2.0 hours, .4 hour) (Health Sciences non-clinical faculty only)) and acting as laboratory supervisors (1.3 hours, .3 hours) ($p < .06$). Females spent more time acting as undergraduate student advisors. There was no difference in the average number of hours spent by female and male faculty in teaching undergraduates (7.1 hours).

On average, each faculty member taught or advised approximately one hundred students in the academic year 1987-88 (Table 3.3.2). The total number of students did not differ significantly between female and male faculty.

TABLE 3.3.1

HOURS PER WEEK SPENT TEACHING OR ADVISING STUDENTS, FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY*

	HOURS			NUMBER OF FACULTY			F	SIG.
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total		
<u>Average Number of Hours Spent:</u>								
Teaching undergraduates	7.3	6.9	7.1	95	99	194	.1	NS
Teaching graduates (graduate programs only)	1.9 2.0	4.4 4.5	3.2 3.5	96 69	99 95	195 164	3.6 2.6	<.06 NS
Teaching MD students** (health sciences only)	.4	2.0	1.0	43	22	65	7.6	<.01
Graduate student advisor (graduate programs only)	1.6	3.5	2.7	68	93	161	4.8	<.05
Student advisor	1.4	.7	1.0	96	98	194	9	<.05
Tutorial or Seminar leader	1.1	.5	.8	95	98	193	3.1	NS
Research intern advisor (health sciences, only)	.2	1.1	.5	44	23	67	2.2	NS
Laboratory supervisor	.3	1.3	.8	96	96	192	3.5	<.06
Other teaching	.8	.7	.8	97	98	195	.0	NS
Total Number of Hours	14.5	17.1	15.8	93	93	186	1.0	NS

* Note that this table does not take into account differences between faculties in the pattern of teaching.

** Faculty surveyed in Health Sciences did not include full-time clinical faculty.

TABLE 3.3.2
NUMBER OF STUDENTS TAUGHT OR ADVISED, FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY, 1987/88

	AVERAGE NUMBER OF STUDENTS			NUMBER OF FACULTY			F	SIG.
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total		
	Teaching undergraduates	77	72	75	92	95		
Teaching graduates (graduate programs only)	7 8	6 7	7 7	96 68	98 94	194 162	.0 .2	NS NS
Teaching MD students (health sciences only)	4	20	9	44	23	67	2.8	NS
Graduate student advisor (graduate programs only)	1	2	2	65	94	159	1.2	NS
Student advisor	9	3	6	90	93	183	2.7	NS
Tutorial or Seminar advisor	6	4	5	94	97	191	.7	NS
Research intern advisor (health sciences only)	0	0	0	45	23	68	1.1	NS
Laboratory supervisor	1	4	3	97	97	194	.9	NS
Other teaching	7	0	4	94	97	191	2.4	NS
Total Number of Students	103	94	98	84	86	170	.3	NS

These data indicate that a greater proportion of male than of female faculty acted as MA supervisors (55% vs 35%) or as PHD supervisors (41%, 17%) (Table 3.3.3A). These differences were partly explained by the fact that male faculty were more likely than female faculty to be in departments with graduate programs. However, within departments with graduate programs, the male-female difference in PHD supervision remained significant (54% vs 32%) (Table 3.3.3B). The fact that more male faculty were located at the rank of professor than females, and professors are more likely to act as PHD supervisor than associate or assistant professors, may explain the male-female difference in PHD supervision. To test this explanation, the percentages of female and male faculty at each rank who acted as PHD supervisors were examined. The data showed that female and male full professors in departments with graduate programs were equally likely to supervise doctoral students. The data showed that male associate professors were over three times as likely as their female counterparts to act as PHD supervisors, although this finding is not significant, probably due to the small number of cases within the rank (43% to 14%; Table 3.3.4). The data, then, suggested that female faculty were less integrated than male faculty in graduate programs. They were less likely to be a graduate student supervisor and less likely to supervise PHD students. Although some of these differences may be explained by the relatively more junior position of the average female faculty

member, the data suggest an area in which female integration may be improved.

TABLE 3.3.3A
GRADUATE STUDENT SUPERVISOR BY FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY, 1987/88

	PERCENTAGES			NUMBER OF FACULTY			CHI-SQ	SIG.
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total		
Act as an M.A. Supervisor	35	55	45	95	96	191	7.278	<.01
Act as a PHD Supervisor	17	41	29	96	96	192	12.333	<.01
Act as an MA Committee Member	34	43	38	95	96	191	1.287	NS
Act as a PHD Committee Member	24	47	35	96	96	192	10.042	<.01
Act as an outside MA Committee Member	7	11	9	94	95	189	.236	NS
Act as an outside PHD Committee Member	14	19	16	96	95	191	.667	NS

TABLE 3.3.3B

GRADUATE STUDENT SUPERVISION BY FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY, 1987/88
IN DEPARTMENTS WITH GRADUATE PROGRAMS

	PERCENTAGES			NUMBER OF FACULTY			CHI-SQ	SIG.
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total		
Act as an M.A. Supervisor	54	65	61	56	81	137	1.485	NS
Act as a PHD Supervisor	32	54	46	44	70	114	4.629	<.05
Act as an MA Committee Member	54	53	54	59	78	134	.000	NS
Act as a PHD Committee Member	50	59	56	44	75	119	.529	NS
Act as an outside MA Committee Member	15	15	15	48	69	117	.000	NS
Act as an outside PHD Committee Member	28	30	29	39	61	100	.000	NS

TABLE 3.3.4

SUPERVISE PHD STUDENTS, FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY WITH PHD'S BY RANK,
IN DEPARTMENTS WITH GRADUATE PROGRAMS ONLY, 1987/88

	PERCENTAGES			NUMBER OF FACULTY			CHI-SQ.	SIG.
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total		
Total	39	58	51	36	62	98	2.628	NS
Professor	83	76	78	12	33	45	.018	NS
Associate Professor	18	45	36	11	20	31	1.212	NS
Assistant Professor/ Lecturer	17	22	19	13	9	22	.000	NS

3.4 Perceptions of Faculty Integration

As noted in Section 1, this study was preceded by a pilot study in the spring of 1986, in which questionnaires were sent to a stratified random sample of the social science faculty. This questionnaire contained 20 items designed to assess faculty perceptions of their work environment at McMaster. The study found some differences between men and women. Many of the items in the pilot study were included in the questionnaire used here. The 1988 version of the questionnaire was expanded to include 57 statements. These were rated on a 5-point scale (1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree), with an additional response alternative to indicate "don't know" or "not applicable". This section of the questionnaire contained 8 items related to the work environment of the department; 5 items about the faculty; 7 items about the university; 5 items about the faculty association; 1 item about colleagues; and 22 items about the work environment in general.

In formulating this section of the questionnaire, the Committee reasoned that people's perceptions are based on their employment histories and the experiences of their reference group. If male-female differences are found in the opinions of faculty members on their work environment, these may indicate differences in the integration of male and female faculty at McMaster. While no significant differences by sex were found for many of the opinion

items, a number of items did show significant male-female differences.

3.4.1 At The Departmental Level

The analysis presented here focuses on the percentage of female and male faculty who agreed with each statement as it relates to their Department. Sixty-seven percent of faculty endorsed the item, "In general I feel supported by my chair"; 57% felt that "the merit increases generally awarded to me are fair and equitable"; 65% agreed that they had the "opportunity to serve on the types of departmental committees" of interest to them; and 70% felt that their "voice is heard in Department and Committee meetings". No significant differences by sex were found for these items (Table 3.4.1).

In 4 of the 8 items included in this section, females and males significantly differed in the extent of their endorsement. Females were less likely than males to agree to the statements, "I have been a member of important decision-making committees in the Department" (47%,67%), "I am generally satisfied with the hiring decisions made by my Department" (45%,67%) and "I am as likely to be invited to dine with guest speakers as my colleagues" (45%,71%). Female faculty were more likely to agree with the statement, "I tend to be assigned tasks dealing with undergraduates rather than graduates" (39%,19%).

These male-female differences were not due to differences in rank between the sexes, but were found within each rank.

3.4.2 At the Faculty Level

Five items were included to measure the respondents' perceptions of Faculty-level work environments. Less than one-half endorsed statements which positively described their work environment at the Faculty level (Table 3.4.2). Of these, 2 showed significant differences by sex and two approached statistical significance. Overall, 40% of faculty agreed that, "I have been a member of important decision-making committees in the Faculty" (although women were less inclined to agree with this statement than men) and 42% felt their "voice is heard in Faculty level committee meetings". Female faculty were less likely than male faculty to agree to the statements "I know the Dean fairly well" (37%,52%); "I feel supported by my Dean" (38%,58%); and "I have had the opportunity to serve on the types of Faculty level committees that I am interested in" (37%, 56%). Again, these differences were not due to differences in the ranks of female and male faculty, since an analysis of respondents' perceptions within each rank also showed sex differences in perceptions of Faculty-level work environments.

TABLE 3.4.1
 PERCEPTIONS OF FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY OF THEIR WORK ENVIRONMENT IN THE DEPARTMENT

	PERCENTAGE AGREE			NUMBER OF FACULTY			CHI-SQ	SIG.
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total		
<u>At the Department Level</u>								
In general I feel supported by my Chair	61	73	67	97	93	190	2.707	NS
The merit increases generally awarded to me are fair and equitable	57	57	57	91	93	184	.000	NS
In 1987-88 I had the opportunity to serve on the types of departmental committees that I was interested in	60	70	65	79	82	161	1.355	NS
I have been a member of important decision making committees in the Department	47	67	57	93	90	183	6.217	<.01
I feel my voice is heard in Department and Committee meetings of the Department	65	75	70	94	95	189	1.731	NS
I am generally satisfied with the hiring decisions made by my Dept.	45	67	56	93	94	187	8.207	<.01
I tend to be assigned tasks dealing with undergraduates rather than graduates	39	19	28	83	86	169	7.314	<.01
I am as likely to be invited to dine with guest speakers as my colleagues	45	71	58	96	93	189	12.208	<.01

TABLE 3.4.2
PERCEPTIONS OF FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY OF THEIR WORK ENVIRONMENT IN THE FACULTY

	PERCENTAGE AGREE			NUMBER OF FACULTY			CHI-SQ	SIG.
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total		
<u>At the Faculty Level</u>								
I know the Dean fairly well	37	52	44	99	99	198	3.457	<.06
I feel supported by my Dean	38	58	48	99	97	196	6.594	<.01
I have had the opportunity to serve on the types of Faculty level committees that I am interested in	37	56	47	84	88	172	5.359	<.02
I have been a member of important decision making committees in the Faculty	32	47	40	84	88	172	3.173	<.08
I feel my voice is heard in Faculty level committee meetings	36	48	42	81	89	170	2.231	NS

3.4.3 At the University Level

The questionnaire contained 6 items that attempt to measure the respondents' perceptions of their work environment at the level of the university. Less than one-third of the respondents endorsed the statements used to describe their work environments at the University level and, for each item, significant differences by sex were found (Table 3.4.3). For each statement, women were much less likely than men to agree that:

- "I know the President fairly well" (11%, 40%);
- "I know the Vice President Academic fairly well" (19%, 41%);
- "I feel supported by Senior Administrators including Deans" (22%, 38%);
- "I have had the opportunity to serve on the University level committees that I am interested in" (27%, 46%);
- "I have been a member of important decision-making committees at the University level" (16%, 40%);
- "I feel my voice is heard in University level committee meetings" (18%, 45%).

These differences in the perceptions of females and males were found within each rank.

TABLE 3.4.3
PERCEPTIONS OF FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY OF THEIR WORK ENVIRONMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY LEVEL

	PERCENTAGE AGREE			NUMBER OF FACULTY			CHI-SQ	SIG.
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total		
<u>At the University Level</u>								
I know the President fairly well	11	40	26	97	100	197	19.612	<.01
I know the Vice-President (Academic) fairly well	19	41	30	98	100	198	9.947	<.01
I feel supported by Senior Administrators including Deans	22	38	30	98	98	196	4.753	<.05
I have had the opportunity to serve on the University level committees that I am interested in	27	46	37	77	87	164	5.343	<.05
I have been a member of important decision making committees at the University level	16	40	28	83	85	168	11.167	<.01
I feel my voice is heard in University level committee meetings	18	45	32	77	82	159	12.021	<.01

3.4.4 About the Faculty Association

Eighteen per cent of the faculty respondents reported that they participated regularly in the Faculty Association. Twenty one per cent have been "asked by active members to express my views" and 11% feel their "views are influential in the Faculty Association." Of those responding to the survey, 39% endorsed the statement "If I were in difficulties with my job at McMaster, I would be confident that the Faculty Association would assist me." And 21% reported that "I have been supported by the Faculty Association when I needed it" (Table 3.4.4). There were no significant differences by sex in the percentage of faculty who endorsed these items.

3.4.5 About Colleagues

Eleven items were included to measure faculty members' perceptions of their colleagues. Of these, 4 showed significant differences by sex. Overall, high percentages of faculty agreed with positive statements used to describe their co-workers (Table 3.4.5). In particular:

- 79% agreed that "My female colleagues are very supportive";
- 65% agreed that "My male colleagues are very supportive";
- 70% agreed that "I have the respect of my male colleagues";
- 74% agreed that "My female colleagues take my research seriously";

TABLE 3.4.4
 PERCEPTIONS OF FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY ABOUT THE FACULTY ASSOCIATION

	PERCENTAGE AGREE			NUMBER OF FACULTY			CHI-SQ	SIG.
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total		
<u>About the Faculty Association</u>								
I participate regularly in the Faculty Association	19	16	18	89	92	181	.089	NS
I feel my views are influential in the Faculty Association	10	11	11	70	73	143	.000	NS
I am asked by active members of the Faculty Association to express my views	25	16	21	79	80	159	1.474	NS
If I were in difficulties with my job at McMaster, I would be confident that the Faculty Association would assist me	37	42	39	90	91	181	.302	NS
I have been supported by the Faculty Association when I needed it	27	16	21	45	45	90	1.067	NS

TABLE 3.4.5
PERCEPTIONS OF FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY ABOUT THEIR COLLEAGUES

	PERCENTAGE AGREE			NUMBER OF FACULTY			CHI-SQ	SIG.
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total		
<u>About Your Colleagues</u>								
My female colleagues are very supportive	84	72	79	93	79	172	2.815	NS
My male colleagues are very supportive	61	70	65	94	99	193	1.369	NS
I have the respect of my female colleagues	88	74	82	93	80	173	5.015	<.05
I have the respect of my male colleagues	67	74	70	94	98	192	.671	NS
My female colleagues take my research seriously	80	66	74	86	74	160	3.345	<.07
My male colleagues take my research seriously	54	74	65	86	97	183	7.679	<.01
When I speak up in a meeting my female colleagues pay attention to my views	86	70	79	91	73	164	5.155	<.05
When I speak up in a meeting my male colleagues pay attention to my views	67	75	72	86	97	183	1.012	NS
I find my female colleagues' attitudes to men prejudiced (old fashioned)	13	5	10	91	76	167	2.156	NS
I find my male colleagues' attitudes to women prejudiced (old fashioned)	50	24	37	93	91	184	11.561	<.01
My research receives greater respect from colleagues at other Universities than from my colleagues at McMaster	40	45	43	90	96	186	.262	NS

72% agreed that "When I speak up in a meeting my male colleagues pay attention to my views";

10% agreed that "I find my female colleagues attitudes to men prejudiced (old fashioned)".

43% agreed that "My research receives greater respect from colleagues at other Universities than from my colleagues at McMaster"

There were four items in which significant differences in the percentages of men and women agreeing to each statement were found. Women were more likely than men to endorse the statements that, "I have the respect of my female colleagues (88%,74%); "When I speak up in a meeting my female colleagues pay attention to my views" (86%,70%); and "I find my male colleagues' attitudes to women prejudiced (old fashioned)" (50%,24%). Males were more likely than females to agree that "My male colleagues take my research seriously" (80%,66%). Sex differences within ranks were also observed for each of these items.

3.4.6 Perceptions on the Work Environment in General

General Working Conditions

Sixty-five percent of faculty endorse the item, "I work in an environment that is supportive to me; 42% "have a network of colleagues at McMaster who help keep me abreast of events at McMaster"; and 51% "have a network of colleagues at McMaster who advise and support me in my career and my academic concerns" (Table 3.4.6A). Forty-nine per cent of faculty were "aware of and could obtain if needed, internal (University, Faculty or

Departmental) funding for my research". There were no significant differences by sex in the percentages of faculty who endorsed these items.

Female and male faculty did, however, differ in their agreement with a number of items related to general working conditions. Females were less likely than males to "feel confident about my future at McMaster" (48%,69%) and more of them agreed to the statement that "Men have greater opportunity for career advancement at this University than women" (44%,26%). These differences were also observed within each rank.

Tenure and Promotion

Six items were included that concerned tenure and promotion. Overall, 54% of faculty felt that "The criteria used for tenure and promotion recommendations are clearly articulated" and 65% felt that "My opportunities for promotion are/have been as good as or better than those of my colleagues". Male and female faculty did not differ in the percentages that endorsed these statements (Table 3.4.6B). Female faculty were significantly more likely than the males to agree that "Women are less likely than men (of equal accomplishment) to be considered for tenure or promotion" (24%,6%); "Women must be more qualified than men to achieve tenure and/or promotion" (35%,12%); and "If they go to appeal, women are less likely to win their appeal on a negative tenure or promotion decision than men" (19%,7%).

Referring to their own personal situation, fewer women than men endorsed the statements that, "My opportunities for tenure are/have been as good as or better than those of my colleagues" (54%,77%). Again, these differences in the perceptions of males and females were found within each rank.

Teaching

A high proportion of faculty are "satisfied with the way in which my teaching load is determined" (70%), report that "My teaching assignments at the undergraduate level are consistent with my interests" (83%) and that "I have been given the graduate teaching assignments that I desire" (80%) (Table 3.4.6C). No significant differences by sex were found on the items related to teaching.

TABLE 3.4.6A

GENERAL PERCEPTIONS OF FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY OF THEIR WORK ENVIRONMENT

	PERCENTAGE AGREE			NUMBER OF FACULTY			CHI-SQ	SIG.
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total		
<u>In General</u>								
I feel confident about my future at McMaster	48	69	59	96	97	193	8.047	<.01
I work in an environment that is supportive to me as an academic	61	69	65	99	100	199	1.191	NS
My research has the respect of my colleagues	65	78	72	93	97	190	3.812	.05
I am aware of and could obtain, if needed, internal (University, Faculty or Departmental) funding for my research	48	50	49	95	97	192	.000	NS
Men have greater opportunity for career advancement at this University than women	44	26	35	99	96	195	6.437	<.01
I have a network of colleagues at McMaster who help keep me abreast of events at McMaster	38	46	42	99	97	196	.980	NS
I have a network of colleagues at McMaster who advise and support me in my career and my academic concerns	48	54	51	99	95	194	.520	NS

TABLE 3.4.6B
PERCEPTIONS OF FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY OF TENURE AND PROMOTION

	PERCENTAGE AGREE			NUMBER OF FACULTY			CHI-SQ	SIG.
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total		
<u>Tenure and Promotion</u>								
My opportunities for tenure are/have been as good as or better than those of my colleagues	54	77	65	90	86	176	8.697	.01
My opportunities for promotion are/have been as good as or better than those of my colleagues	52	66	59	89	90	179	3.001	NS
Women are less likely than men (of equal accomplishments) to be considered for tenure or promotion	24	6	15	96	96	192	10.398	<.01
The criteria used for tenure and promotion recommendations are clearly articulated	52	55	54	98	98	196	.082	NS
If they go to appeal, women are less likely to win their appeal on a negative tenure or promotion decision than men	19	7	13	99	96	195	4.988	<.05
Women must be more qualified than men to achieve tenure and/or promotion	35	12	24	99	96	195	14.142	<.01

TABLE 3.4.6C

PERCEPTIONS OF FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY OF TEACHING

	PERCENTAGE AGREE			NUMBER OF FACULTY			CHI-SQ	SIG.
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total		
<u>Teaching</u>								
I am satisfied with the way in which my teaching load is determined	60	81	70	99	99	198	9.657	NS
I have been given the graduate teaching assignments that I desire	76	84	80	75	88	163	1.206	NS
My teaching assignments at the undergraduate level are consistent with my interests	83	84	83	94	91	185	.000	NS

Salary

Close to sixty per cent of all faculty agree that "I was originally hired at a fair salary" (56%) and that "My salary is appropriate for my rank, years of experience and accomplishments" (60%) (Table 3.4.6D). No differences by sex were found for these items. Less than thirty percent of all faculty, however, endorsed the statement that "Merit increases are awarded equitably in my department", and female faculty were significantly less likely to agree to this statement than were male faculty (21%,37%).

Decision-Making

Three items were included in the attitudinal section of the questionnaire to measure faculty's perceptions of decision-making, and significant differences in the percentages of males and females who agreed with each statement were found for each. Females were less likely than males to endorse the statements, "My point of view is given at least equal consideration to that of my colleagues concerning important decisions" (50%, 66%); "Discretionary funds (e.g. for travel, equipment, etc) are at least as readily available to me as to my colleagues (66%,84%); and "I would have as equal an opportunity as my colleagues to acquire an administrative role in the University if desired" (40%,61%) (Table 3.4.6E). These differences in the perceptions of males and females were found within each rank.

TABLE 3.4.6D
PERCEPTIONS OF FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY OF SALARY

	PERCENTAGES			NUMBER OF FACULTY			CHI-SQ	SIG.
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total		
<u>Salary</u>								
I was originally hired at a fair salary	49	63	56	100	99	199	3.213	NS
My salary is appropriate for my rank, years of experience, and accomplishments	57	62	60	100	100	200	.332	NS
Merit increases are awarded equitably in my Department	21	37	29	97	95	192	5.412	<.05

TABLE 3.4.6E
PERCEPTIONS OF FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY OF DECISION-MAKING

	PERCENTAGE AGREE			NUMBER OF FACULTY			CHI-SQ	SIG.
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total		
<u>Decision-Making</u>								
My point of view is given at least equal consideration to that of my colleagues concerning important decisions	50	66	58	97	99	196	4.607	.05
Discretionary funds (e.g., for travel, equipment, etc.) are at least as readily available to me as to my colleagues	66	84	75	99	97	196	7.301	<.01
I would have as equal an opportunity as my colleagues to acquire an administrative role in the University if desired	40	61	51	96	98	194	8.241	<.01

3.5 Social Contacts

The last measure of integration in this report relates to the social and recreational activities of McMaster University. It is assumed here that those faculty who make use of the facilities and/or have social contacts with administrators and colleagues, including social contacts with colleagues of the opposite sex, may be considered to be more fully integrated into the University.

3.5.1 Access to the Administrator

The vast majority of faculty were of the opinion that they had easy access to the Chair of their Department (90%) and 68% had easy access to their Dean (Table 3.5.1A). Many fewer faculty felt they had easy access to the Vice President (Academic) (40%), and males were more likely to have easy access than females (51%, 28%).

3.5.2 Use of McMaster Facilities

Sixty-two per cent of respondents reported that they attended cultural activities on a regular basis at McMaster (Table 3.5.2A). Significantly more male than female faculty made regular use of the athletic facilities (44%; 29%). Nearly one-half of the faculty reported that they were a member of the Faculty Club and visited the Club fairly often (Table 3.5.2B).

TABLE 3.5.1A
ACCESS TO THE CHAIR, DEAN, ACADEMIC VICE-PRESIDENT,
FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY

	PERCENTAGES			CHI-SQ.	SIG.
	Female	Male	Total		
<u>Do you feel you have easy access to the:</u>					
Chair					
Yes	86	94	90	2.171	NS
No	17	6	10		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	96	97	193		
Dean					
Yes	62	74	68	2.675	NS
No	38	26	32		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	94	99	198		
Vice-President Academic					
Yes	28	51	40	8.640	<.01
No	72	50	60		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	86	93	179		

TABLE 3.5.2A
USE OF McMASTER FACILITIES, FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY

	PERCENTAGES			CHI-SQ.	SIG.
	Female	Male	Total		
<u>Attend cultural activities</u>					
Fairly often/occasionally	59	65	62	.563	NS
Rarely/never	41	35	38		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	98	101	199		
<u>Use of athletic facilities</u>					
Fairly often/occasionally	29	44	36	4.125	<.05
Rarely/never	71	56	64		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	98	101	199		

TABLE 3.5.2B
 USE OF THE FACULTY CLUB BY
 FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY

	PERCENTAGES			CHI-SQ.	SIG.
	Female	Male	Total		
<u>Member of the Faculty Club</u>					
Yes	46	51	48	.327	NS
No	54	49	52		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	99	101	200		
<u>How often visit the Faculty Club</u>					
Fairly often	43	45	44	.022	NS
Occasionally	57	55	56		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	91	91	182		
<u>Feel comfortable at the Faculty Club</u>					
Yes	82	87	85	.603	NS
No	18	13	15		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	94	93	187		

3.5.3 Socializing Outside Normal Working Hours

Over two-thirds of faculty socialized with their colleagues outside working hours (71%) (Table 3.5.3). A much smaller percentage socialized with their Chair (29%) or their Dean (14%). Males were more likely to socialize with the Chair outside normal working hours than females (38%, 20%).

3.5.4 Informal Contacts with Colleagues of the Opposite Sex

The data indicate that, while faculty are more likely to have informal contacts with members of the same sex, there is also a high degree of informal contact with colleagues of the opposite sex. The vast majority of faculty (88%) feel free to invite colleagues of the opposite sex to join them to eat or have coffee. Sixty-six per cent have often or occasional informal contacts (e.g., lunch, coffee) with members of the opposite sex. Very few male or female faculty participate in competitive team sports with members of the opposite sex (5%) (Table 3.5.4).

TABLE 3.5.3
SOCIALIZING OUTSIDE NORMAL WORKING HOURS

	PERCENTAGES			CHI-SQ.	SIG.
	Female	Male	Total		
<u>Socialize with:</u>					
Colleagues					
Yes	72	69	71	.110	NS
No/Rarely	28	31	29		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	98	101	199		
Chair of your Department					
Yes	20	38	29	7.034	<.01
No/Rarely	80	62	71		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	96	94	190		
Administrators					
Yes	10	17	14	1.407	NS
No/Rarely	90	83	96		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	98	100	198		

TABLE 3.5.4
INFORMAL CONTACTS WITH COLLEAGUES OF THE OPPOSITE SEX

	PERCENTAGES			CHI-SQ.	SIG.
	Female	Male	Total		
<u>Informal contact (coffee/lunch) with colleagues of the opposite sex</u>					
Yes	70	61	66	1.189	NS
Rarely/Never	30	39	34		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	96	101	197		
<u>Feel free to invite Colleagues of the opposite sex to join you to eat or have coffee</u>					
Yes	84	92	88	1.919	NS
No	16	8	12		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	96	98	194		
<u>Participate in competitive team sports with members of the opposite sex</u>					
Yes	2	7	5	1.738	NS
No	98	93	95		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	98	101	199		
<u>Percentage of informal contacts (coffee/lunch) which are with members of the opposite sex</u>					
Less than 50%	46	67	56	6.781	<.01
More than 50%	54	33	44		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	85	82	167		

3.6 Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment is defined by the Committee on the Status of Women, Council of Ontario Universities (1988) as "any sexually related act, practice, comment or suggestion that interferes with an employee's job or job performance or threatens his or her economic livelihood". Faculty were given this definition and asked if "within the academic year, 1987-88, did you experience sexual harassment by a colleague, administrator or student?" Faculty were not asked if the sexual harassment they received was from a member of the same or opposite sex. Four per cent of the faculty surveyed reported such sexual harassment (Table 3.6.1). As well, faculty were asked "Within the academic year 1987-88, were inappropriate remarks about your appearance and/or clothing made by colleagues of the opposite sex?" More women than men reported the occurrence of inappropriate remarks (28%, 13%).

TABLE 3.6.1
SEXUAL HARASSMENT, FEMALE AND MALE FACULTY

	PERCENTAGES			CHI-SQ.	SIG.
	Female	Male	Total		
<u>Within the academic year 1987-88, were inappropriate remarks about your appearance and/or clothing made by colleagues of the opposite sex?</u>					
Yes	28	13	21	6.022	<.01
No	72	87	79		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	95	99	194		
<u>Within the academic year 1987-88, did you experience sexual harassment by a colleague, administrator or student?</u>					
Yes	5	3	4	.152	NS
No	95	97	96		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	100	102	202		

3.7 Factors Affecting Progress at McMaster

Thirty-five per cent of female faculty and 2% of male faculty who participated in this study felt that their sex impedes their progress at McMaster. A few of the quotes below show how some female faculty explain this perception.

I feel no opportunity to discuss my work with colleagues; because I am female my work is considered unimportant and I feel I am not being given any support.

It [one's sex] acts as a barrier to informal contact and integration into the higher levels of administration.

[The university] will not offer Dean, V.P. jobs to women academics.

Women are not taken seriously and are usually assigned "motherhood" roles, i.e., undergraduate advising and counselling.

No access to real decision making process or positions. Positions of leadership denied (overtly).

A lot of my time is wasted by requests to do things that somehow are felt likely to be better done by a women, i.e., Orientation Day, Student Activities, counselling (less threatening).

Not at the Department level. I don't feel women are given serious consideration for administrative positions within the Faculty.

Women aren't taken seriously - the old boy network operates.

Mainly because there are so few women faculty members. Women's views have to be represented on many committees by a handful of over-worked individuals. Also, this university has no women's studies nor respect for that discipline. [As of July 1989, the university has a Women's Studies Program.]

The views of many members of the administration are still very conservative regarding females. They have difficulty with females as faculty members as opposed to secretaries.

Because men dominate my department the most influential decisions and administrative positions are held by men and women have little input into the department.

Forty per cent of female faculty and 11% of male faculty also felt that other aspects of their personal situations, other than sex, affected their participation at McMaster (Table 3.7.1). Here are a few illustrative quotes stating the nature of these factors:

Single parenthood severely restricts how one can compete with workaholics.

My political actions cause some of my colleagues to stereotype me, particularly those who are not in regular contact with me.

Ethnicity and nationality affect my progress at McMaster.

TABLE 3.7.1
FACTORS AFFECTING PROGRESS AT McMASTER

	PERCENTAGES			CHI-SQ.	SIG.
	Female	Male	Total		
<u>Do you feel that your sex impedes your progress at McMaster?</u>					
Yes	35	2	19	34.394	<.01
No	65	98	81		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	99	100	199		
<u>Do you feel that any other aspects of your personal situation, other than sex, affects your participation or progress at McMaster?</u>					
Yes	40	11	26	20.322	<.01
No	60	89	74		
Total %	100	100	100		
Total N	99	100	199		

4.0 DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This survey is divided into two parts:

- I) information on the structural integration of women faculty, compared to a control group of male faculty, into McMaster University in 1987-88, and
- II) attitudes of female and male faculty to their integration into McMaster's affairs.

The findings for the study indicate that female faculty appear to be fairly well integrated into the structure of the university. Female and male faculty did, however, differ in integration at the administrative level, in graduate advising, in teaching summer and evening courses, and in their perceptions of a number of important factors related to their work environment. There were also suggested differences in graduate teaching and chairing hiring and tenure committees.

The discussion below first considers structural integration (Part I), and then turns to the attitude questions (Part II).

4.1 Part I: Structural Integration

a) Graduate Studies

Male faculty were more likely to be advising and supervising graduate students than female faculty. This difference was greatest for male and female associate professors. While this difference might reflect the longer length of service of male than female faculty, the data do suggest an area in which female integration may be improved. It may also be the case that males have greater social "credibility" than females, even given equivalent qualifications. Therefore:

RECOMMENDATION 1:

Chairs and Directors of Departments and Schools, and/or the Chairs of their Graduate Committees, should monitor the extent to which female Full, and especially Associate Professors, are given graduate teaching and supervisory duties commensurate with their qualifications. A special effort should be made to inform graduate students seeking teachers and advisors of the interests of relevant female members of faculty.

Males tended also to be asked more often by the Graduate Deans to be outside examiners or Chairs of PHD defenses than females. While this may reflect the particular related or relevant interests of male faculty (e.g. members of the Mathematics

Department may be asked to sit on Engineering defenses) it might also reflect informal social "networking" among male faculty. While the position of Chair of a Doctoral Defense may appear to be an honorific position, it is an important job which, moreover, brings visibility to professors outside their own particular schools or faculties.

RECOMMENDATION 2:

The School of Graduate Studies should make an effort to give women faculty members of appropriate rank or qualifications the opportunity to chair doctoral defenses, and to sit on doctoral committees as external examiners where appropriate.

b) Teaching

The data indicate that in 1987-88, women were more likely than men to have been required to teach evening or summer courses (p. 40). If this is a pattern and if it continues in the future, the perceived discrepancy may impede the job satisfaction of women faculty.

RECOMMENDATION 3:

Deans and Directors should assure that required summer and night teaching be allocated equitably by sex, among those faculty members whose contracts permit such requirements. Further, all faculty members should be annually assured of their contractual rights to one month's continuous vacation and two months free of all other duties for research.

c) Senior Administration

Women faculty members were less likely than males to have ever held administrative positions, and women were less likely than men to feel that they had ever been seriously considered for such positions. These positions are generally filled at McMaster by nomination. Moreover, procedures for selecting senior administrators are not clearly explained, and appear to consist of informal discussion of possible candidates by members of selection committees who are appointed by Senate or by their Deans or Chairs. Research data on systemic discrimination suggests that women and other minorities are more likely to be excluded from consideration when such relatively informal processes of appointment are used. A more open and formal set of procedures would improve women's likelihood of appointment to senior administrative positions.

RECOMMENDATION 4:

Procedures should be instituted whereby all senior administrative positions are advertised and candidates are encouraged to apply for these positions. All faculty members under consideration for senior positions should be advised of such consideration and invited to submit their curricula vitae. The search committee will not exclude any candidate from consideration before studying his or her curriculum vitae. Such procedures need not preclude nominations as well.

The data indicated that in 1987-88, male faculty were two to three times more likely than female to chair Departmental Tenure and Promotion and Hiring committees (p. 35).⁵

RECOMMENDATION 5:

Particular attention should be paid to ensuring that female faculty members with equivalent qualifications have equal opportunity to chair Departmental Tenure and Promotion and Hiring Committees.

⁵ Because of the small number of faculty who chaired these committees, the percentage differences were not statistically significant.

4.2 Part II: Attitude Survey

The results of this section of the report suggest that women faculty at McMaster - even after controlling for rank - perceive themselves not to be fully equal participants in the University's affairs. Their perceptions do not fully accord with the data on structural integration for 1987-88. The explanation for the difference may be attributed to the fact that people's perceptions are based on their employment histories and the experiences of their reference group, while the data on structural integration are based only on a single academic year prior to this study, namely 1987-88 at McMaster.

Perceptions affect decision-making. For instance, women who believe that it is more difficult for them than for men to be tenured or promoted, may delay their applications for both (p. 62). If women are less confident about their futures at McMaster than men (44 per cent of the women who responded felt that men had greater opportunities for career advancement at McMaster than women [p. 61]), they may be more likely to seek appointments elsewhere; and if thereby McMaster loses fine women scholars, its own reputation will suffer, as will its capacity to fulfil its staffing needs in light of the expected faculty shortages of the mid-1990s. Women scholars outside McMaster might be reluctant to apply to the university for jobs if its general reputation is that it does not encourage women faculty.

RECOMMENDATION 6:

All Chairs of Departments, Directors of Schools, and Deans of Faculties who do not already do so should adopt a proactive stance with regard to the promotion and tenure of all faculty, reviewing their records annually and ensuring that candidates for tenure and promotion are identified and nominated, rather than waiting for faculty members to put themselves forward.

RECOMMENDATION 7:

Chairs and Directors of Departments should have regular meetings with all faculty members to discuss their progress. Senior members of Departments and Schools should also make themselves available to discuss such matters with their junior colleagues. It should be recognized that advice on such matters as how to obtain grants, where to submit papers for publication, etc. can assist junior faculty in their career progress and should, therefore, be freely offered.

Women members of faculty were less likely than men to agree that merit increments were awarded equitably in their department. To rectify this problem and in accordance with the 1989 Agreement between the University and the Faculty Association, we recommend that:

RECOMMENDATION 8A:

Chairs and Directors of Departments and Schools should ensure that all members of faculty are apprised annually of the criteria to be used in awarding merit increments.

RECOMMENDATION 8B:

The distribution of merit awards should be publicized with a breakdown based on demographic characteristics, faculty, and rank.

Women faculty were less likely than men to agree that they had had the chance to serve on the Faculty or University Committees that interested them, or on important decision-making committees at any level. Women were less likely than men (p. 52) to agree that they knew the Deans well or were supported by their Deans, or that they knew the President and Vice-President well (p. 54). Very few women thought that their voice was heard in University level committee meetings.

RECOMMENDATION 9:

Many Faculty and University level committees - e.g. the Research Board Committees or the Ethics Committee - are filled by nomination or appointment by Deans or Chairs. Lists of positions that are available should be circulated to faculty, who should be encouraged to inform the relevant

officials of any positions in which they might be interested.

RECOMMENDATION 10:

Nominating committees for such positions as Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committees and Senate should be advised of the 1976 Board-Senate regulations requesting nomination of at least one woman candidate for all positions. Moreover, when several positions are to be filled simultaneously, two or more women faculty members should be nominated.

RECOMMENDATION 11:

Senior members of the university should be apprised via the proposed Workshop (see recommendation 13 below) as well as by other means, of the academic literature on the gender dynamics of small groups, and should make an effort to ensure that women's opinions are not disregarded or attributed to male members of the group.

A small matter concerning female integration into the University is women's lesser likelihood to be invited to join academic guests for informal social activities. Not only does such lesser likelihood send a negative signal of acceptance to female faculty members, but it also deprives them of important chances to make informal academic contacts outside McMaster.

RECOMMENDATION 12:

That relevant officials make an effort to ensure that women faculty are included in informal contact with academic and other visitors to the University.

The Status of Women Committee discussed the report and concluded that a first step toward resolving the issues identified would be to have a workshop with Faculty and past and incumbent senior Administrators to devise mechanisms to implement the recommendations of this report.

RECOMMENDATION 13:

Incumbent and immediate past senior academic administrators (the President, Vice-Presidents, Deans) and Chairs and Directors should attend the Fall 1989 Workshop to be presented by the Faculty Association and members of its Status of Women Committee, to discuss this report and identify further means to ensure that women are fully integrated into McMaster University.

Four per cent of faculty (5% women 3% men) reported having experienced sexual harassment either by a colleague, an administrator, or a student. In this study, a very restrictive definition of sexual harassment was used (COU definition): any sexually related act, practice, comment, or suggestion that interferes with an employee's job performance or threatens his or

her economic livelihood. Twenty-eight per cent of women (as well as 13% of men) thought that inappropriate remarks about their clothing had been made by members of the opposite sex. Since five per cent of women faculty report experiencing sexual harassment in one academic year and 28% report inappropriate remarks about their clothing, this suggests a very high rate of perceived sexual harassment over their lifetime careers. McMaster University has no women's rights officer (its employment equity officer has a very narrow mandate) or central office to deal specifically with sexual harassment issues. Many other Ontario Universities do have such officials.

RECOMMENDATION 14:

McMaster University should hire or appoint an official who would be responsible for dealing with all cases of alleged sexual harassment, whether against faculty, staff, or students.

4.3 A Note With Regard to Visible Minorities

In the section on demographic variables, twenty-three per cent of male faculty members, but only eight per cent of female, identified themselves as members of visible minorities.

RECOMMENDATION 15:

McMaster University should make a particular effort, in monitoring employment equity concerns in hiring faculty, to ensure that female candidates from visible minority groups are not at any disadvantage.

4.4 In Conclusion

Research reports do not always result in changes in policy or procedures, often because no established mechanism may be available to ensure that the suggested recommendations are translated into action.

RECOMMENDATION 16:

McMaster University should develop a task force to implement the recommendations contained in this report.

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire ID _____

SURVEY OF FACULTY AT McMASTER

Conducted by Social Data Research Limited

for

The Status of Women Committee

McMaster University Faculty Association

SURVEY OF FACULTY AT McMASTER

SECTION 1: TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Line #1

(PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER TO THE RIGHT OF THE PRE-CODED ANSWERS OR WRITE IN YOUR RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED)

1. For how many years have you taught at any university?

full-time	_____	_____
part-time	_____	_____

2. For how many years have you taught at McMaster?

full-time	_____	_____
part-time	_____	_____

3. What is your highest degree?

Ph.D.	_____	1
MD	_____	2
Other (please specify) _____	_____	3

(a) In what year did you receive your highest degree?

19	_____	_____
----	-------	-------

4. Are you tenured?

yes	_____	1
no	_____	2

(IF TENURED):

(a) In what year did you receive tenure?

19	_____	_____
----	-------	-------

(IF NOT TENURED):

(b) What type of appointment do you have?

contractually limited	_____	1
term (i.e., tenure-stream appointment	_____	2
other (please specify) _____	_____	3
NA (not applicable)	_____	9

5. What is your rank?

Full Professor	_____	1
Associate Professor	_____	2
Assistant Professor	_____	3
Lecturer	_____	4
Other (please specify)	_____	5

6. In what year were you appointed to:

Full Professor	19	—	—
Associate Professor	19	—	—
Assistant Professor	19	—	—
Lecturer	19	—	—
Other _____	19	—	—

SECTION 2: PROFESSIONAL PARTICIPATION

(PLEASE CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER)

7. Were you on research or other leave in the academic year 1987-88?

yes	1
no	2

8. Were you on the following departmental or program committees in the academic year 1987-88?

	yes, a member	not a member	not applic./ no committee
(a) Tenure Committee or the Tenure and Promotions Committee	1	2	9
(b) Hiring/Selection Committee	1	2	9
(c) Graduate or Graduate Education Committee	1	2	9
(d) Undergraduate or Undergraduate Education Committee	1	2	9
(e) Other Departmental or Program Committee or Office (e.g., Library Representative, Visiting Speakers Co-ordinator, Post-Professional Education) (PLEASE SPECIFY)			
_____	1	2	9
_____	1	2	9

(IF NOT A MEMBER OF A COMMITTEE GO TO QUESTION 11)

9. (IF A MEMBER OF A COMMITTEE)

9. Did you chair this committee?

10. List the number of female and male members

	yes	no	female	male
(a) Tenure Committee or the Tenure and Promotions Committee	1	2	—	—
(b) Hiring/Selection Committee	1	2	—	—
(c) Graduate or Graduate Education Committee	1	2	—	—
(d) Undergraduate or Undergraduate Education Committee	1	2	—	—
(e) Other Departmental or Program Committee or Office (e.g., Library Representative, Visiting Speakers Co-ordinator, Post-Professional Education) (PLEASE SPECIFY)	1	2	—	—
_____	1	2	—	—
_____	1	2	—	—

11. In your department or program are the following committees elected, appointed or did you volunteer?

Line #2

(INDICATE NA (NOT APPLICABLE) IF COMMITTEE DID NOT EXIST)

	elect.	appoint.	volun.	DK	NA
(a) Tenure Committee or the Tenure and Promotions Committee	1	2	3	7	9
(b) Hiring/Selection Committee	1	2	3	7	9
(c) Graduate or Graduate Education Committee	1	2	3	7	9
(d) Undergraduate or Undergraduate Education Committee	1	2	3	7	9
(e) Other Departmental or Program Committee or Office (e.g., Library Representative, Visiting Speakers Co-ordinator, Post-Professional Education) (PLEASE SPECIFY)	1	2	3	7	9
_____	1	2	3	7	9
_____	1	2	3	7	9

12. In 1987-88, were you a member of a faculty level committee?

(IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 17)

yes
no

1
2

13. (IF A MEMBER OF A FACULTY LEVEL COMMITTEE)

List the committee membership in your faculty which you held in the academic year 1987-88.

14. Was this position elected, appointed, or did you volunteer?

(SPECIFY COMMITTEE)

	elect.	appoint.	volun.	NA
(a) _____	1	2	3	9
(b) _____	1	2	3	9
(c) _____	1	2	3	9

15. Did you chair this committee?

16. List the number of female and male members

	yes	no	NA	female	male
(a) _____	1	2	9	_____	_____
(b) _____	1	2	9	_____	_____
(c) _____	1	2	9	_____	_____

17. In the academic year 1987-88, were you a member of a university level committee (e.g., Senate)?

yes
no

1
2

(IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 22)

18. (IF A MEMBER OF A UNIVERSITY LEVEL COMMITTEE)

List the committee membership at the University level (e.g., Senate) which you held in the academic year 1987-88.

19. Was this position elected, appointed, or did you volunteer?

(SPECIFY COMMITTEE)

	elect.	appoint.	volun.	NA
(a) _____	1	2	3	9
(b) _____	1	2	3	9
(c) _____	1	2	3	9

20. Did you chair this committee?

21. List the number of female and male members

(SPECIFY COMMITTEE)

	20. Did you chair this committee?			21. List the number of female and male members	
	yes	no	NA	female	male
(a) _____	1	2	9	_____	_____
(b) _____	1	2	9	_____	_____
(c) _____	1	2	9	_____	_____

22. In your academic career, have you ever held any of the following administrative positions in your department/school/program?

(a) chair	yes	1
	no	2
(b) associate chair	yes	1
	no	2
(c) director of a school/program	yes	1
	no	2
(d) other administrative (PLEASE SPECIFY)		
_____	yes	1
	no	2

		Line #3
23. In your academic career, have you ever held any of the following positions?		
(a) associate dean	yes	1
	no	2
(b) dean	yes	1
	no	2
(c) other administrative (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____	yes	1
	no	2
24. In the 1987-88 academic year, did you hold a joint or associate appointment to another academic department, school, or program?		
	joint appointment	1
	associate appointment	2
	no	3
25. In the 1987-88 academic year, did you serve as a teacher or hold a defined administrative role in a special program (e.g., interdisciplinary program)?		
Please specify _____	yes	1
	no	2
26. In the 1987-88 academic year, did you give any scholarly talks to:		
(a) Members of your department, school or program?	yes	1
	no	2
(IF YES): How many? _____		
(b) Members of your Faculty?	yes	1
	no	2
(IF YES): How many? _____		
(c) Other within the university?	yes	1
(IF YES PLEASE SPECIFY) _____	no	2
(IF YES): How many? _____		

27. In the 1987-88 academic year, on average, how many hours per week did you teach or advise students including:

(INCLUDE CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION, SEMINARS, TUTORIALS, LABS, ETC.)

27. This involved how many hours per week? (AVERAGE OVER TEACHING TERMS)
 28. This involved how many students?

(a) teach under-graduates	_____ hrs	_____ #
(b) teach graduates	_____ hrs	_____ #
(c) teach MD students	_____ hrs	_____ #
(d) act as a MA, MSc, or Ph.D. graduate student advisor	_____ hrs	_____ #
(e) act as a student advisor	_____ hrs	_____ #
(f) act as a tutorial, seminar leader	_____ hrs	_____ #
(g) act as a research intern advisor	_____ hrs	_____ #
(h) act as a laboratory supervisor	_____ hrs	_____ #
(i) other (please specify)	_____ hrs	_____ #
_____	_____ hrs	_____ #

Line #4

29. Does your department have a:

	yes	no
master's program	1	2
doctoral program	1	2

30. In the 1987-88 academic year, for how many graduate students did you: (SPECIFY NUMBER)

	act as a MA or Ph.D. supervisor	act as a committee member	act as an outside committee member
masters	_____	_____	_____
doctoral	_____	_____	_____

31. In the 1987-88 academic year, how many times were you asked to be an examiner or a chair of a Ph.D. defense at McMaster for which you had not been previously involved?

(SPECIFY NUMBER)

32. In your department, are you familiar with:

	very familiar	somewhat familiar	not familiar
(a) the <u>procedures</u> used to conduct yearly faculty evaluations for merit salary increases	1	2	3
(b) the <u>criteria</u> used for faculty evaluations for merit salary increases	1	2	3
(c) the <u>procedures</u> used to make promotion decisions	1	2	3
(d) the <u>criteria</u> used to make promotion decisions	1	2	3
(e) the <u>procedures</u> used to make hiring decisions	1	2	3
(f) the <u>criteria</u> used to make hiring decisions	1	2	3
(g) the <u>procedures</u> used to make tenure decisions	1	2	3
(h) the <u>criteria</u> used to make tenure decisions	1	2	3

33. How would you rate the following with respect to their importance for tenure decisions?

	very important	important	not important	irrelevant
(a) publications	1	2	3	4
(b) teaching	1	2	3	4
(c) administrative duties	1	2	3	4

34. In the 1987-88 academic year, did you apply for any McMaster University research funds?

(a) (IF YES):	yes	1
Was an award made?	no	2
(b) (IF YES):	yes	1
What percentage of the proposed budget was awarded?	no	2
(INDICATE PER CENT)		_____ %

35. In the 1987-88 academic year, were you engaged in any collaborative research with other members of McMaster Faculty?

yes 1
no 2

(a) (IF YES): Were any of your co-investigators members of the opposite sex?

yes 1
no 2

36. Is there a senior member of your department who:

37. (IF YES): Is the person of the same or opposite sex?

	yes	no	same sex	opposite sex
(a) provides advice on academic matters	1	2	1	2
(b) co-authors papers with you	1	2	1	2
(c) involves you in research projects	1	2	1	2
(d) advises you on criteria for promotion and tenure	1	2	1	2
(e) provides information on research monies available	1	2	1	2
(f) other (PLEASE SPECIFY)	1	2	1	2

38. In the academic year 1987-88, how often did the Chair consult you informally on important decisions that were to be made?

often 1
occasionally 2
rarely 3
never 4

39. In the academic year 1987-88, how often did the Dean consult you informally on important decisions that were to be made?

often 1
occasionally 2
rarely 3
never 4

40. In the academic year 1987-88, how familiar were you with your department's budget?
- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| very familiar | 1 |
| familiar | 2 |
| somewhat familiar | 3 |
| not familiar | 4 |
41. In the academic year 1987-88, how often were you consulted on your department's budget?
- | | |
|--------------|---|
| often | 1 |
| occasionally | 2 |
| rarely | 3 |
| never | 4 |
42. Does the Chair of your Department direct your attention to conferences or grants that may be of interest to you?
- | | yes | no |
|-------------|-----|----|
| conferences | 1 | 2 |
| grants | 1 | 2 |
43. In the academic year 1987-88, were summer or evening courses taught in your department?
- | | |
|-----|---|
| yes | 1 |
| no | 2 |
- (IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 44)
- (a) How were these summer and evening teaching assignments determined?
- | | |
|------------------------|---|
| by the chair | 1 |
| by a department member | 2 |
| by volunteers | 3 |
| other (specify) _____ | 4 |
| don't know | 5 |
- (b) Were you required to teach summer or evening course?
- | | |
|-----|---|
| yes | 1 |
| no | 2 |
- (c) Were you offered the opportunity to teach summer or evening courses for extra remuneration?
- | | |
|-----|---|
| yes | 1 |
| no | 2 |

SECTION 3: OPINIONS

44. The following is a set of questions which deal with your relationships with colleagues, administrators, and the university at large. Please indicate if you strongly disagree (SD), disagree (D), are neutral (N), agree (A), or strongly agree (SA) with each statement.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Don't Know	Not Applic
A. <u>AT THE DEPARTMENT LEVEL</u>							
(a) In general I feel supported by my Chair	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(b) The merit increases generally awarded to me are fair & equitable	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(c) In 1987-88 I had the opportunity to serve on the types of departmental committees that I was interested in	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(d) I have been a member of important decision making committees in the Department	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(e) I feel my voice is heard in Department and Committee meetings of the Department	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(f) I am generally satisfied with the hiring decisions made by my Department	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(g) I tend to be assigned tasks dealing with undergraduates rather than graduates	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(h) I am as likely to be invited to dine with guest speakers as my colleagues	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
B. <u>AT THE FACULTY LEVEL</u>							
							Line #5
(a) I know the Dean fairly well	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(b) I feel supported by my Dean	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(c) I have had the opportunity to serve on the types of Faculty level committees that I am interested in	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(d) I have been a member of important decision making committees in the Faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(e) I feel my voice is heard in Faculty level committee meetings	1	2	3	4	5	6	9

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Don't Know	Not Applic
C. <u>AT THE UNIVERSITY LEVEL</u>							
(a) I know the President fairly well	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(b) I know the Vice-President (Academic) fairly well	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(c) I feel supported by Senior Administrators including deans	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(d) I have had the opportunity to serve on the University level committees that I am interested in	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(e) I have been a member of important decision making committees at the University level	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(f) I feel my voice is heard in University level committee meetings	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(g) I feel confident about my future at McMaster	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
D. <u>ABOUT THE FACULTY ASSOCIATION</u>							
(a) I participate regularly in the Faculty Association	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(b) I feel my views are influential in the Faculty Association	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(c) I am asked by active members of the Faculty Association to express my views	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(d) If I were in difficulties with my job at McMaster, I would be confident that the Faculty Association would assist me	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(e) I have been supported by the Faculty Association when I needed it	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
E. <u>ABOUT YOUR COLLEAGUES</u>							
(a) My female colleagues are very supportive	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(b) My male colleagues are very supportive	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(c) I have the respect of my female colleagues	1	2	3	4	5	6	9

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Don't Know	Not Applic
(d) I have the respect of my male colleagues	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(e) My female colleagues take my research seriously	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(f) My male colleagues take my research seriously	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(g) When I speak up in a meeting my female colleagues pay attention to my views	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(h) When I speak up in a meeting my male colleagues pay attention to my views	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(i) I find my female colleagues' attitudes to men prejudiced (old fashioned)	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(j) I find my male colleagues' attitudes to women prejudiced (old fashioned)	1	2	3	4	5	6	9

F. IN GENERAL

(a) I work in an environment that is supportive to me as an academic	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(b) I am satisfied with the way in which my teaching load is determined	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(c) My research has the respect of my colleagues	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(d) My opportunities for tenure are/have been as good as or better than those of my colleagues	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(e) My opportunities for promotion are/have been as good as or better than those of my colleagues	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(f) I was originally hired at a fair salary	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(g) My salary is appropriate for my rank, years of experience, and accomplishments	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(h) I am aware of and could obtain, if needed, internal (University, Faculty or Departmental) funding for my research	1	2	3	4	5	6	9

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Don't Know	Not Applic
(i) My teaching assignments at the undergraduate level are consistent with my interests	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(j) I would have as equal an opportunity as my colleagues to acquire an administrative role in the University if desired	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(k) The criteria used for tenure and promotion recommendations are clearly articulated	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(l) I have a network of colleagues at McMaster who help to keep me abreast of events at McMaster	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(m) I have a network of colleagues at McMaster who advise and support me in my career and academic concerns	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(n) If they go to appeal, women are less likely to win their appeal on a negative tenure or promotion decision than men	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(o) Women must be more qualified than men to achieve tenure and/or promotion	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(p) My point of view is given at least equal consideration to that of my colleagues concerning important decisions	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(q) Men have greater opportunity for career advancement at this University than women	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(r) My research receives greater respect from colleagues at other Universities than from my colleagues at McMaster	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(s) Merit increases are awarded equitably in my Department	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(t) I have been given the graduate teaching assignments that I desire	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(u) Discretionary funds (e.g. for travel, equipment, etc.) are at least as readily available to me as to my colleagues	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
(v) Women are less likely than men (of equal accomplishment) to be considered for tenure or promotion	1	2	3	4	5	6	9

SECTION 5: SOCIAL CONTACTS

45. Are you a member of the Faculty Club?	yes	1
	no	2
46. How often do you visit the Faculty Club? Would this be:		
	daily	1
	a few times a week	2
	weekly	3
	2-3 times per month	4
	once a month or less	5
47. Do you feel comfortable at the Faculty Club?	yes	1
	no	2
48. Do you have informal contact (e.g., lunch, coffee) with colleagues of the opposite sex? Would this be:		
	often	1
	occasionally	2
	rarely	3
	never	4
49. Do colleagues of the opposite sex join or invite you to eat or have coffee with them?	yes	1
	no	2
50. What percentage of your informal social contacts (e.g. lunch, coffee) would be with members of the opposite sex?		%
51. Do you feel free to invite colleagues of the opposite sex to eat or have coffee with you?	yes	1
	no	2
52. Do you feel you have easy access to the:	yes	no
	Chair	1 2
	Dean	1 2
	Academic Vice-President	1 2

53. Outside normal working hours, do you socialize with ...		
colleagues:	often	1
	occasionally	2
	rarely	3
	never	4
chair of your department:	often	1
	occasionally	2
	rarely	3
	never	4
administrators:	often	1
	occasionally	2
	rarely	3
	never	4
54. Do you attend cultural activities such as plays, concerts, prestigious lectures, etc. at McMaster?	often	1
	occasionally	2
	rarely	3
	never	4
55. Do you use the athletic facilities at McMaster?	often	1
	occasionally	2
	rarely	3
	never	4
56. Do you participate in competitive team sports with members of the opposite sex at McMaster?	yes	1
	no	2
57. Are inappropriate remarks about your appearance and/or clothing made by colleagues of the opposite sex? Would this be:	often	1
	occasionally	2
	rarely	3
	never	4

58. Within the academic year 1987-88, did you experience sexual harassment by a:

(Sexual harassment is defined by the Committee on the Status of Women, Council of Ontario Universities, as any sexually related act, practice, comment or suggestion that interferes with an employee's job or job performance or threatens his or her economic livelihood).

	yes	no
(a) colleague	1	2
(b) administrator	1	2
(c) student	1	2

Line #6

59. Do you feel that your sex impedes your progress at McMaster?

yes	1
no	2

(IF YES): In what way?

60. Do you feel that any aspects of your personal situation, other than sex (e.g., ethnicity, nationality, age, marital status, family status), affects your participation or progress at McMaster?

yes	1
no	2

(IF YES): Please explain.

61. Do you have other comments?

62. Would you be interested in attending a workshop to discuss the results of this survey and suggest recommendations?

yes	1
no	2

SECTION 5: SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC DATA

63. Year of birth		19	_____	_____
64. Are you:				
	single			1
	married/cohabitating			2
	separated/divorced			3
	widowed			4
65. Do you identify yourself as a member of a visible or ethnic minority?				
	yes			1
To which group do you belong? _____	no			2
66. What is your religion? Are you:				
	Protestant			1
	Catholic			2
	Jewish			3
	Moslem			4
	Hindu			5
Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____				6
	No religious affiliation			0
67. Do you have child rearing responsibilities?				
	yes			1
(IF YES):	no			2
(a) For how many children?			_____	_____
(b) For each child, how many years have you had child rearing responsibilities?				
	Child 1		_____	_____
	Child 2		_____	_____
	Child 3		_____	_____
	Child 4		_____	_____
	Child 5		_____	_____
	Child 6		_____	_____
(c) Are you the primary person in your family who has child rearing responsibilities?				
	yes			1
	no			2
	shared equally			3

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS IMPORTANT STUDY.



McMASTER UNIVERSITY

President and Vice-Chancellor

June 24, 1988

Dear Colleague:

The Faculty Association through its Status of Women Committee, chaired by Maroussia Ahmed, is sponsoring a survey on "Integration of Faculty at McMaster." The survey, funded by the Secretary of State, will be conducted by Social Data Research Ltd. The purpose of the survey is to enable female faculty to contribute fully to the academic, cultural, and social life of McMaster. The survey will aid this purpose by ascertaining "the degree and quality of integration of McMaster University's female faculty members into the structure and organization of McMaster University as a whole."

I urge you to cooperate with this survey. If you have any questions please contact Dr. Ahmed at Ext. 3758 or the Faculty Association at Ext. 4682.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Alvin A. Lee".

Alvin A. Lee

AAL/jw



**SOCIAL
DATA
RESEARCH LTD.**

309 Main Street West, Hamilton, Ontario L8P 1J7
Phone (416) 529-5357

SURVEY OF FACULTY AT McMASTER

The Status of Women Committee
McMaster University Faculty Association
McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario

Dear Colleague:

The Faculty Association's Status of Women Committee is currently studying the degree and quality of integration of McMaster University's faculty members into the structure and organization of McMaster University as a whole. This study is made possible through a grant from the Secretary of State. Social Data Research Limited has been hired to collect and tabulate the data.

The attached questionnaire is part of the Committee's research and is being distributed to all women faculty and a random sample of male faculty at McMaster. We ask you to take a few minutes to answer this questionnaire as your participation in this project is essential. The information you provide will be kept in strict confidence, and will be used for statistical purposes only. Individual questionnaires will not be made available to the McMaster University Faculty Association. The results of this study will be presented in report form and made available to all faculty and administrators.

Most questions require you to circle the appropriate number, insert a number or numbers in the space provided, or write a short response. Many of the questions are about the academic year 1987-88. If you held a joint or cross appointment, please answer in terms of your primary appointment. This refers to the period beginning July 1, 1987 and ending June 30, 1988. Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope by September 30, 1988.

If you have any questions about this survey or want to provide additional information, please call Dr. Margaret Denton at 529-5357. Thank you for your co-operation.

Sincerely,

Margaret Denton, Ph.D.
President
Social Data Research Ltd.
309 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario
L8P 1J7

Maroussia Ahmed
Chair
Status of Women Committee
McMaster University Faculty Assoc.
McMaster University
Ext. 3758



**SOCIAL
DATA
RESEARCH LTD.**

309 Main Street West, Hamilton, Ontario L8P 1J7
Phone (416) 529-5357

October 19, 1988

RE: McMASTER FACULTY STUDY

Dear Respondent:

Your opinion, as a McMaster faculty member, is important to us. We realize the deadline of September 30th may not have given many of you adequate time to fill out the McMaster Faculty Study questionnaire. Please take the time to complete your questionnaire and return it, in the envelope that was provided, to Social Data Research Ltd., c/o the McMaster Faculty Association office as soon as possible.

The information you provide will be treated in the strictest confidence. The number you see on each questionnaire is for record keeping purposes only (e.g. response rates). The information you provide will be released only in aggregate form to the Status of Women Committee, McMaster University Faculty Association.

If you have misplaced your questionnaire, another may be obtained by calling Social Data Research at 529-5357.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Sincerely,

Margaret Denton, Ph.D.
President
Social Data Research Ltd.
309 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario
L8P 1J7