



**Report on the Cardiff University
'Careers in Research Online Survey'
2009**

October 2009

Report on the Cardiff University 'Careers in Research Online Survey' 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Background	4
2	Careers in Research Online Survey 2009	4
3	Recruitment and Selection	5
	3.1 Finding out about current post	5
	3.2 Contract of employment	6
	3.3 Induction to the institution	6
	3.4 Induction to role	8
	3.5 Recruitment and selection: additional comments	8
4	Recognition and Value	8
	4.1 Understanding of relevant policies and procedures	8
	4.2 Understanding of relevant UK wide policies and initiatives	9
	4.3 Parity of treatment with lecturing staff	10
	4.4 Perceptions regarding recognition of contribution	11
	4.5 Research culture and community	12
	4.6 Recognition and value: additional comments	13
5	Support and Career Development	14
	5.1 Engagement with career management and personal development	14
	5.2 Progress and performance review processes	15
	5.3 Career Aspirations	16
	5.4 Additional comments on career aspirations	17
	5.5 Engagement with development activity	17
	5.6 Discussions about career development	18
	5.7 Time spent on continuing professional development	19
	5.8 Engagement with training and development in different areas	20
	5.9 Usefulness of modes of training and development	21
	5.10 Information and advice	21
	5.11 Development within current role	22
	5.12 Additional comments on training and career development	24

5.13	Mentoring	25
5.14	Research Staff Conference	26
6	Equality and Diversity	28
6.1	Work/life balance	28
6.2	Institutional commitment to equality and diversity	28

Appendix One: About the sample **30**

1	Respondents by contract	30
2	Respondents by source of funding for current post	30
3	Respondents by main subject specialism (current contract)	30
4	Respondents by gender	31
5	Respondents by age	31
6	Respondents by qualifications	31
7	Respondents by ethnic group/cultural background	32
8	Respondents by nationality	32
9	Respondents by language	33
10	Respondents by disability	33

Appendix Two: Cardiff University Research Staff Population June 2009 **34**

1	Cardiff University research staff population by contract type	34
2	Cardiff University research staff population by gender	34
3	Cardiff University research staff population by age	34
4	Cardiff University research staff population by ethnic group/cultural background	34
5	Cardiff University research staff population by nationality	36
6	Cardiff University research staff population by Academic School	37

Appendix Three: Cardiff University-specific Questions **38**

1 Background

The Careers in Research Online Survey (CROS) is a UK-wide survey of the experiences and views of research staff working in the higher education sector regarding their working conditions, career aspirations and career development opportunities. First launched in 2002 as the Contract Researcher Online Survey, it was run annually until 2006 and then revised and re-launched in 2009 as a vehicle through which the Higher Education sector will monitor the implementation of the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers. CROS comprises a series of parallel surveys conducted by individual Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), and is hosted by Bristol Online Survey, which is owned and managed by Bristol University's Institute for Learning & Research Technology. Each survey is based upon a core of questions compulsory to all participating HEIs, although HEIs are able to add their own institution-specific questions.

Cardiff University has previously participated in the Careers in Research Online Survey, first in 2003 and then in 2005. It was due to run CROS again in 2007 but, as indicated above, the survey was not available between 2006 and 2009.

2 Careers in Research Online Survey 2009

The question set for the 2009 Careers in Research Online Survey was designed by the CROS Steering Group and was structured to reflect as close as possible the seven principles of the Concordat. The survey has five main sections: 'Recruitment and Selection'; 'Recognition and Value'; 'Support and Career Development'; 'Equality and Diversity'; and 'About You'.

As the core parts of the survey were lengthy it was agreed that any additional questions, specific to Cardiff University, should be kept to a minimum and used only where plans were already underway to consult with the research staff population. Therefore only two sets of questions were added – one regarding mentoring, the other regarding the annual Research Staff Conference. These questions are reproduced in full in Appendix 3 and the results are discussed in Section 5 on 'Support and Career Development'.

Completion of the survey is anonymous. The majority of questions are mandatory and the survey has a built-in validation check to ensure that all mandatory questions are answered before the survey is submitted. The survey also contains an open question at the end of each section, allowing respondents to comment further on any matters that they think are important. This report uses a selection of these to expand upon the quantitative results.

In 2009 51 institutions participated in CROS, including 16 of the 20 Russell Group Universities. The UK-wide survey received 6,203 responses of a population of 28,626, giving a response rate of 21.7%.

Cardiff's survey was run from 6th to 31st May 2009. It received 224 responses from a research staff population of approximately 850, giving a response rate of 26.4%, lower than the previous response rates for CROS but higher than the overall UK response rate. There were also 38 incomplete surveys, and anecdotal evidence suggests that this may be due to the lengthiness of the survey.

This report provides an outline summary of Cardiff's 2009 CROS data. As outlined above, each HEI's 2009 CROS results is linked with every other HEI's survey, allowing individual HEIs to compare their results both against the aggregate data, but also against aggregate data for key 'benchmarking clubs', such as the Russell Group, '94 Group and so on. The aggregate UK data is collated and summarised in 'Careers in Research Online Survey (CROS) 2009: Analysis of aggregated UK results', launched by Vitae in September 2009¹. Further analysis of Cardiff's data is planned in order to compare its results with the UK aggregate data and with the aggregate Russell Group results.

As the core question set is different from the 2003 and 2005 surveys it is not possible to make a direct comparison between Cardiff's 2009 results and the results from previous years. However an examination of the 2003, 2005 and 2009 data is planned in order to establish whether any general trends are discernible.

3. Recruitment and Selection

3.1 Finding out about current post

Respondents were asked how they found out about their current post². As the table below shows, the most common response was 'word of mouth', selected by almost 30% of respondents. The next most common responses were 'jobs.ac.uk or other external website' and 'on the institution's website'.

	Number	% respondents ³
By word of mouth	67	30
On jobs.ac.uk or another external website	47	21
On the institution's website	39	17
Previous contract was extended	31	14
Named on the grant	20	9
Newspaper or other printed media	16	7
On a Listserv or email distribution	6	3

¹ http://vitae.ac.uk/CMS/files/upload/CROS_2009_Sept09.pdf

² It is worth noting that 37% (83/224) of respondents were currently employed on their first contract of employment with the University.

³ Respondents were invited to select all the options that applied, therefore percentages reflect percentage of the respondents who selected each option and not the 'share' of responses.

Redeployed (e.g. to avoid redundancy)	5	2
Don't know/can't remember	2	1
Other	30	13
Total	263	-

'Other' responses included that the respondents won the grant funding which paid for their post, or that they were invited to apply.

Only 73% (164/224) of respondents claimed to have been provided with a written job description during the application process, which may well be more a reflection of perceptions of the recruitment process than an accurate and objective picture of recruitment at Cardiff, given that all advertised posts have written job descriptions. Even fewer respondents claimed to have been provided with written details of the skills required for the post: only 67% (150/224) claimed to have been provided with details of the qualifications required of the post-holder, 55% (124/224) with details of the specialist skills required, and 46% (102/224) with details of the transferable/personal/management skills required. 10% of respondents (23/224) claim to have been provided with no written details regarding the requirements of the job or of the post-holder during the application process. As above, some care must be taken with interpreting these results.

3.2 Contract of employment

83% (169/224) of respondents stated that they were currently employed on fixed term contracts, a slightly lower proportion than in the research staff population overall (90%, see Appendix 2). Of those employed on fixed-term contracts 57% (96/169) held contracts of 2 years or more, 38% (64/169) held contracts of 7 months to 2 years, and 5% (9/169) held contracts of 6 months or less.

3.3 Induction to the institution

Respondents were asked to rate the usefulness of induction processes and information they received upon taking up their employment at Cardiff. Responses are summarised in the table below.

	Very useful	Useful	Not very useful	Not at all useful	Not offered	Offered but not taken
Information about employment contract	41	127	28	5	21	0
Information about probationary requirements	28	102	35	9	46	1

Copies of institutional policies and procedures (e.g. complaints procedures)	13	72	51	15	63	4
Statement of your rights and responsibilities	18	80	40	9	67	3
Copy of the institution's research strategy	10	54	41	10	99	3
Induction to current role	18	74	34	7	81	6
Departmental induction programme	10	50	28	10	115	6
Cross-institutional induction programme	7	32	31	12	126	8
Training or information about equality and diversity	5	41	43	20	99	10
Training or information about health and safety	9	89	39	11	64	6
Information about other training and development opportunities	37	104	20	10	45	3

Once more, these data need to be treated with caution, especially where respondents state that they were not 'provided' with information/induction opportunities. In some cases it is likely that these responses are inaccurate – for example over half of the respondents stated that they were not offered cross-institutional induction, yet every new member of staff is invited to University induction. It may be that the phrasing of the question – that is 'cross-institutional induction' was misleading. Similarly, the question asks whether respondents were 'offered' information. This may lead to inconsistent and misleading results. For example, most of the information listed in the table above are available for staff via the University web pages, but it is a matter of interpretation as to whether respondents would class this information as being 'offered' to them. Similarly 21 respondents stated that they were not offered information about their employment contract. As every member of staff at Cardiff University has a contract or employment it is perhaps possible that some respondents misinterpreted the question, and did not see that the contract itself also constitutes 'information about the contract of employment'.

28% of respondents stated that they were not offered copies of institutional policies and procedures. Of more concern, perhaps, in view of the institution's legal obligations is that 29% of respondents claimed not to have been offered information or training about health and safety and 44% claimed to have received no information or training about equality and diversity.

Only 17% (39/224) of respondents found their institution-wide induction useful or very useful, although it should be noted that this is contradicted in part by the feedback received about the University's monthly induction seminars for academic staff.

Only 38% (84/224) of respondents stated that the University's research strategy was useful or very useful. Almost half of respondents stated that

they were 'not offered' this document, and 23% (51/224) of respondents stated that it was 'not very' or 'not at all useful'.

Over half of respondents (141/224) found the information they received about training and development upon joining the institution 'useful' or 'very useful'.

3.4 Induction to role

Only 27% (60/224) of respondents found the induction to their current role 'useful' or 'very useful', with over half claiming to have received no induction to their current role. 20% (44/224) of respondents found the information about probationary requirements 'not very useful' or 'not at all useful'. However, it is not clear whether these responses relate to the information about the probation scheme/probationary requirements in general or to the specific requirements of the individual's probation period.

3.5 Recruitment and selection: additional comments

Fifty respondents chose to make further comments on their experience of being appointed and inducted into their current post. These comments tend to relate to individual circumstances and, as such, no clear trends emerge from the data. A majority of the comments were from respondents pointing out that their current post was not their first post within the Institution and therefore they did not receive induction, or that they had been in post so long that they did not remember. Others pointed out particular problems with the appointment process, for example delays in receiving the relevant documentation from Human Resources, whilst others commented that their experience of the appointment process was very positive. Finally, several respondents commented that although induction at a University level was satisfactory, induction at a School or Departmental level was not, for example *'Nothing is in place in the Department to welcome new staff members, making it incredibly difficult to integrate oneself'*.

4. Recognition and Value

4.1 Understanding of relevant policies and procedures

The first set of questions in the 'Recognition and Value' section of the survey provides further information regarding the respondents' levels of awareness and understanding of the institution's policies, procedures and strategy. The results, summarised in the table below, broadly show that respondents have a basic understanding of, or at least an awareness of the existence of, relevant University policies and procedures.

	Good understanding	Partial understanding	Awareness of existence	Never heard of	Not applicable
Appraisal/performance review	119	74	25	4	1
Bullying/harassment policies and procedures	22	57	114	29	1
Complaints process	9	47	145	21	0
Departmental decision making structures	20	69	106	28	0
Equality and diversity policies	31	78	105	8	0
Fixed-term contracts	94	100	26	1	2
Institutional decision-making structures	10	60	129	23	1
Institutional research career pathways	26	85	73	37	1
Institutional research strategy	23	92	86	19	0
Internal funding sources	15	79	97	31	1
Job evaluation processes	31	80	73	36	2
Probation processes	62	94	53	6	4
Promotions criteria and processes	19	80	96	25	3
Redundancy and redeployment	26	102	78	14	1
Research codes of practice (e.g. research integrity/academic conduct/ethics)	75	78	47	22	0
Terms and conditions of employment	73	116	29	3	1

4.2 Understanding of relevant UK wide policies and initiatives

The respondents' revealed less of an awareness of relevant initiatives and policy at a UK level, as summarised in the table below.

	Good understanding	Partial understanding	Awareness of existence	Never heard of	Not applicable
Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers	22	75	72	54	0
Research Assessment Exercise/Research Excellence Framework	65	99	47	11	0
'Roberts' Agenda	7	17	30	167	2
Vitae (incorporating UK GRAD and UKHERD)	4	18	31	168	2

75% of respondents had at least some awareness of the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers, which would seem to suggest that the awareness raising activities of 2008/9 have been reasonably effective. However, it is plausible that the research staff who chose to

participate in CROS 2009 are generally more engaged with the 'research staff agenda' and as a quarter of respondents had not heard of the Concordat it is clear that more promotion of the Concordat is necessary.

Almost three quarters of respondents had at least a partial understanding of the Research Assessment Exercise/Research Excellence Framework, which leaves 21% with only an awareness of their existence and 5% of respondents who had not heard of these. Given the significance of the RAE/REF to both the success of the institution and individual research careers it is clear that further awareness-raising activity is necessary in this area.

Approximately 75% of respondents had not heard of either the Roberts agenda or of Vitae. It could be argued that it is not necessary for researchers to have a good understanding of the Roberts agenda, and that this is of more relevance to UK policy makers and managers within Universities. Furthermore, although Sir Gareth Roberts' recommendations regarding the development of transferable skills are obviously of importance to researchers, these have been incorporated into the Concordat. However, as Vitae not only champions researcher careers but also provides resources, training and development, and other forms of support for research staff, there would be clear benefits in promoting this organisation more systematically.

4.3 Parity of treatment with lecturing staff

Respondents were asked to state whether they thought they were 'treated on an equal footing with lecturing staff at a similar level' with regard to various matters. The results are collated in the table below:

	Agree strongly	Agree	Disagree	Disagree strongly	Don't know	Not applicable
Opportunities for promotion and progression	18	34	63	62	38	9
Requests for flexible working	49	88	13	17	44	13
The job evaluation of your role (pay and grading schemes)	20	73	39	26	57	9
Terms and conditions of employment (excluding any fixed-term nature of contract)	35	64	27	40	40	15
Your visibility on websites and staff directories	43	100	38	17	19	6
Eligibility for performance related pay	9	15	40	48	89	20
Access to training and development opportunities	73	108	15	4	17	5
Opportunities to participate in Departmental decision-making processes (e.g. committees)	18	54	54	41	48	8

Opportunities to participate in cross-institutional decision-making processes	5	28	59	49	68	14
Opportunities to attend conferences and external meetings	61	108	20	11	17	5

The main areas where respondents think they are treated equally with lecturing staff were in their access to training and development opportunities, 81% (181/224); opportunities to attend conferences and external meetings, 75% (169/224); visibility on websites and staff directories, 64% (143/224); and requests for flexible working, 61% (137/224). Interestingly, despite research staff at Cardiff having identical terms and conditions of employment to lecturing staff, 30% of respondents did not think that they were treated equally in this regard. The main areas where respondents expressed a lack of knowledge with regard to how they compared to lecturing staff were in their eligibility for performance related pay, 40% (89/224); opportunities to participate in cross-institutional decision-making processes, 30% (68/224); and job evaluation, 25% (57/224). The main areas where respondents did not think that they are treated equally with lecturing staff were in opportunities for promotion and progression, 56% (125/224); opportunities to participate in departmental, 42% (95/224); and cross-institutional, 48% (108/224); decision making processes, and eligibility for performance related pay, 39% (88/224).

4.4 Perceptions regarding recognition of contribution

Respondents were asked to state the extent to which they agreed that the institution recognises and values the contributions they make to a number of areas. These responses are collated in the table below. The main areas where respondents agreed, or strongly agreed, that their contributions were recognised and valued were with regard to publications, 65% (145/224); achieving the institution's research strategy, 54% (122/224); research culture within the department, 54% (122/224); external collaborations, 51% (115/224); grant applications, 48% (108/224); and world-class research, 48% (107/224). The only area where more respondents disagreed than agreed that their contributions were recognised was with respect to managing staff 32% (72/224) disagreed, or disagreed strongly, whilst 30% (67/224) agreed or agreed strongly. The other areas where at least 30% of respondents believed their contributions weren't recognised or valued were managing resources 31% (69/224); teaching and lecturing 33% (75/224); and supporting others (e.g. informal mentoring), 35% (79/224).

	Agree strongly	Agree	Disagree	Disagree strongly	Don't know	Not applicable
Achieving the institution's research strategy	31	91	39	25	32	4
External collaborations	29	86	37	23	33	13

Grant applications	31	77	46	19	25	22
Knowledge transfer and commercialisation activities	20	68	31	20	39	42
Managing resources	17	66	43	26	45	24
Managing staff	14	53	45	27	37	45
Promoting the institution	17	80	44	19	41	20
Public engagement with research	22	71	39	21	41	26
Publications	45	100	27	21	20	7
Research culture within the department	33	89	34	27	31	7
Supervising students	23	72	34	30	21	42
Supporting others (e.g. informal mentoring)	17	72	46	33	29	24
Teaching and lecturing	15	50	40	35	21	61
World-class research	30	77	31	27	41	14

4.5 Research culture and community

Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they believed themselves to be integrated into a wider research culture and research community. The results are collated in the table below:

	Agree strongly	Agree	Disagree	Disagree strongly
The research culture of the institution stimulates your work	45	103	59	15
You are integrated into your department's research community	44	103	59	16
You are integrated into your institution's research community	19	84	101	19
You are integrated into your wider disciplinary community	36	103	69	13

Two thirds of respondents agreed or agreed strongly that the research culture of the institution stimulates their work and that they are integrated into their department's research community, and 62% agreed or strongly agreed that they are integrated into their wider disciplinary community. However 54% of respondents disagreed, or disagreed strongly, that they are integrated into the institution's research community.

4.6 Recognition and value: additional comments

Less than a quarter of respondents (49) provided additional comments on how they thought they were recognised and valued by the institution, or what more the institution could do to recognise and value their contributions. However, of all the free-text questions, this invited the lengthiest comments.

Some of these were positive and referred to how they were supported by their Schools and had *'great opportunity for training and development'*. The majority, however, raised concerns which may be categorised into four principal themes.

(i) **Concerns regarding insecurity of employment;** comments included *'I feel neither part of, nor valued by the university. Fixed term contracts have a lot to do with that. How can I feel valued when I am constantly waiting for my contract to expire, and wondering if I will still be needed next year?'* *'I recently had to fight to retain my job. My fixed term contract was running out and the two main parties that could extend it one only had the money for a 6 month extension and the other told me preferred to employ an external candidate. I had to apply for the job through the redeployment scheme after being told by one of the parties not to twist their arm regarding the job. I eventually got the job by not leaving any choice to the PI having gone through the redeployment scheme while meeting all the criteria for the job. Based on that and having been here since 2001 I would say that I don't feel at all recognised.'* *'As a member of staff on a FTC I am expendable and have a fixed time here therefore I am not worth training – indeed, I was expected to be fully qualified to do my job, and my requests for training have been inferred as a sign of academic weakness.'*

(ii) **Lack of formal promotion processes for staff on research-only contracts;** comments included *'Clear procedures are not in place for researchers to gain promotion. The only way to get promotion/open ended contract is to get a similar offer from a competing institution.'* *'Research staff should be simply treated in the same way that lecturing staff are. Permanent contracts and promotion procedures based on performance-in-role (ie research outputs/outcomes) would go a long way to facilitate this.'*

(iii) **Lack of recognition of broader contribution made by staff on research-only contracts or not allowing research staff the time to engage in any activity beyond their current project;** comments included

'Researchers have a very low profile e.g. I am strongly encouraged to apply for research funding but not given any recognition when this is achieved, I am not 'formally' allowed to supervise students'.

'To further develop my CV I undertake teaching for the school which is at no cost to them as I am not contracted to teach – this is often taken for granted such that if you offer to cover some teaching it is often implied that you will then be a resource on which they can depend'.

'...Myself and other contract researchers are discouraged from doing any teaching, and are not given the opportunity to supervise students. We are not invited to departmental research strategy meetings or invited to share our thoughts or contribute...'

'I feel like an invisible member of staff. I am required to produce results to publish in journals, and anything that removes me from the bench gets in the way of my primary role. I have no support from my line manager in any form of career development. I am not invited to participate in any of the functions of the school, and I am simply expected to focus on my project...'

'...there are many aspects of my academic development that I am not allowed to pursue within the terms of my research contract – for example attending conferences in the area of my specific research interests and writing publications based on my PhD thesis. Yet, if I was a lecturer I would be allowed to pursue these academic goals'.

(iv) Lack of recognition for contribution and difficulties in making the transition to both being an independent academic and also to being recognised as such; comments included

'I am not valued as an academic in my own right, despite publications in peer-reviewed journals and active self-directed research agenda and collaborative work within and beyond my department'.

'...Nobody wants to hear about the things that I have achieved research wise outside of this project...'

'I feel that when grants are awarded and manuscripts published it is primarily the established principal investigator who is talked about in relation to it. I think more of a point should be made about the person who actually performed the research'.

'Research I undertake is strongly recognised by my peers at other institutions than within this University – hence I work with these groups much closer than within Cardiff. This is a historical situation born out of academic prejudice'.

5. Support and Career Development

5.1 Engagement with career management and personal development

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they had engaged in active career management and personal development. The majority of respondents stated that they have reflected on their development needs and considered their career options, although 8% of respondents claimed to have done neither of these. 67% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they are encouraged to engage in personal and career development. However just under half of the respondents (47%) stated that they have a clear career development plan.

	Agree strongly	Agree	Disagree	Disagree strongly
You have reflected on your development needs	59	144	19	0
You have considered your career options	81	122	18	0
You have a clear career development plan	26	80	104	9
You are encouraged to engage in personal and career development	39	111	51	17

5.2 Progress and performance review processes

Half of respondents (110/224) had participated in probation over the last two years, and 67% (151/224) had participated in appraisal. Of those who stated that they had not participated in the appraisal process, almost half (29/66) did not do so because they were on probation or they'd only recently been appointed at the time of the survey. 24% (16/66) of those who did not participate in appraisal stated that they had not been invited to participate.

Those respondents who had participated in the University's appraisal scheme rated its usefulness as follows:

	Very useful	Useful	Not very useful	Not at all useful	Not applicable
Overall	10	79	45	24	22
In identifying your strengths and achievements	17	76	42	23	21
In leading to training or other development opportunities	12	64	52	29	22
In leading to changes in work practices	3	38	68	36	33
For highlighting issues	16	84	31	21	26
For finding solutions to problems	5	53	64	30	27
In helping you focus on your career aspirations and how these are met by your current role	10	58	59	29	23
In reviewing your personal progress	25	75	34	24	21

Feedback regarding the usefulness of appraisal is very mixed. There are four areas where respondents who thought that the appraisal process is not very, or at all, useful outnumbered those who thought it was useful or very useful; namely in leading to training and development opportunities (81:76); in

leading to changes in work practices (104:41); for finding solutions to problems 94:58); and in helping respondents to focus on their career aspirations and how these are met by their current role (88:68).

5.3 Career Aspirations

Respondents were asked to specify the areas of work in which they would place their immediate and long term career aspirations. They were asked to select all that applied and so could select more than one option for 'now' and 'in 5 years' and could also select the same option for both 'now' and 'in 5 years'.

	Now	In 5 years
Career in higher education – primarily research and teaching	82	112
Career in higher education – primarily research	141	85
Career in higher education – primarily teaching	5	17
Research career beyond higher education (e.g. in a private research organisation, charity or in an industrial environment)	18	68
Teaching career outside higher education	2	10
Self employment (including setting up own business)	3	26
Non-research career in business/industry/public sector	13	35
Any other professional career	6	20
Other (including not planning to enter employment)	4	6

The most popular response for career options 'now' was 'career in higher education - primarily research', with 141/224 respondents selecting this option, perhaps unsurprisingly as this is the work in which all of the respondents were engaged. However only 85/224 respondents wanted to be engaged in research-only posts in five years time. The most popular career choice for five years time was 'career in higher education – primarily research and teaching', which was selected by precisely half (112/224) of all respondents. Although this is clearly a large proportion of respondents it still means that half of respondents did not see themselves taking on the full breadth of the academic role, which challenges some of the stereotypes regarding research posts being regarded by researchers as a stepping stone for lectureships. 82/224 respondents also stated that they would currently like to be engaged in teaching and research work in higher education. Roles in higher education which primarily focus on teaching proved to be less attractive to respondents, with 5/224 respondents selecting it as a desirable career option 'now' and 17/224 'in 5 years'. Teaching outside higher education was also low with only 10/224 respondents seeing this as a desirable option in five year's time. After research or teaching and research roles in higher education the next most popular choice was research outside higher education, with 68/224 respondents selecting this option as something that they would like to do in five years' time. Self-employment was not a

popular choice for 'now' but 26/224 respondents selected this as a career aspiration for five years' time. It is clear from the table above that a majority of respondents saw their careers – both immediate and in five years' time - as either being in higher education or research, but some respondents were considering options beyond this with 35/224 respondents stating that they had aspirations to pursue a non-research career in business/industry/public sector, and 20/224 with aspirations to pursue 'any other professional career'. There was some variation between the short- and the longer-term with respect to respondents' career aspirations. 224 respondents selected a total of 274 career options for where their aspirations lay 'now', but 379 career options for 'in five years', suggesting that respondents were considering a wider range of possibilities for the future.

5.4 Additional comments on career aspirations

The majority of respondents chose not to add further detail regarding their career aspirations, but the comments that were made in this section may be broadly divided into the positive, where respondents were clearly taking a proactive approach to career planning; and the more fatalistic, where respondents believe that their careers will be largely determined by factors beyond their control. For example, with regard to academic career planning, some respondents spoke of planning a “*balanced [p]ortfolio*” of research and teaching and “*seeking progression through fellowships*” whilst others were more negative, seeing their plans for an academic career as being wholly dependent on research funding, “*if grants successful!*”. With regard to options beyond the higher education sector, some respondents have specific plans, such as “*[i]ntend to shift to a part-time contract in about 5 years to allow pursuit of other writing, consultancy and travel opportunities*”, others indicate that they are keeping their options open, planning to “*consider many possible avenues*”, whilst others see a career beyond academe as a last resort, or something which experiences may have driven them to “*[t]he research environment including practices and politics have left me with a very bad taste and I have no desire to waste any more of my life away*”.

5.5 Engagement with development activity

Respondents indicated how often they had engaged in various forms of developmental activity during the past twelve months (or since taking up their post if this was more recent):

	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Never	Not applicable
Discussed their training needs and/or opportunities for career development with PI/line manager	11	45	114	51	2
Discussed their training needs and/or opportunities for career development with	8	19	66	107	23

a mentor					
Discussed their training needs and/or opportunities for career development with a careers advisor	0	3	27	185	7
Discussed their training needs and/or opportunities for career development with someone responsible for developing researchers (e.g. staff development)	0	8	45	163	6
Discussed their progress towards any probationary requirements	1	17	47	88	68
Participated in internal institutional training activities or courses	10	37	124	43	9
Participated in external training activities or courses	4	16	89	105	7

76% (170/224) of respondents indicated that they had discussed their training needs and/or opportunities for career development at least 'sometimes' with their PI in the last year, and 71% (159/224) of respondents indicated that they had discussed this 'often' or 'very often' with their PI. 76% (171/224) of respondents also indicated that they had participated in internal training activities or courses at least 'sometimes' within the last 12 months, and 49% (109/224) indicated that they had participated in external training activities in the same period 'sometimes', at least,. 48% (107/224) of respondents had 'never' discussed their training needs or opportunities for career development with their mentors in the previous 12 months, with 11% of total respondents indicating that this option was not applicable to them. However, although all research staff have access to dedicated support in the University's staff development unit and a dedicated careers advisor, 73% (163/22) indicated that they had 'never' discussed their training and career development needs with 'someone responsible for developing researchers (e.g. staff development)' in the last 12 months and 83% (185/224) that they had 'never' discussed this with a careers advisor in the same period.

5.6 Discussions about career development

Respondents were also asked who they had consulted with in the past, or would consult with in the future, in relation to their career development. These data are collated in the table below:

	Have consulted	Would definitely consult	Likely to consult	Unlikely to consult	Would not consult	Not applicable
Careers advisor	35	20	55	71	23	11
Careers service resources	19	16	64	75	24	14
Staff developer	7	18	49	90	24	22
Human resources specialist	7	15	36	107	29	17
Principal investigator/line	86	43	53	18	13	6

manager						
Your appraiser	56	41	47	28	13	28
Mentor	38	45	32	31	9	59
Colleagues	71	49	63	22	8	4
Professional body/learned society	9	11	60	81	33	20
Funding organisation	5	18	37	94	38	23
Recruitment agency	5	7	29	103	48	21
Online social networks	3	3	20	94	71	24
Partner/family/friends	95	45	45	20	7	6

42% (95/224) of respondents reported having consulted with partner/family/friends about their career development. A further 20% indicated that they would definitely do so in the future and an additional 20% that they would be likely to do so. Principal Investigators and colleagues also scored highly in terms of whether respondents had consulted with them about their career development in the past (38% had consulted with their PI; 32% with colleagues); or would consult with them in the future (19% would definitely consult with PIs and 24% would be likely to do so; 22% would definitely consult with colleagues, and 28% would be likely to do so). The sources that respondents would be least likely to consult with were Human Resources specialists, funding organisations, recruitment agency and online social networks, with over half of respondents indicating that they would be unlikely to, or would not, consult with any of these. The findings regarding the use of careers advisors and careers service resources was slightly more mixed. 49% (110/224) expressed that they had consulted or that they would (definitely/be likely to) consult with a careers advisor in the future, with 42% (94/224) stating that they would be unlikely to or would definitely not do so. 44% (99/224) expressed that they had consulted or that they would (definitely/be likely to) consult with careers service resources in the future, with 44% (99/224) stating that they would be unlikely to or would definitely not do so.

5.7 Time spent on continuing professional development

Respondents were asked to note the numbers of days that they had spent on continuing professional development during the past twelve months, or since taking up current post if this was more recent. The responses are summarised in the table below:

Number of days	Respondents	%
0	20	9.2
1-2	35	16.1
3-5	62	28.6
6-10	62	28.6
11-15	24	11.1
16-20	6	2.8
More than 20	8	3.7

The University's staff development policy encourages staff to spend a minimum of five days each year on activities related to their continuing professional development. Because of the way the questions were structured in the survey it is impossible to extrapolate how many respondents spent five or more days on CPD related activity. However, 45% (100/224) of respondents had spent six days or more on their continuing professional development in the last twelve months (or since taking up their current post if this was more recent). 9% stated that they had not spent any days on CPD related activity in the previous twelve months. This is despite the survey prompting respondents to think of CPD related activity in its broadest sense and to include activities such as training, conference attendance, individual reflection and mentoring.

5.8 Engagement with training and development in different areas

Respondents were asked to identify the areas in which they had undertaken, or would like to undertake, training and development. The responses are collated in the table below:

	Undertaken and found useful	Undertaken and found not very useful	Would like to do this	Of no interest currently
Research skills and techniques	92	12	66	41
Ethics and research governance	32	11	58	103
Personal effectiveness	27	5	83	88
Communication skills	36	7	70	92
Team working	23	5	58	115
Career management	14	15	97	78
Knowledge transfer and outreach activity	12	7	90	91
Teaching	39	12	77	80
Leadership and management	27	7	110	60

Only 15% (34/224) of respondents stated that they had previously undertaken training and development in leadership and management, but half of respondents (110/224) expressed a wish to undertake this in the future. Indeed, 'leadership and management' and 'research skills and techniques' were the only two areas where the number of respondents who wished to undertake development in these areas outnumbered the number of respondents who had no interest in doing so. Although only 12.5% of respondents (28/224) had undertaken training and development in team working, over half of respondents overall (115/224) expressed that they had no interest in doing so. The results for research ethics and governance show a similar pattern – 19% of respondents had undertaken training and development in this area, but 46 % (103/224) of all respondents expressed

that they had no interest in doing so. 43% of respondents expressed an interest in engaging in development activity in relation to career management, whilst 35% did not, and an almost equal number of respondents (90:91) expressed an interest in engaging in development activity in knowledge transfer and outreach as those who expressed no interest in this.

5.9 Usefulness of modes of training and development

The modes of training and development rated as most helpful by respondents were face-to-face presentations, with 83% of respondents (186/224) rating these as helpful or very helpful; one-to-one conversations with 80% (179/224) of respondents rating them as helpful or very helpful; and interactive workshops, with 76% (170/224) of respondents rating them as helpful or very helpful. Just over half of respondents found online resources helpful or very helpful, but a quarter of respondents found this mode of training and development 'not very helpful' or 'unhelpful' and just over 20% stated that they had no experience of online resources. The other most common areas for researchers to claim they had no experience of were training and development were in the workplace 20% (45/224), mentoring and coaching 25% (56/224) and online discussion forums 39% (87/224).

	Very helpful	Helpful	Not very helpful	Unhelpful	Not applicable/ experienced
Face-to-face presentations	58	128	15	1	16
In the workplace	57	96	12	4	45
Interactive workshops	57	113	17	4	26
Mentoring and coaching	52	81	22	5	56
One-to-one conversations	70	109	6	2	28
Online discussion forums	2	31	69	24	87
Online resources	20	94	48	8	47
Self-reflection	33	109	40	5	29

5.10 Information and advice

The areas where respondents would find information, advice and guidance particularly helpful in assisting with career decision making/progression are listed in order of popularity in the table below:

	No.	%
Information on careers inside academia	127	57
Job application processes in academia	124	55
Information on careers outside academia	85	38
Information on internal job opportunities	78	35

Job application processes outside academia	71	32
Information on secondment and placement opportunities	62	28
Information on self-employment and freelance consultancy	47	21
Information on business skills and enterprise	41	18
Others	4	

5.11 Development within current role

Respondents were asked to indicate what forms of development they had undertaken in their current roles, or would like to undertake in the future, in five broad 'skills' areas.

These data reveal that respondents are engaged in a wide range of activity within their current roles and have an enthusiasm to take on a wider range of duties, particularly in terms of developing management experience and developing broader research related experience.

Over half of the respondents had experience of collaborating with colleagues outside the UK, 60%; developing specialist research skills and techniques, 54%; explaining work to people outside their field, 52%; writing up research for publication, 75%; demonstrating, 53%; presenting work at conferences, 84%; and teaching or lecturing, 51%.

Just over half of the respondents also expressed a wish to gain experience beyond the University through a secondment to another institution or a placement in another sector. Roughly half of respondents expressed a wish to develop a personal development plan or a career development strategy and to maintain a professional development record. Many researchers expressed a wish to be more involved in departmental (52%) or institutional (46%) decision making processes and committees, although 41% expressed that they currently have no interest in participating in decision making processes at an institutional level.

.1 Acquiring experience outside immediate area

	I have done this	I would like to do this	I currently have no interest in doing this
Collaborate with colleagues outside the UK	134	72	14
Collaborate with industry	81	75	61
Undertake a placement in another sector (e.g. business/voluntary/government)	15	115	88
Undertake a secondment to another institution	18	122	76
Work as part of a cross-disciplinary role	107	98	15

.2 Developing management experience or expertise

	I have done this	I would like to do this	I currently have no interest in doing this
Manage a budget	85	86	47
Participate in departmental decision making processes and committees	52	117	48
Participate in institutional decision making processes and committees	19	103	92
Plan and manage a project	115	91	11

.3 Developing broader experience of research functions

	I have done this	I would like to do this	I currently have no interest in doing this
Apply for a fellowship	58	105	52
Develop specialist research skills and techniques	121	80	16
Explain work to people outside your field	126	59	32
Knowledge transfer	80	100	32
Supervise a doctoral or masters student	85	81	50
Write a grant/funding proposal	108	94	17
Write up research for publication	169	47	4

.4 Improving skills of communication or engagement

	I have done this	I would like to do this	I currently have no interest in doing this
Demonstrating	119	29	69
Presenting work at a conference (orally/poster)	189	29	3
Participating in public engagement activities	105	75	39
Teaching or lecturing	115	64	39

.5 Engaging in personal development activities

	I have done this	I would like to do this	I currently have no interest in doing this
Develop a personal development plan or a career development strategy	45	116	57
Maintain a professional development record	38	108	69
Engage in coaching, mentoring or action learning	36	95	84

5.12 Additional comments on training and career development

Only 31 respondents chose to comment on the training and career development they have undertaken or to make suggestions for activities they would like the opportunity to undertake. Of these, only six were suggestions regarding training activity which they would find useful, and included advice on writing CVs, and obtaining grant funding (both of which are already offered free-of-charge to research staff), and support on using specific software packages.

Some respondents were positive about the formal development opportunities offered at Cardiff University:

'I've had many opportunities to access high quality development courses through the University and in many ways have had better opp[ortunitie]s than colleagues in industry. The training has generally been very good and very useful and my supervisor has allowed and encouraged me to attend everything I've wanted to'.

'Training and career development options are available, but you have to be pro-active in undertak[ing] them. This is exactly as it should be'

Other comments may be grouped into two main themes. The first of these concerns difficulties in taking up training opportunities offered by the University – either due to lack of time within their roles or lack of support by line managers/PIs, for example *'I believe that the provision of career development resources at a HR level takes second place to my opportunities to participate in them due to my workload and to [Research Group] policies' 'although I've done this stuff in my current role, its all been outside my working hours'.*

The second theme concerned the relevance of the training offered by the University – either because of its content, for example, *'these are probably not as focussed as they could be'*, or because attending training and development

does not address the fundamental structural conditions of employment for researchers and the tensions that these can create. More specifically, for these respondents, the instability and uncertainty of being employed on fixed term contracts, and the absence of a clear career pathway for research staff, were the central concerns:

'developing a career development strategy is all well and good but is of no use with limited support for senior contract researchers who have to go where the money is, not necessarily where they want to be'.

'When I am no longer treated as a casual worker, I can start making the commitment to my future and my colleagues. When I am guaranteed to be unemployed at the end of my FTC [fixed term contract], I have no incentive to improve as it only benefits my line manager during my employment but does not get me continued employment here when the funding runs out'.

5.13 Mentoring

41.5% (93/224) of respondents stated that they were currently being mentored, 58.5% (131/224) that they were not. Of those who were being mentored, a majority (66%, 61/93) were being mentored by a more experienced academic within their School, and not their Principal Investigator (30%, 28/93). Seven respondents were being mentored by someone in a similar role. Of those who were not currently being mentored (131), 20 stated that they would find it useful to be mentored by someone in a similar role; 14 by their Principal Investigator; 74 by a more experienced academic within their School; 29 by an academic from another school; 20 by an academic at another institution; and 14 by somebody outside the sector.

Respondents were asked to comment on the benefits, or the potential benefits, of mentoring. Four key themes run through the free-text responses. The first of these concerns the centrality of effective communication in the mentor/mentee relationship. Receiving advice and having someone listen and act as a *'sounding board'* were both seen as important, as was the allocation of time to the kind of reflection that is necessary for meaningful discussions with mentors: *"Regardless of who the mentor might be, I feel it would be useful in allowing me a time and space, outside of constraints of current funding and contract, to focus solely on my development and career."*

Secondly, many respondents wrote of the usefulness of a *'different perspective'* and although some respondents saw no need for mentoring beyond the researcher/PI relationship, others stated that they would welcome the opportunity for interaction beyond the line management relationship. Indeed, for some, being mentored by someone from outside their Academic School, or even the University, was seen as being of potential value – because this would both provide exposure to different viewpoints and experiences, and was also seen by some as being more *'impartial'*: *'the focus for a PI is on getting a project completed and ensuring you collect the data*

that they can use for their own career development – so there can be a tension which wouldn't be the case for a mentor outside the School.

The third theme concerns the benefits of having a mentor to act as a guide or teacher. Many respondents expressed a wish to have a mentor who was able to provide general insights about strategies for progression in an academic career, and to be guided by *'someone who has gone through the process'*. Other respondents hoped to learn specific skills and forms of knowledge from their mentors, from technical and research-related skills and help with specific technical problems, to advice on grant writing and publication, as well as how best to navigate School and University politics.

The fourth theme that emerges relates to the usefulness of mentors in opening up new networks and helping the mentee to explore future career options, both within and beyond higher education.

Not all respondents thought that mentoring would be useful – some commented that they did not need mentoring and several respondents commented that they did not know what mentoring involved or whether it would be useful to them.

5.14 Research Staff Conference

As outlined in the Report of the 2008 Career Development Conference for Research Staff⁴, attendance at this annual event has declined steadily over the last three years and so the 2009 Careers in Research Survey was used as a vehicle for gathering the views of respondents about the Conference. The majority (86%) of respondents did not attend the Conference in 2008. However, all respondents were asked to comment on what would enable or encourage them to attend future research staff conferences, eliciting responses from 218 respondents.

Many of these responses were from people who thought that the conferences were useful. Some of these had been prevented from attending past events due to other commitments or because they were not in post at the time

'Being the only researchers I find the conference a good arena in which to network and the topics covered are, to a greater degree, very interesting. I hope to attend the next one.'

'Attended previous conference and hope to again in future'

'I should attend future conferences without any special encouraging.'

Those comments regarding how researchers could be enabled or encouraged to attend future conferences may be broadly grouped into five themes:

(i) **having more time**; comments included

'being less busy'

'depends on workload and other conferences attended. International conferences have a higher priority.'

⁴ Paper 08/332

'having time in my role to use for personal development activity'

Several researchers commented that they believed that holding the conference annually was too frequent:

'I attended one in 2007 and didn't think I would gain significantly from going to another one so soon. I might go in 2009, if not, definitely in 2010'.

'I attended one in 2007, I just thought that attendance once every couple of years would be adequate'.

(ii) **having the encouragement or approval of their managers;** comments included

'an attitude from PIs that this is something we should be doing in work hours'

'if I was not discouraged by my line manager'

'I have never had any problems in getting permission to attend the research staff conferences'

(iii) **having more information and seeing the event publicised more widely;** comments included

'better publicity – didn't really know what it was about'.

'email reminders with more information about content'.

'I do not know what the Research Staff conference is'.

'know more about how relevant this is to me'.

(iv) **relevant and interesting content;**

Some respondents emphasised the need for practical support in relation to their own career development. However, others questioned the extent to which it is possible to hold an event that is relevant and useful to the research staff population as a whole. They pointed to the diversity of the research staff population, both in terms of being at different career stages, for example

'the university needs to realise that not all researchers are early stage researchers';

and with respect to discipline-based differences

'It would be difficult to make a conference relevant to all researchers in the University which would put me off attending. I might attend if there was something particularly relevant to my research'.

'Research Staff is a wide number of roles. You cannot for example have a conference for lecturers. Can't treat everyone the same. I have very different needs compared with a research assistant in the Sciences. Different world. Different needs. Your conference is too general'.

'I prefer more specialist meetings related to my field of research and would like to meet more people within the department'.

(v) **believing that there is a genuine commitment to improving career structures for research staff on the part of the University.**

In terms of conference content, the involvement of the University's senior figures was seen as important, as was the provision of information regarding how the University's policy affected research staff. However, some researchers questioned the extent to which they were able to influence University policy through attendance at the Research Staff Conference, saying that they would be more keen to attend *'[i]f I had the feeling that the*

policies that are talked about were actually put into action'. Several respondents expressed their frustration at having raised concerns at previous conferences which they believed were not subsequently addressed by the University's senior management:

'I have attended such conferences in the past. There a lot of RAs with the same concerns that tend to get ignored as soon as the conference ends'.

'colleagues who have attended have reported back that the same issues (mainly contract research related) have been discussed without resolution at more than one conference – hearing of progress from this situation would encourage me to go'.

6. Equality and Diversity

6.1 Work/life balance

Just over 70% of respondents 'agreed' (124/224) or 'agreed strongly' (34/224) that they were satisfied with their work life balance, with 22% (49/224) disagreeing and 6% (14/224) disagreeing strongly.

6.2 Institutional commitment to equality and diversity

88% (198/224) of respondents 'agreed' (139/224) or 'agreed strongly' (59/224) that the institution is committed to equality and diversity.

The majority of respondents agreed that staff were treated fairly across each of the equality streams:

	Agree strongly	Agree	Disagree strongly	Disagree
Gender	67	121	22	7
Ethnicity	77	129	5	4
Nationality	76	124	12	3
Ability/disability	72	130	7	3
Age	68	121	22	5
Sexual orientation	77	133	0	2
Religion/belief	77	128	6	2

In order to provide further detail respondents were asked to indicate whether they thought that staff at their institution are treated fairly, regardless of ethnic background, gender, religion or belief, sexual orientation, disability or age with regard to several key areas. The results are collated below.

	Agree strongly	Agree	Disagree strongly	Disagree
Recruitment and selection	64	137	11	6
Career progression/promotion	61	120	31	5
Reward	58	117	35	3
Day to day treatment at work	67	136	12	3
Access to training and development	73	139	5	1
Participation in decision making	56	127	27	5

85.3% of respondents stated that they did not feel that they had been unfairly discriminated against in their current post, whilst 14.7% stated that they felt that they had.

Dr Sara Williams, Training and Development Manager (Research)
Mrs Josie Grindulis, Career Development Manager for Research Staff
 HRSHE
 October 2009

Appendix One: About the sample

1 Respondents by contract

88% (197/224) of respondents were employed full time, 10% (23/224) were employed part time. 37% (83/224) of respondents were on their first employment contract at Cardiff University. 16% (35/224) of respondents had five or more contracts with Cardiff University.

2 Respondents by source of funding for current post

	Number
Research Council Funded	78
Institution funded	58
Charity funded	39
UK government (including devolved administrations) funded	36
EU/EC funded	16
UK industry funded	10
Overseas funded	4
Other	24

3 Respondents by main subject specialism (current contract)

As CROS is a UK-wide survey, we are unable to identify respondents' Academic Schools. However, the following table summarises the main subject specialism of respondents' current contract.

	No.	%
Medicine and Dentistry	21	9.4
Medical Science and Pharmacy	15	6.7
Nursing	4	1.8
Other subjects allied to medicine	15	6.7
Biology and related sciences	44	19.6
Psychology	23	10.3
Agriculture and related subjects	1	0.4
Physical science	14	6.3
Physical geography and environmental science	3	1.3
Mathematical sciences	3	1.3
Computer science	3	1.3
Mechanically-based engineering	8	3.6
Electronic and electrical engineering	3	1.3
Civil, chemical and other engineering	2	0.9
Technology	1	0.4
Architecture, building and planning	7	3.1
Economics	1	0.4
Politics	3	1.3
Sociology, social policy and anthropology	12	5.4

Human and social geography	4	1.8
Business	5	2.2
Management	4	1.8
Finance and accounting	2	0.9
Media studies	2	0.9
European languages and area studies	1	0.4
Other languages and area studies	1	0.4
History and archaeology	3	1.3
Philosophy, theology and religious studies	1	0.4
Combined	6	2.7
Missing data	12	5.4

4 Respondents by gender

115/224 (52.8%) respondents were female, 103/224 (47.2%) were male.

5 Respondents by age

	Number	%
Under 25	6	2.7
25-29	46	21.0
30-34	61	27.9
35-39	40	18.3
40-44	19	8.7
45-49	24	11.0
50-54	12	5.5
55-59	8	3.7
60 or older	3	1.3

6 Respondents by qualifications

Respondents were asked which of the following qualifications they had. As the number of respondents reporting that they had doctorates or equivalent professional qualifications was higher than those reporting that they had undergraduate degrees it seems likely that some respondents only reported their highest qualification, whilst others reported all.

	Number
Undergraduate degree	157
Taught postgraduate qualification	56
Research masters	41
Doctorate or equivalent professional qualification	161
None of the above	2

7 Respondents by ethnic group/cultural background

	Number	%
White British	105	48.8
White English	14	6.5
White Scottish	3	1.4
White Welsh	29	13.5
White Irish	4	1.9
Any other White background	14	6.5
Mixed White and Asian	1	0.5
Asian, Asian British, Asian Scottish or Asian Welsh Indian	4	1.9
Asian, Asian British, Asian Scottish or Asian Welsh Pakistani	1	0.5
Asian, Asian British, Asian Scottish or Asian Welsh Bangladeshi	1	0.5
Any other Asian background	2	0.9
Black, Black British, Black English, Black Scottish, Black Welsh African	1	0.5
Chinese, Chinese British, Chinese English, Chinese Scottish, Chinese Welsh	7	3.3
Other	29	13.5

8 Respondents by nationality

	Number	%
American	2	1.1
Argentinean	1	0.5
Australian	2	1.1
Austrian	1	0.5
British	116	63.7
Bulgarian	1	0.5
Canadian	2	1.1
Chinese	2	1.1
Egyptian	1	0.5
French	4	2.2
German	4	2.2
Greek	2	1.1

Indian	2	1.1
Iranian	1	0.5
Irish	4	2.2
Italian	1	0.5
Malaysian	1	0.5
Mexican	1	0.5
Pakistani	1	0.5
Polish	2	1.1
Scottish	2	1.1
Singaporean	1	0.5
Spanish	1	0.5
Swedish	1	0.5
Swiss	1	0.5
Vietnamese	1	0.5
Welsh	24	13.2

9 Respondents by language

English was the first language of 165 (78.9%) respondents.

10 Respondents by disability

	Number
None	193
Dyslexia	5
Blind/visually impaired	1
Deaf/hard of hearing	2
Mental health difficulties	4

Appendix Two: Cardiff University Research Staff Population June 2009

1 Cardiff University research staff population by contract type

As at June 2009, 846 members of staff were employed on research-only contracts. Of these, 83 (9.8%) were employed on regular contracts and 763 (90.2%) on fixed term contracts.

	Full-time	Part-time
Fixed-term	672	91
Regular	73	10

2 Cardiff University research staff population by gender

Of the 846 members of staff employed on research-only contracts in June 2009, 390 (46%) were female and 456 (54%) were male.

3 Cardiff University research staff population by age

	No.	%
16-24	16	1.9
25-34	446	52.7
35-44	239	28.3
45-54	104	12.3
55-64	40	4.7
65+	1	0.1

4 Cardiff University research staff population by ethnic group/cultural background

	No.	%
White British	467	55.2
White Irish	8	0.9
Any other White background	194	22.9
Asian, Asian British, Indian	23	2.7
Asian, Asian British, Pakistani	6	0.7
Asian, Asian British, Bangladeshi	6	0.7
Any other Asian background	14	1.7
Black, Black British, African	9	1.1
Black, Black British,	2	0.2

Caribbean		
Any other Black background	1	0.1
Chinese, Chinese British,	52	6.1
Mixed White & Black, African	1	0.1
Mixed White & Black, Caribbean	1	0.1
Mixed White & Asian	3	0.4
Other Mixed Background	3	0.4
Other ethnic background	23	2.7
Information refused	10	1.2
Unknown	23	2.7

5 Cardiff University research staff population by nationality

	No.	%		No.	%
Argentina	2	0.2	Malaysia	3	0.4
Armenia	1	0.1	Mexico	3	0.4
Australia	5	0.6	Netherlands	6	0.7
Austria	6	0.7	New Zealand	2	0.2
Bangladesh	4	0.5	Nigeria	3	0.2
Belgium	3	0.4	Norway	1	0.1
Brazil	1	0.1	Pakistan	4	0.5
Bulgaria	12	1.4	Poland	9	1.1
Burma (Myanmar)	1	0.1	Portugal	2	0.2
Cameroon	1	0.1	Romania	2	0.2
Canada	8	0.9	Russia (Federation)	7	0.8
China	41	4.8	Singapore	2	0.2
Cyprus	1	0.1	South Korea	1	0.2
Czech Republic	1	0.1	Spain	11	1.3
Denmark	2	0.2	Sri Lanka	1	0.1
Egypt	4	0.5	Sudan	1	0.1
Eire (Ireland)	9	1.1	Switzerland	3	0.4
Finland	1	0.1	Syria (Arab Republic)	2	0.2
France	29	3.4	Tanzania (United Rep)	1	0.1
Gabon	1	0.1	Union of Sov Soc Rep	1	0.1
Germany	22	2.6	United Kingdom	552	65.2
Ghana	1	0.1	United States	4	0.5
Greece	11	1.3	Vietnam (Viet Nam)	2	0.2
Hungary	1	0.1	Yugoslavia (other)	1	0.1
India	18	2.1	Not known	3	0.4
Indonesia	1	0.1	Not known	3	0.4
Iran (Islamic Rep)	3	0.4			
Iraq	1	0.1			
Israel	1	0.1			
Italy	20	2.4			
Kazakhstan	1	0.1			
Kenya	1	0.1			
Lebanon	1	0.1			
Lithuania	2	0.2			
Luxembourg	1	0.1			
Macedonia	1	0.1			

6 Cardiff University research staff population by Academic School

ARCHI	19
BIOSI	115
CARBS	38
CHEMY	48
CLAWS	6
COMSC	17
CPLAN	24
DENTL	18
EARTH	13
ENCAP	4
ENGIN	41
HISAR	2
JOMEC	2
MATHS	10
MEC01	37
MEDIC	247
OPTOM	19
PGMDE	1
PHRMY	24
PHYSX	44
PSYCH	58
RELIG	9
SOCSI	41
SOHCS	1
SONMS	5
WELSH	3

Appendix Three: Cardiff University-specific Questions

Section 6: Mentoring

40. Are you currently being mentored?

Yes

No

40.a. If 'yes' is this by

Someone in a similar role

Your PI

A more experienced academic within your School

An academic from another School

An academic at another higher education institution

Somebody outside the higher education sector

Other (please specify)

40.b. How has this helped you in your broader career development? (If you have identified more than one mentor in the list above please comment on each mentoring relationship separately).

40.c. If 'no' would you find it useful to be mentored by

Someone in a similar role

Your PI

A more experienced academic within your School

An academic from another School

An academic at another higher education institution

Somebody outside the higher education sector

Other (please specify)

40.d. How would you anticipate that this mentor relationship would help you in your broader career development? ? (If you have identified more than one mentor in the list above please comment on each mentoring relationship separately).

Section 7: Cardiff University Annual Career Development Conference for Research Staff

41. Did you attend the 2008 Research Staff Conference?

Yes

No

42. What would enable or encourage you to attend future Research Staff Conferences?