## Part I: An Unequal Support Conundrum



In early 2018, a post on Career Support Group (CSG) asking about the challenges faced by women in their work place/graduate school, got an overwhelming response. There were stories and struggles shared, but also support and willingness to take action. This led to the inception of Women in Science (WiS) sub-group of the PhD Career Support Group (CSG), a group of volunteers both women and men who care about the challenges faced by women in their lives. This survey is a part of an initiative to identify and address gaps in the support received by women researchers in a professional STEM environment and will be published as a 5-part series on ClubSciWri.

The survey had 220 participants and their demographics are as follows:
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As a postdoctoral researcher, Shrini was always supported by his supervisor.
Together, as a team, Shrini and his supervisor were working toward Shrini's first funded grant. This implied navigating every highs and lows through five different grant cycles. From aiding in writing skills to strategizing the science pitch to moral support, Shrini's supervisor mentored and steered him toward his science career.

Shrini's friend, Amy, a third year PhD candidate, was experiencing a tad hostility.
She was told to not "waste time" in conferences when she could spend the same time in lab hours. She was also discouraged from applying to a mere travel grant because the advisor had sufficient funds. In retrospect, Amy regrets not being able to reap benefits of attending a conference or the fulfilment of winning a travel award.
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## Colleagues



## Introduction

It is inevitable that the support one receives from mentors, co-workers and the workplace environment plays a major role in shaping up one's career. Surveys point to the skewed nature of women/girl participation in STEM careers - not because of a paucity of talent but several other factors including social and cultural values, lack of adequate mentoring and workplace support in general. Most individual success stories, along with self initiative of course, highlight the significance of a mentor. That Amy's and Shrini's careers turned out differently is no surprise.

The Career Support Group - Women in Science (CSGWiS ) survey series is an attempt to gather and understand quantitative and qualitative data about work environments as experienced by women and men with advanced degrees. The survey asked respondents about the 'level of support' they received in their respective work environments from group leaders (similar to a supervisor in some settings), colleagues, collaborators, clients and family members. 'Gender' of the mentor, colleague, collaborator or family member was a variable the respondents had to consider. In addition, they had to pick one of six options for the 'level of support' received: always, moderately, mostly, never, rarely or not available. See schematic 1.

|  | Always | Mostly | Moderately | Rarely | Never | Not Applicable |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underline{\text { Group leader }}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Colleagues | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Clients | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| $\underline{\text { Collaborators }}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Parents | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Spouse | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Friends | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |

Schematic 1: A snapshot of the survey showing how the question was framed and how respondents had to choose the 'level of support' based on working and personal relationships.

In this report we present and discuss the results of this survey vis-a-vis 'levels of support' experienced by the respondents.

Two caveats the reader must keep in mind. (i) Our interpretation assumes that response Always equals unequivocal support 80-100\% of the time; Mostly equals support 60-80\% of the time; Moderately equals support 40-60\% and Rarely equals support 0-40\% of the
time (see schematic 2). Of course this is arbitrary and survey respondents may have had another scale in their minds. What is mostly for one respondent maybe moderately for another, and (ii) we use the word 'support' indicating mentorship, financial help, encouragement and general help that one requires to grow to full potential working in a STEM environment. In the context of this survey it depends on the interpretation of the respondent.

| 100 | 90 | 80 | 70 | 60 | 50 | 40 | 30 | 20 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Always |  | Mostly | Moderately | Rarely |  |  |  |  |  |

Schematic 2: Schematic showing our interpretation of 'Levels of Support'. All numbers are percentages. The reader must keep this scale in mind while referring to figures 1-6.

Majority of our respondents were Indian nationals (90.4\%) working across the world. About 32\% of the Indians polled work in India, 48\% in USA and 20\% in other countries. Our respondents were predominantly female (73.5\%) and maximum survey responses were filled in the USA (45.6\%) followed by India (29.2\%).

Keeping this in mind we analyzed our results by subsetting survey responses by geographical regions. Three regions were explored - India, USA and the rest of the world (RoW). Next we categorized responses by gender and determined unique trends.

No matter how we segregated the data, a few key findings remained invariant. First, most people have worked with more male supervisors (an average of 3) compared to female supervisors (average of 1). This points to a lack of female leadership, which is unfortunately relevant across various professional fields. Second, most people reported being 'mostly' supported by their co-workers be it group leaders, colleagues or collaborators. Third, our survey shows across region and gender divide a strong family support - be it friends, parents or spouse- exists.

In the next few sections we present category wise survey results.

For analysis and presentation, the data were segregated into three groups. In Figs 1-6, Group 1 represents respondents from India (circles). Group 2 represents respondents from USA (squares) and Group 3 represents rest of the world (RoW, triangles). For each group, data was further divided by gender of respondents. Pink symbols show all pooled data by region; green symbols show responses by women and blue show responses by men.

## Support from Male Group Leaders

Fig. 1 presents results from the survey question asking respondents to rate the level of support they received from Male group leaders.


1. In the 'always' category, male group leaders (GL) in the US were found to be more supportive of their subordinates than in India and RoW. Indian Male GLs were found to be the least supportive. When we looked at gender specific responses, across the three categories, women were better supported by male group leaders.
2. In India and US, women experienced better support from Male GLs. Maximum respondents who polled ( $\sim 35 \%$ ) were 'mostly' supported by male group leaders' regardless of the country they worked in. When we split responses along gender and region lines we found that in both India and USA more men feel 'moderately' supported by male GLs (compare blue circles and squares across the 'mostly' and 'moderately' categories) whereas more females polled in the 'mostly' category (compare green circles and squares across the 'mostly' and 'moderately' categories).
3. The two lack of support categories - 'rarely' and 'never'- were interesting. From India, only one person (a woman) replied never and no one replied rarely. This was not the case with data from the US or RoW. All negative responses from the US were female respondents and men seemed to not have experienced a lack of support.
4. Overall RoW fared poorly when compared to others be it men or women respondents. $10 \%$ of people reported 'rarely' being helped while $\sim 5 \%$ reported 'never'.

## Support from Female Group Leaders

Fig. 2 presents results from the survey question asking respondents to rate the level of support they received from Female group leaders.


1. Female GLs from US were 'always' more helpful when compared with Female GLs from India or RoW. The majority of our respondents in India (38\%) and RoW (43.4\%) reported being 'mostly' supported from female group leaders. This was in sharp contrast to US where maximum people (30.6\%) reported being 'always' supported by female group leaders.
2. In fact, Female Group Leaders in the US were consistently helpful - compare pink squares across 'always', 'mostly' and 'moderately' categories. Surprisingly they also lead in the 'never' category.
3. Female group Leaders from India, at $\sim 15 \%$, were most likely to 'rarely' support people working with them. More people reported being unsupported by female GLs than male GLs across regions.
4. Most people who reported 'never' or 'rarely' being supported were women. This begs us to ask the question if a same sex bias exists.

## Support from Male Colleagues

Fig. 3 presents results from the survey question asking respondents to rate the level of support they received from Male Colleagues.


1. Across regions, the maximum number of responses ( $48.5 \%$ from India, $42.8 \%$ from US and $50.9 \%$ from RoW) polled in the 'mostly' category.
2. Male colleagues in India were 'always' more helpful towards their coworkers. They are also most likely to 'rarely' help when compared to counterparts from USA and RoW.
3. In categories that measured lack of support women polled higher than men.
4. Data from India showed that a larger fraction of men cannot expect help from male colleagues. This also raised the question if a same sex bias exists.

## Support from Female Colleagues

Fig. 4 presents results from the survey question asking respondents to rate the level of support they received from Female Colleagues


1) Regardless of the region, maximum number of responses polled in the 'mostly' category. Region wise breakup was: $42.1 \%$ polled from India, $32.6 \%$ from US and 48.1\% from RoW.
2) Compared to male colleagues ( $\sim 20 \%$, see Fig 3), female colleagues in the US were remarkably 'always' more helpful towards others ( $31.8 \%$, see Fig4).
3) Female colleagues in US were also less likely to help others when compared with their counterparts in India and RoW.
4) Once again women were disproportionately affected by the lack of support (see 'never' and 'rarely' categories).

## Support from Male Collaborators

Fig. 5 presents results from the survey question asking respondents to rate the level of support they received from Male Collaborators.


1) Regardless of the region, maximum number of responses (53.45\% from India, 42.04\% from US and 45.8\% from RoW) polled in the 'mostly' category.
2) Different from other groups, men in the USA were equally supported both 'always' and 'moderately'. They were also least likely to not be supported compared to men polled from India and RoW.
3) Regardless of region, more women were unsupported compared to men.

## Support from Female Collaborators

Fig. 6 presents results from the survey question asking respondents to rate the level of support received from Female Collaborators.


1) Regardless of the region, maximum number of responses (59.18\% from India, 37.66\% from US and $50 \%$ from RoW ) polled in the 'mostly' category.
2) In the 'always' category female collaborators from India fare poorly when compared to counterparts from US and RoW polling in close to $5 \%$. This was lower than responses polled from US ( $\sim 30 \%$ ) and RoW ( $\sim 25 \%$ ).
3) Female collaborators in the US were 'always' more supportive of both male and female co-workers whereas female collaborators in India and RoW were 'mostly' supportive.
4) Women collaborators in the US were also marginally likely to 'never' support their co-workers.
5) Women collaborators, regardless of region, are 'rarely' likely to support others - particularly women.

## What does 'Not Available’ data tell us?

Fig.7- Graph depicts all 'not available' responses as a percentage of total number of male and female response. Higher the percentage, higher is the degree of lack of interaction. More people, be it men or women, lack female collaborators. A similar trend was observed for female group leaders.


All the percentages presented above were calculated after removing 'not available' (NA) data points. It was
clear people responding with 'not available' implied that they had no direct experience of working with a male or female co-worker hence could not respond to questions of support. We chose to interpret these NAs as a measure of 'lack of interaction' (Fig.7).

More number of people had no direct experience of working with a female group leader ( $\sim 16 \%, 35$ NA's in 219 responses) or a female collaborator ( $\sim 23 \%, 51$ NAs in 219 responses) in comparison to their male counterparts. For example, only 7 people have no direct experience of working with a male group leader ( $\sim 3 \%$ ) and 16 of not working with a male collaborator ( $7.3 \%$ ).

These numbers seem to reinforce what we already know about work environments in STEM, i.e. in leadership positions men dominate and fewer women run their own labs. This also correlates with another metric in our survey data - the average number of male bosses one respondent worked with was thrice the average number of female bosses. Nearly $34 \%$ of respondents from India and $21 \%$ of respondents from the US have not worked with a female boss.

At $\sim 23 \%$, the lack of female collaborators is a bit alarming. If we break this down by gender we see both men and women lack female collaborators with men faring marginally ( $12 / 51$ NAs or $\sim 21 \%$ ) better than women ( $39 / 51$ NA responses, $\sim 24 \%$ ). When we look at the lack of male collaborators ( 25 NAs in data) women fare poorly when compared to men. 22 NA responses came from women respondents ( $\sim 13.6 \%$ and only 3 from men respondents ( $\sim 5 \%$ ).

It is striking that women lag behind men in setting up work collaborations. Men fare better but in general have fewer female collaborators. The importance of collaborative work in STEM cannot be understated and if women are not succeeding in setting up collaborations their career development and progression will most likely suffer.

## Conclusions

The first part of our analysis sheds light at some interesting trends.


Most people report being 'mostly' supported by male or female co-workers which leads one to believe that people find, on the whole, their work environments agreeable. This is counterintuitive on two accounts. Compared to women, men in general reported higher job satisfaction across different academic fields as surveys conducted by National Science Foundation (NSF) have shown multiple times (Fig.8). In fact these surveys reported a decrease in job satisfaction from 1997-2010. The NSF survey reported zero job satisfaction for women across all fields.

Postdoctoral surveys in US and Canada have highlighted the need for better support systems and mentorship for career advancement. Different from these reports most people we surveyed, a majority of whom were women, reported being 'mostly' supported at work.

Women also consistently polled higher than men in categories that signify lack of support. Across regions and gender of co-worker considerations this trend remains robust. Women also had fewer collaborations (Fig.7).

Our survey hints that a same sex bias possibly exists when it comes to helping coworkers as observed in other comprehensive studies. Indian male colleagues are least likely to help men working with them when compared to other groups. Similarly, female group leaders, colleagues and collaborators are more likely to not offer support to a woman.

What impedes women from setting up collaborations? Could same-sex bias be a factor? An interesting study highlights the tendency of men, across various fields, to selectively collaborate with other men whereas they find women to be more egalitarian in their collaborations. Are women shy to ask for help and team up with others? If true, does this have roots in our cultural upbringing? Or is it the lack of good mentorship for women in academia? Even if the rates of attrition are similar for men and women in companies, the playing field is not similar and women in the workplace face daunting challenges specific to their gender.

The trends in this survey reveal issues around inclusion and biases that affect career goals. One thing is clear we must all set our biases aside and rally around each other for an equitable tomorrow. As Indra Nooyi said at a panel discussion during the 2016 Women in the World Summit in New York City - "Let's figure out how we can help each other way more than what we are doing today."
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