



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

Centre for Labour & Trade Union Studies
Department of Societies & Cultures

The 2003 PBRF Experience

A Survey of Academic Staff at the University of Waikato



William Cochrane
Michael Law
Tom Ryan

**A report prepared for the
Association of University Staff**

2005

THE 2003 PBRF EXPERIENCE

A SURVEY OF ACADEMIC STAFF AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO

**William Cochrane
Michael Law
Tom Ryan**

December 2005

**Centre for Labour & Trade Union Studies
Department of Societies & Cultures
Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences
The University of Waikato
Hamilton, New Zealand**

All queries regarding this paper should be directed to Dr Tom Ryan, The University of Waikato, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton, New Zealand or e-mail tryan@waikato.ac.nz

© The Centre for Labour and Trade Union Studies,
Department of Societies & Cultures
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
University of Waikato
Private Bag 3105
Hamilton
New Zealand

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Methodology.....	1
3. Results	2
3.1 Responses – Personal Characteristics.....	2
3.2 Responses – Gender Disaggregated	4
4. Summary.....	10
Appendix 1 – Questionnaire.....	12

List of Tables

Table 1: What is your gender?.....	3
Table 2: With which ethnic group do you most strongly identify?	3
Table 3: Which of the following best describes your current job title?.....	3
Table 4: In what school or faculty are you employed?.....	3
Table 5: Do you feel that your personal PBRF score/grade was a fair assessment of your actual research performance over the period 1997-2002?	4
Table 6: If you think that your personal PBRF score/grade was not a fair assessment of your actual research performance for the period concerned, do you feel that your personal PBRF score/grade was... ?	5
Table 7: Do you consider that your personal PBRF score/grade reflected the overall evaluation of your research performance by this University's own promotions processes over the same period of time?	5
Table 8: If you feel that your personal PBRF score/grade did not reflect the overall evaluation of your research performance by the University's own promotions processes over the same period of time, was your actual PBRF score/grade... ?	6
Table 9: Do you think that researchers focused on New Zealand/ Maori/ Pacific topics were disadvantaged by the fact that the PBRF system tends to rank European and North American publications more highly than local ones?.....	6
Table 10: Do you consider that emerging researchers should have their own particular PBRF category, distinct from the A/B/C/R categories?	6
Table 11: Do you believe that the levels of research achievement required for A, B, and C grades in the PBRF process were... ?	7
Table 12: Do you consider that the weighting in the PBRF process given to Research Outputs (70%), as distinct from Peer Esteem (15%) and Research Contribution (15%), was... ?	7
Table 13 Do you think that the output categories used in the PBRF system (eg. book, chapter, essay, design, performance) were appropriate?	7
Table 14: Do you think that the confidentiality of your personal PBRF score/grade has been satisfactorily maintained by the Tertiary Education Commission and your employer?	8
Table 15 Are you aware of any cases at your institution where management or academic staff have used PBRF scores/grades (either provisional or final) in promotions processes?	8
Table 16: Do you feel that the effect of the PBRF on academic staff morale and collegiality in your part of the University has been... ?	9
Table 17: Do you believe that the next round of the PBRF should be based on the research performance of... ?	9
Table 18: Do you think that problems internal to the PBRF process are sufficient to warrant a delay in holding the next round, currently scheduled for 2006?.....	9
Table 19: Overall how would you rate the PBRF system's ability to achieve its stated aims?.....	10

1. INTRODUCTION

In late 2004, the University of Waikato Branch of the Association of University Staff (AUS) requested the Centre for Labour and Trade Union Studies to conduct a web-based survey of local AUS members who had participated in the 2003 Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF) process. One of the Centre's general goals is to "carry out research on behalf of trade unions and other bodies and organisations with objectives that are compatible with the Centre's functions and orientations" (University of Waikato Calendar, 2005, p.803). The purposes of the study were to evaluate members' experiences of the PBRF and to ascertain what actual participants think could be done to improve this process.

At the time of this request, the Department of Societies and Cultures was trialling new software ('Survey System' 8.1®) for its Computer Aided Telephone Interviewing (CATI) survey facility which had been used successfully in a number of recent surveys. Along with the core CATI capacity, the facility also is capable of deploying web, e-mail, and mixed-mode surveys¹. The present survey was undertaken as part of a trial of the new software.

This report provides a summary analysis of the findings of that survey. Section 2 outlines the methodology used, and briefly discusses several technical problems encountered in the conduct of the survey. Section 3 reports some selected results of the survey, organized in both gendered and totalizing forms. Section 4 summarizes data and points that may be of particular interest to AUS as it further defines its views and policies on PBRF.

2. METHODOLOGY

The survey questionnaire was developed by AUS in consultation with the Department of Societies and Cultures, and was subject to the usual ethical approval procedures (see Appendix 1). Prior to the survey being deployed, each of the target e-mail addresses provided by the AUS was sent an e-mail advising that the survey was taking place, its purpose, and that it was sanctioned by AUS.

It was undertaken using the web-based survey component of the 'Survey System' 8.1® software. The process involved a list of target e-mail addresses and some explanatory text being fed into the survey system. The latter sent each of the target e-mail addresses an e-mail containing the explanatory text and an embedded link to the survey website. When clicked on, this link took each respondent to the survey website where they completed the process. Each respondent could complete the survey only once, as the embedded link contains an encrypted password that matched a list of unused passwords on the host server. The initial e-mailing was followed some weeks later by a follow-up to the e-mail addresses that had not yet responded to the original mail out.

This system of deployment worked surprisingly well, given that this was the first local field trial of a complicated system. Difficulties were experienced, however, with the

¹ Mixed-mode surveys combine two or more of the systems functionalities, i.e. web and e-mail, e-mail and CATI, etc.

inability of some web browsers to interact with the ‘Survey System’, and of some e-mail clients to correctly interpret the embedded link in the ‘Invitation to Participate’. Another problem encountered was that the University’s firewall was not pin-holed to allow access from machines external to the University back to the server upon which the survey was resident. A number of strategies were implemented to overcome these difficulties.

With e-mail clients who could not correctly interpret the embedded link, cutting and pasting the link directly from the e-mail into the browser usually proved effective. Failing this, copies of the surveys were e-mailed as attachments to those affected for manual completion and return. Such responses were then manually coded into the system. This approach also was adopted for people who did not have access to their University machine for some reason, such as being overseas. These difficulties were compounded by misspecification of the URL in the follow-up mail out.

Since the completion of the PBRF survey we have explored a number of technical fixes of a more permanent nature that will minimize the chances of a respondent experiencing such difficulties in the future. Problems with the interaction of the ‘Survey System’ and the University’s firewall have also been addressed with the server on which the web and e-mail components are resident being correctly pin-holed.

3. RESULTS

The results of the survey are presented in this section in two parts:

- Section 3.1 reports the responses to the ‘personal characteristics’ questions asked in the final part of the survey.
- Section 3.2 reports the responses to a selection of the substantive questions asked. These questions required either Likert, binary, or qualitative write-in responses. The last of these, the qualitative ‘written responses’, are not reported here.

The tables in the latter section are disaggregated by gender. This is not to suggest that this is the only disaggregation of interest; rather, it reflects the unfortunately small cell sizes for some of the demographic variables that might otherwise have been of interest. For instance, of the 114 responses that specified ethnicity, only 17, or around 15 percent, specified an ethnicity other than Pakeha/European (see Table 2). All tables, cross-tabulations and charts in this report have been prepared using SPSS 12.

3.1 Responses – Personal Characteristics

Ideally, the demographic characteristics of the sample obtained from this survey should have been compared to that of the relevant population of AUS membership – i.e. those eligible to submit PBRF portfolios. However, for reasons of privacy this was not possible. That said, there is reason to believe that this sample is representative of the relevant AUS population, as the 126 responses obtained represent about 40% of the membership of that population at the time the survey was undertaken. The results of the four questions about personal characteristics of respondents drew the following patterns of responses:

Table 1: What is your gender?

	Frequency	Percent
Male	64	50.8
Female	55	43.7
Total (Valid)	119	94.4
Missing	7	5.6
Total	126	100.0

Table 2: With which ethnic group do you most strongly identify?

	Frequency	Percent
Pakeha/European	97	77.0
Maori	4	3.2
Pacific Islander	1	0.8
Asian	3	2.4
Other	9	7.1
Total (Valid)	114	90.5
Missing	12	9.5
Total	126	100.0

Table 3: Which of the following best describes your current job title?

	Frequency	Percent
Professor	21	16.7
Associate Professor	12	9.5
Senior Lecturer	50	39.7
Lecturer/Other	37	29.4
Total (Valid)	120	95.2
Missing	6	4.8
Total	126	100.0

Table 4: In what school or faculty are you employed?

	Frequency	Percent
Arts & Social Sciences	46	36.5
Computing & Mathematical Sciences	12	9.5
Education	11	8.7
Law	7	5.6
Management	19	15.1
Maori & Pacific Development	1	0.8
Science & Engineering	21	16.7
Other	2	1.6
Total (Valid)	119	94.4
Missing	7	5.6
Total	126	100.0

If a profile of a ‘typical’ respondent can be sketched, s/he would be slightly more likely to be male than female (50 as against 43 percent), most likely to be Pakeha/European in ethnic identification (77 percent), somewhat more likely to be a Senior Lecturer than any other job classification (39 percent), and twice as likely to be based in Arts and Social Sciences than in any other of the six schools at Waikato (36 percent). The first three personal characteristics arguably outline a respondent who fits the profile of the average academic at the University. Only the fourth seems to be non-representative: it presumably reflects the relatively high degree of union membership in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences – particularly in contrast to the low degree in the second largest academic division, the Waikato Management School, and coverage by a different union (ASTE) of a significant portion of academic staff in the third largest division, the Waikato Education School.

Given the overall similarities between academic staff profiles in the different New Zealand universities, and the not dissimilar overall results for staff from these respective institutions in the 2003 PBRF exercise, it seems reasonable also to assume that the opinions expressed in the present survey likewise represent a valid cross-section of the views of academic staff in the New Zealand university sector generally. The main qualification to this view would relate to gender, given that Waikato University has a higher ratio of women academics employed than most other New Zealand universities.

3.2 Responses – Gender Disaggregated

Table 5 indicates that a clear majority of respondents believe that the PBRF process resulted in a fair assessment of their overall research performance. However, over a third of respondents felt that this was not the case. Males were somewhat more likely than females to feel that the process had yielded an unfair result, by over 7 percentage points, while females were considerably more likely to record a ‘do not know’ response.

Table 5: Do you feel that your personal PBRF score/grade was a fair assessment of your actual research performance over the period 1997-2002?

(n = 116)	Yes	No	Do not know	Total
Male	53.2%	41.9%	4.8%	100.0%
Female	50.0%	33.3%	16.7%	100.0%
Total	51.7%	37.9%	10.3%	100.0%

Of those 55 respondents who either did not feel that the PBRF process had yielded them a fair personal result, or did not know (Table 6), an impressive 85 percent felt that the process had adversely assessed their performance. By contrast, less than two percent – only women, for some unknown reason – felt that their PBRF score/grade was ‘higher than warranted’. Females also were somewhat more likely than males to report a ‘do not know’ response while, conversely, males were more likely to claim that the PBRF process had assessed their performance at an unfairly low level.

Table 6: If you think that your personal PBRF score/grade was not a fair assessment of your actual research performance for the period concerned, do you feel that your personal PBRF score/grade was...?

(n=55)	Considerably lower than warranted	Lower than warranted	Higher than warranted	Do not know	Total
Male	13.3%	76.7%		10.0%	100.0%
Female	12.0%	68.0%	4.0%	16.0%	100.0%
Total	12.7%	72.7%	1.8%	12.7%	

Female respondents were equally divided as to whether the PBRF process and the University’s own promotions process had yielded similar appraisals of their research performance, with about a fifth of them indicating a ‘do not know’ response (Table 7). Male respondents were not so equally divided, with the largest proportion of them reporting that the PBRF and University assessments of their research performance were not in accord, being some 13 percentage points more than the number agreeing with the proposition. Overall, 7 percentage points more respondents believed that the University and PBRF assessments were not in accord than believed they were, though a sizeable group – around a sixth – ‘did not know’ either way.

Table 7: Do you consider that your personal PBRF score/grade reflected the overall evaluation of your research performance by this University’s own promotions processes over the same period of time?

(n = 118)	Yes	No	Do not know	Total
Male	35.5%	48.4%	16.1%	100.0%
Female	40.4%	40.4%	19.2%	100.0%
Total	37.7%	44.7%	17.5%	100.0%

Table 8 elaborates on the views of the 65 (44.7%) respondents who reported that their personal PBRF scores were not reflected in the University promotions’ evaluation of their research performance over the same period. Of these, close to half of both male and female respondents believed that the PBRF process had assessed them at a level ‘lower’ or ‘very much lower’ than their performance in the University’s promotions processes would indicate. Nevertheless, a considerable group – for males about a third, females about a quarter – reported that they fared better with PBRF than under the University system. Oddly, a relatively large portion of female respondents reported that they ‘do not know’ whether the PBRF evaluation was higher or lower than indicated by the University’s promotion system.

Table 8: If you feel that your personal PBRF score/grade did not reflect the overall evaluation of your research performance by the University’s own promotions processes over the same period of time, was your actual PBRF score/grade... ?

(n = 65)	Very much higher than indicated by University’s promotion process	Higher than indicated by University’s promotion process	Lower than indicated by University’s promotion process	Very much lower than indicated by University’s promotion process	Do not know	Total
Male	8.6%	25.7%	45.7%	2.9%	17.1%	100.0%
Female	6.7%	16.7%	36.7%	10.0%	30.0%	100.0%
Total	7.7%	21.5%	41.5%	6.2%	23.1%	100.0%

When asked if researchers focused on New Zealand/Maori/Pacific topics were disadvantaged by the fact that the PBRF system tends to rank European and North American publications more highly than local ones (Table 9), female respondents who expressed a view other than ‘do not know’ were all of the opinion that such researchers were either disadvantaged or very disadvantaged, in around equal numbers. With male respondents the picture is not as clear cut, though of those who had an opinion other than ‘do not know’ the majority clearly held the view that such researchers were disadvantaged. For both female (36 percent) and male (58 percent) respondents, a large proportion gave ‘do not know’ responses.

Table 9: Do you think that researchers focused on New Zealand/ Maori/ Pacific topics were disadvantaged by the fact that the PBRF system tends to rank European and North American publications more highly than local ones?

(n = 119)	Very disadvantaged	Disadvantaged	Advantaged	Very advantaged	Do not know	Total
Male	5.0%	31.7%	3.3%	1.7%	58.3%	100.0%
Female	30.9%	32.7%			36.4%	100.0%
Total	17.4%	32.2%	1.7%	.9%	47.8%	100.0%

By comparison, Table 10 shows one of the most decisive results of this survey, with both female and – though less so – male respondents clearly favouring a special PBRF category for ‘emerging researchers’. It is noteworthy that the number of ‘do not know’ responses is low in contrast to most other questions in this survey, which suggests a substantial consensus on and understanding of this issue.

Table 10: Do you consider that emerging researchers should have their own particular PBRF category, distinct from the A/B/C/R categories?

(n = 123)	Yes	No	Do not know	Total
Male	76.6%	15.6%	7.8%	100.0%
Female	81.8%	10.9%	7.3%	100.0%
Total	79.0%	13.4%	7.6%	100.0%

Equal proportions of male respondents believed that the levels of research achievement required for A, B, and C grades in the PBRF process were either ‘about right’ or ‘too high’ (Table 11), while somewhat over a sixth replied that they ‘do not know’. For females, nearly a third said ‘do not know’, while most of the remainder of women, by 9 points, believed the research achievement level was ‘too high’. Overall, slightly more respondents believed the requirement was ‘too high’ rather than ‘about right’, though a significant quarter of respondents overall chose ‘do not know’.

Table 11: Do you believe that the levels of research achievement required for A, B, and C grades in the PBRF process were... ?

(n = 120)	Too low	About right	Too high	Do not know	Total
Male	1.6%	41.0%	39.3%	18.0%	100.0%
Female		29.1%	38.2%	32.7%	100.0%
Total	0.9%	35.3%	38.8%	25.0%	100.0%

In terms of the relative weight given to research outputs in the PBRF process, a clear majority of male respondents believed that the 70 percent weighting was ‘about right’ (Table 12), with close to 50 percent of female respondents sharing this view. But women were nearly twice as likely as males to believe that the output weighting was ‘too high’, while males were more likely than females to believe it was ‘too low’.

Table 12: Do you consider that the weighting in the PBRF process given to Research Outputs (70%), as distinct from Peer Esteem (15%) and Research Contribution (15%), was... ?

(n = 120)	Too low	About right	Too high	Do not know	Total
Male	16.1%	54.8%	21.0%	8.1%	100.0%
Female	7.3%	49.1%	40.0%	3.6%	100.0%
Total	12.0%	52.1%	29.9%	6.0%	100.0%

About two-thirds of male respondents felt that the output categories used by the PBRF (Table 13) were appropriate, with only a small proportion giving a ‘do not know’ response. The response from female respondents was more mixed, with a relatively high proportion saying ‘do not know’ and markedly weaker support for the proposition. Overall, more than half the respondents agreed that the output categories used in PBRF were appropriate, while under a third disagreed.

Table 13 Do you think that the output categories used in the PBRF system (eg. book, chapter, essay, design, performance) were appropriate?

(n = 122)	Yes	No	Do not know	Total
Male	65.1%	28.6%	6.3%	100.0%
Female	43.6%	34.5%	21.8%	100.0%
Total	55.1%	31.4%	13.6%	100.0%

Table 14 reports views on the confidentiality of PBRF scores/grades. Male respondents are considerably more likely than female – by 30 percentage points – to

believe that their confidentiality had been maintained, though much of the difference would appear to arise from the high level of ‘do not know’ responses amongst female respondents. Even given this, the proportion of female respondents believing that their confidentiality had not been respected is some 10 percentage points higher than for males. Nevertheless, twice as many respondents agreed that their privacy had been maintained than thought otherwise.

Table 14: Do you think that the confidentiality of your personal PBRF score/grade has been satisfactorily maintained by the Tertiary Education Commission and your employer?

(n = 121)	Yes	No	Do not know	Total
Male	68.3%	19.0%	12.7%	100.0%
Female	38.2%	29.1%	32.7%	100.0%
Total	54.2%	23.7%	22.0%	100.0%

Slightly over a quarter of those surveyed reported that they were aware of cases in which PBRF scores/grades have been used in University promotion processes (Table 15). Some caution is advised in interpreting this result, however, as a single case of such conduct may have come to the attention of multiple respondents. Hence, this answer is not a good indicator of the extent to which this practice occurs. Written comments on the question, not reported here, were consistent – and to them we would apply the same caution.

Table 15: Are you aware of any cases at your institution where management or academic staff have used PBRF scores/grades (either provisional or final) in promotions processes?

(n= 122)	Yes	No	Do not know	Total
Male	25.0%	56.3%	18.87%	100.0%
Female	30.9%	41.8%	27.3%	100.0%
Total	27.7%	49.6%	22.7%	100.0%

Around 85 percent of female respondents felt that the PBRF process has had a ‘negative’ or ‘very negative’ effect upon staff morale and collegiality in their area of the University (Table 16). However, male respondents shared this view to a considerably lesser extent than females, and nearly a sixth of males believe that the PBRF had a positive effect. Most importantly, three-quarters of respondents considered the overall impact of the PBRF on workplace relations to have been negative or very negative.

Table 16: Do you feel that the effect of the PBRF on academic staff morale and collegiality in your part of the University has been... ?

(n = 119)	Very negative	Negative	No effect	Positive	Very positive	Do not know	Total
Male	11.3%	53.2%	16.1%	12.9%	3.2%	3.2%	100.0%
Female	29.1%	56.4%	3.6%	3.6%		7.3%	100.0%
Total	19.7%	54.7%	10.3%	8.5%	1.7%	5.1%	100.0%

The proposal that the basis of assessment in future PBRF rounds should be academic units, rather than individuals, was preferred by a small majority of respondents (Table 17). Half of males and a slightly lesser percentage of females support this view – the lower proportion of women probably reflecting their relatively high level of ‘do not know’ responses. It should be noted, nevertheless, that the current basis of assessment, the individual academic staff member, is favoured by 40 percent of respondents overall, with males again being more inclined to think this way than females.

Table 17: Do you believe that the next round of the PBRF should be based on the research performance of... ?

(n = 120)	Individual staff	Academic units	Do not know	Total
Male	43.8%	50.0%	6.3%	100.0%
Female	35.2%	42.6%	22.2%	100.0%
Total	39.8%	46.6%	13.6%	100.0%

Table 18 indicates that over half of respondents favoured postponing the 2006 PBRF round, with nearly equal proportions of males and females taking this view. Males, however, were considerably more likely than females to oppose this view, while females were markedly more likely to give a ‘do not know’ response.

Table 18: Do you think that problems internal to the PBRF process are sufficient to warrant a delay in holding the next round, currently scheduled for 2006?

(n= 117)	Yes	No	Do not know	Total
Male	51.6%	40.3%	8.1%	100.0%
Female	52.8%	26.4%	20.8%	100.0%
Total	52.2%	33.9%	13.9%	100.0%

The final question reported here (Table 19) invited respondents to give an assessment of the PBRF system’s ability ‘to achieve its stated aims’. Overall, close to 50 percent judged the system’s capacity in the negative. Both male and female respondents show similar levels of adverse assessment of the PBRF, though females are more likely to rate it ‘very poorly’. Around a third of respondents, slightly more female than male, returned a neutral response of ‘neither poorly nor highly’. Just ten percent of the total rated the PBRF’s ability to achieve its aims as ‘highly’ or ‘very highly’, with males the most likely to think this way.

Table 19: Overall how would you rate the PBRF system’s ability to achieve its stated aims?

(n = 117)	Very poorly	Poorly	Neither poorly or highly	Highly	Very highly	Do not know	Total
Male	15.9%	34.9%	31.7%	9.5%	3.2%	4.8%	100.0%
Female	20.8%	28.3%	35.8%	5.7%	1.9%	7.5%	100.0%
Total	18.1%	31.9%	33.6%	7.8%	2.6%	6.0%	100.0%

4. SUMMARY

It is likely that the PBRF system, in some form or other, is going to be part of the New Zealand academic landscape for some time yet. Clearly, the present survey provides one of the most comprehensive insights to date into how New Zealand academics found the experience of the first PBRF round, and how in retrospect they now think about it. The purpose of this final part of the report, therefore, is to summarize key points of agreement or significant trends revealed by the survey, and to link these findings to policy debates of particular interest to the Association of University Staff.

As has been shown in Section 3.2, the issue of gender in the PBRF context is one that needs to be confronted. The survey reveals considerable differences between female and male experiences and perceptions of the 2003 exercise, and about the institution at large. Of particular concern must be the tendency of women respondents to answer questions in the negative or with a ‘do not know’. This may reflect a sense of alienation from the PBRF process. It also may be linked to women being more likely than men to be located at the lower end of the academic employment spectrum, and thus also being more likely to see the PBRF as a negative imposition rather than a positive opportunity. Further investigations of the qualitative data may provide further insights. Given that the University of Waikato is usually considered to have a better track record than other New Zealand universities for the employment of female academics, comparative data on the PBRF experiences of women from a range of institutions could also be informative.

Similarly important is the issue of fairness, or at least perceptions of fairness, in the PBRF process and in university employment practices at large. While a clear majority of surveyed staff believe that their personal PBRF score/grade provided a fair evaluation of their actual research performance for the period in question, a large minority nevertheless believes that their PBRF score/grade was too low. The last view seems to be connected to the fact that almost half of those surveyed said there was a difference between how they were evaluated by the PBRF and by their University’s own promotions process. Of the latter group, most said they were judged more generously by the University than by the PBRF system, with a smaller group stating the opposite.

This pattern foreshadows an ongoing dilemma in New Zealand university promotions contexts, as employers are tempted to deploy ostensibly ‘confidential’ PBRF results in an effort to slow promotions for those academics retrospectively deemed to have been over-compensated in the recent past by normal promotion channels, or to reward

others belatedly considered to have been harshly treated by the same. Meanwhile, academic staff who believe that their recent research achievements continue to be undervalued by their employer, and who want a reconsideration of their employment status, will feel under pressure to divulge their PBRF results as primary evidence for their claims.

Without a doubt, the significant disparities indicated by this survey between recent university evaluations of staff research and those determined by the PBRF process seem set to create ongoing disequilibrium in employment processes and workplace relations. This in turn promises to make a travesty of official claims that PBRF results should not influence the conduct of universities' internal promotions procedures. Clearly, the full implications of this situation have yet to be confronted by staff unions, university managements, and other parties charged with monitoring the impact of the PBRF.

On a number of points, however, there was very clear support from those surveyed for the PBRF system and its mode of implementation by the relevant authorities. In particular, respondents expressed satisfaction with the respective weightings given to the three parts of the personal evaluation process, and with the output categories used in the PBRF exercise. Similarly, there was endorsement by many participants for efforts by their employer and the Tertiary Education Commission to maintain the confidentiality of personal PBRF scores/grades, with a healthy majority saying they were not aware of cases where their University had used PBRF scores/grades in the promotions process.

But negative opinions of the PBRF also were not hard to find, even if sometimes they were expressed as relatively slender respondent margins. For example, the view that: the levels of research achievement required for A, B, and C grades in the PBRF process are set too high; or that problems internal to the PBRF system are sufficient to warrant a delay in the next round, scheduled for 2006; or that the unit of assessment in future rounds should be the academic unit rather than, as at present, the individual researcher. The last proposal is current AUS policy.

However, another set of negative opinions were expressed by solid majorities. One of these was that researchers working on New Zealand, Maori, and Pacific themes and/or publishing through local presses should be seen to be not disadvantaged relative to colleagues engaging with more international/global topics and outlets. Then there was the overwhelming support for the view that new and emerging researchers should be given their own PBRF category, distinct from the existing A/B/C/R categories.

Finally, and perhaps most important in terms of thinking about the future of the PBRF, fundamentally negative answers were returned for questions regarding: first, the capacity of the PBRF system to achieve its designers' stated aims; and second, the overall effect of the 2003 exercise on collegiality and morale in respondents' workplaces. The problems implied by these responses probably can not be resolved by tinkering around the edges of the system. Rather, they point to major doubts about the long term viability of the PBRF.

Appendix 1 – Questionnaire

Q1 Did you actually submit an Evidence Portfolio in the recent PBFR exercise?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Do not know

Q2 Do you feel that your personal PBRF score/grade was a fair assessment of your actual research performance over the period 1997-2002?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Do not know

Q3 If you think that your personal PBRF score/grade was not a fair assessment of your actual research performance for the period concerned, do you feel that your personal PBRF score/grade was

- 1 Considerably lower than warranted
- 2 Lower than warranted
- 3 Higher than warranted
- 4 Considerably higher than warranted
- 5 Do not know

Q4 Do you consider that your personal PBRF score/grade reflected the overall evaluation of your research performance by this University's own promotions processes over the same period of time?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Do not know

Q5 If you feel that your personal PBRF score/grade did not reflect the overall evaluation of your research performance by the University's own promotions processes over the same period of time, was your actual PBRF score/grade

- 1 Very much higher than indicated by Universities promotion process
- 2 Higher than indicated by Universities promotion process
- 3 Lower than indicated by Universities promotion process
- 4 Very lower than indicated by Universities promotion process
- 5 Do not know

Q6 Do you have any comments on matters relating to Questions 1-5?

Q7 Do you think that researchers focussed on New Zealand/ Maori/ Pacific topics were disadvantaged by the fact that the PBRF system tends to rank European and North American publications more highly than local ones?

- 1 Very disadvantaged
- 2 Disadvantaged
- 3 Advantaged
- 4 Very advantaged
- 5 Do not know

Q8 Do you consider that emerging researchers should have their own particular PBRF category, distinct from the existing A/B/C/R categories?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Do not know

- Q9 Do you believe that the levels of research achievement required for A,B, and C grades in the PBRF process were
- 1 Too low
 - 2 About right
 - 3 Too high
 - 4 Do not know
- Q10 Do you consider that the weighting in the PBRF process given to Research Outputs (70%), as distinct from Peer Esteem (15%) and Research Contribution (15%), was
- 1 Too low
 - 2 About right
 - 3 Too high
 - 4 Do not know
- Q11 Do you think that the output categories used in the PBRF system (eg. book, chapter, design, performance) were appropriate?
- 1 Yes
 - 2 No
 - 3 Do not know
- Q12 Did you use the 'Special Circumstances' section of the PBRF Evidence Portfolio?
- 1 Yes
 - 2 no
 - 3 Do not know
- Q13 If you did use the 'Special Circumstances' section, do you feel that what you entered in that section was appropriately reflected in your personal PBRF score/grade?
- 1 Yes
 - 2 no
 - 3 Do not know
- Q14 Do you have any comments on matters relating to Questions 7-13?
- Q15 Do you think that the confidentiality of your personal PBRF score/grade has been satisfactorily maintained by the Tertiary Education Commission and your employer?
- 1 Yes
 - 2 No
 - 3 Do not know
- Q16 Are you aware of any cases at your institution where management or academic staff have used PBRF scores/grades (either provisional or final) in promotions processes?
- 1 Yes
 - 2 no
 - 3 Do not know
- Q17 Are you aware of any examples of the University using PBRF scores/grades for the recruitment or selection of new academic staff?
- 1 Yes
 - 2 no
 - 3 Do not know
- Q18 Do you feel that the effect of the PBRF on academic staff morale and collegiality in your part of the University has been
- | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1 Very negative | 4 Positive |
| 2 Negative | 5 Very positive |
| 3 No effect | 6 Do not know |

Q19 Do you believe that the next round of the PBRF should be based on the research performance of

- 1 Individual staff
- 2 Academic units
- 3 Do not know

Q20 Do you think that problems internal to the PBRF process are sufficient to warrant a delay in holding the next round, currently scheduled for 2006?

- 1 Yes
- 2 no
- 3 Do not know

Q21 Overall how would you rate the PBRF system's ability to achieve its stated aims?

- 1 Very poorly
- 2 poorly
- 3 Neither poorly or highly
- 4 Highly
- 5 Very highly
- 6 Do not know

Q22 Do you have any comments on matters relating to Questions 14-21?

Q23 In what school or faculty are you employed?

- 1 Arts & Social Sciences
- 2 Computing & Mathematical Sciences
- 3 Education
- 4 Law
- 5 Management
- 6 Maori & Pacific Development
- 7 Science & Engineering
- 8 Other

Q24 Which of the following best describes your current job title?

- 1 Professor
- 2 Associate Professor
- 3 Senior Lecturer
- 4 Assistant Lecturer
- 5 Other
- 6 Lecturer

Q25 With which ethnic group do you most strongly identify?

- 1 Pakeha/European
- 2 Maori
- 3 Pacific Islander
- 4 Asian
- 5 Other

Q26 What is your gender?

- 1 Male
- 2 Female