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EDITOR’S NOTE

Dear Colleagues,

This issue of Research Management Review is dedicated to the topic of leadership in research administration. In a knowledge-worker culture, there is often a disconnect between what makes a top performer and what can motivate others toward their own peak of performance. We see this all too often in the academic environment: Someone is an expert scholar in “somethingology.” They progress through the ranks amid praise, adoration, and high funding success. They become the chief of a division or chair of a department, but have never had any training in managing personnel, or a budget, or allocation of scarce resources between competing subordinate units. They are thrown into an on-the-job-training situation with very high stakes at risk. How often have you heard, “She’s a world class scientist, BUT….”

We are quick to notice those disconnects in the larger community we serve. We try to do damage control, smooth and soothe, as required, and act as servant leaders, trying to manage up the chain of command so that those down the chain have a better workplace experience. It often falls to us, in that hybrid area of seeking to serve the researcher, the institution, the funding agency, and the public weal, to be that visionary leader who must be able to see the prism from all sides.

Excellence in leadership can make the difference between a workplace that is exhilarating and one that is simply exhausting. This issue is an effort to compile essays, research articles, a case study, and book reviews that would turn our minds to leadership and its impact in research administration from some of the thought leaders of our profession.

It is with great pleasure that I introduce the offerings in this particular issue of Research Management Review. As this issue is being finalized, we are preparing for the International Network of Research Management Societies (INORMS) conference being held in North America. NCURA is serving as one of the co-hosts and the conference is being held in the Washington Hilton, which has been the venue for the NCURA Annual Meeting for decades. In this issue, you will find articles by authors from Great Britain, Portugal, Australia, China, and the United States.

This issue opens with the inspiring Gabriel and Caines essay which provides an important perspective on the importance of the role of the research administrator in the culture of the research community. Trindade and Agostinho address the issues surrounding the professional identity of research administrators with provocative thoughts about research administrators/managers residing in a
“semi-academic field somewhere between the academic and non-academic domains.”

Dr. Janice Besch shares a case study of her experiences in managing change and setting priorities for research support through the use of online survey tools. The survey tool follows the case study article. Improving quality through thoughtful change management techniques is contrasted with the research article by Meng, He, and Luo, with the use of various forms of power and the level of satisfaction with supervision of research teams. This article is the segue to an essay from former RMR Editor, Robert Killoren, on the high cost of bullying in the workplace.

Three short essays are offered to highlight positive attributes of effective leaders. Campo addresses four key characteristics of an effective leader in research administration. Willenberg offers leadership advice from what she has learned working in the world of clinical trials administration. Retired NIH Grants Management Officer, David Mineo, who now coaches executives, organizations and teams throughout the world in the area of leadership, completes the short essays on leadership attributes with thoughts on the importance of credibility and trust in a leader.

Book reviews for this issue include The Martian’s Daughter: A Memoir, reviewed by Andre Walker, and Long Fuse, Big Bang, which is reviewed by Sue Kelch and Michelle Schoenecker. The Martian’s Daughter: A Memoir tells the true story of a woman who was a trailblazing pioneer, opening the research environment for women. Long Fuse, Big Bang describes a business model for increasing productivity and successful results in the face of conflicting demands.

Farewell Thoughts

The completion of this issue completes my three-year term as the Editor of Research Management Review. It has been one of the greatest honors of my career to serve as the Editor of RMR. I am very thankful for the experience in the practical sense of learning while doing as an editor. I have learned more things about research administration, new things about editing, and surprising things about the many things that go on behind the scenes in the world of publishing.

Enough cannot be said to thank the many volunteers who make RMR possible. The members of the editorial board are some of the smartest and busiest people of my acquaintance, yet they took time to read articles, make suggestions, write reviews, and meet deadlines, in addition to their usual professional commitments. The authors have continued to serve as thought leaders as they have worked diligently to contribute to the growing body of knowledge for the profession of research administration and management. It has been a privilege to work with both the review board and authors.
My sincere thanks is extended to the RMR editorial staff. Ms. Lee Carpenter has served as the copy editor for RMR through the changing of the guard of many editors. She is the constant that has held RMR together. Bridgette Pfister led the charge in the achievement of our goal to become indexed in Google Scholar and ERIC. Beryline Temples has organized and implemented the effort to ensure authors retained open access copyrights while RMR secured a license for the publication of their articles. Marc Schiffman has assisted in getting each article posted to the developing issues and has been our liaison with the NCURA office and acts as the point of contact with ERIC. Dr. Christine Katsapis and Jeremy Miner accepted my invitation to serve as Associate Editors in order to complete this issue of RMR while I was in the midst of a job change and geographic move. I offer each you my heartfelt gratitude for your diligence and the level of excellence with which your duties were performed.

My father always told me to leave a place better than I found it. This has been my goal as RMR Editor. With the help of the many hands of the talented team mentioned above, I believe we have succeeded.

Jennifer Shambrook, Ph.D.
Editor, 2011–2014
Research Management Review
June 30, 2014
LeaderBeing: Critical Reflections on Context, Character and Challenge in the Culture of Research and Its Administration
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ABSTRACT

Servant leadership is a critical concept for understanding the ongoing importance of research administration as a central profession of service within the culture of research itself. The leadership of research administrators is both a unique gift and a challenge to the research culture. To ensure the continued productivity of the research enterprise, while respecting its wider and more powerful mission of service to the public trust, research administrators have a critically important role that can open the research enterprise to new depths, unprecedented possibilities, and unforeseen horizons of opportunity. Providing for these expansive missions necessitates that the research administrator as servant leader understands and courageously enters into the dynamic, never-ending processes of “LeaderBeing.”
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INTRODUCTION

Research administration and management have had a profoundly rich development and history. With a professional presence in the United States and across the globe that has skyrocketed since World War II, the identity, service, and mission of research administration has grown and developed in vastly unforeseen ways. It is important to understand that the growth and development of the profession has advanced in response to the unfolding nature, importance, and unprecedented pathways on which research itself has evolved as an academic and professional entity in human history. To understand the importance of research administrators and managers, it is logically and equally important to appreciate the profession’s context, namely the unfolding nature of the exploratory activities that we call research.

This article is comprised of a series of reflections aimed at helping research administrators understand our critical role as servant leaders in the world of research itself. Servant leadership has become a common term in current popular vocabulary for a variety of professions and leadership roles in society, culture, and diverse institutions. Obviously, the term itself seeks to orient the practice of leadership as a service as opposed to the practice of hierarchical privilege or workplace domination. Yet what does it mean to be a leader who serves? What constitutes the act of service? How does the service of research administration assist the nature, activities, outcomes, and horizons of research regardless of discipline or institution?

It would be easy to assume that what is needed are answers to these questions. However, that may be too quick a conclusion. In a world of speed and hand-held mobility, perhaps it may be wise to take the time to articulate and grapple with the questions themselves, and then allow the answers to emerge more slowly and with greater maturity in the lives and professional work of the members of our profession.

Therefore, the purpose of this article is to invite our readers to follow the proverbial white rabbit down a pathway of consideration. The hoped result would be one’s entry into a process of seasoned reflection out of which might emerge over time an ever deepening understanding of what it means to lead,
assist, and bring to fruition the knowledge, application, and utility of the discoveries whose birth we are privileged to assist. We begin by reflecting on the nature of what research is and seems to be.

**THE CHANGING CULTURE OF RESEARCH**

"Human behavior flows from three main sources: desire, emotion, and knowledge."

---

*Plato*

In the regulatory and legal worlds, many of us are aware of and utilize those sources that define research as any systematic investigation that is intended to contribute to the advancement of knowledge of some form. That is a convenient regulatory dictum. However, to be satisfied with the two-dimensionality of that definition is to miss the larger and more important picture, namely the role of research in human society and its origins within the very nature of human experience. Why does the human animal do research at all? More deeply than publications, products, prestige, or the plenty that is appropriation, why does the human engage in research? What does research stoke in the human experience?

As the opening above attributed to Plato indicates, there is something in the human animal that seeks “to know.” We are creatures of desire and emotion. We seek “to know” because, from a certain interesting perspective, we seek to fill up in our very selves something that is lacking. Regardless of the origins of that lacking, from the moment we leave the womb it seems we leave a garden and go in search of something that can fill us. In a certain rarified respect, our search for knowledge is the search for an “other.” And in that search for the “other,” we seek to find that which can fill up the emptiness within. At its root, this quest is the ultimate passion of the human animal. It is, as some philosophers might describe, an experience of existential incompleteness that seeks that unique “other” that will complete the unfilled self.

Intrinsically, we know that we will never really find it. But that does not keep us from the search. For our quest “to know” is ultimately our quest “to be” and to discover ultimately who we are, why we exist, and what we can create in the act of self-fulfillment. We are creational beings, after all. It seems that this internal, furnace-like quest would be an appropriate image for the
context and subliminal drives for the act of research.

However, we are all very aware that many people might find the above reflections impractical, or perhaps even unimportant. Since the Industrial Revolution, society’s emphasis upon “outcomes” has developed rapidly. In a certain respect, the need to “establish worth via product” has become an almost ultimate paradigm for nearly every aspect of human living. If linguists are correct that “language talks,” then we can understand the pervasiveness of this approach or paradigm.

In our own times, all of us are aware that healthcare has become truly a business. Despite its really being a human service, what seems to be most important are observable, almost tangible patient outcomes that can conveniently be recorded as relative value units or metrics of productivity in electronic medical records systems. How the patient feels is not as important as what is considered to be observable data. This same reality we see in education today, particularly in higher education. Today we find the potential student being attracted to online programs that might be easily watched on a laptop or tablet, and then have content-acquisition verified through on-line objective quizzes or examinations. Such ventures lack peer or professor interaction, are predicated on swift completion, do not make use of substantive essay-based knowledge acquisition approaches, and lack the personalization and academic reflection that real education has always demanded since the dawn of human civilization. While business practices are extremely important to maintain prudent use of resources to attain ultimate goals, in the contexts of human services such as healthcare and education, business is a means to an end and not necessarily an end in itself. Education and healthcare are not businesses at their very roots. They are human services.

The same is true of research.

Research in any discipline or field is ultimately a human act. It obviously needs the best managerial and business practices to be both practically and practicably successful. Yet it is not a business at its roots. It is a human service. The business aspect of research and its human service definition are inextricably joined though in a context of, what should be, healthy tension. The
collision of these approaches is natural and should be welcomed. It creates a volatile, creative vortex in the experience of research and its administration.

**Research in any discipline or field is ultimately a human act.**

To be able to span both perspectives and integrate them successfully, there is a need for gifted leaders whose expertise, talents, and corporate wisdom make them useful to the success of research as an enterprise and a human experience. This is, in the final analysis, the challenging identity of research administrators in the culture of research that is itself in always in permanent flux. Such an atmosphere of change and collision requires careful reflection and consideration by research administrators on their role and servant leadership. However, before proceeding to core character elements and contemporary shifts in the servant leadership that is research administration, it is important to reflect upon what seems to be the pull of the popular imagination that makes the business enterprise aspects of research what some might believe are the only reality that is important.

**THE EXPERIENCE OF POWER: THE CONTEXTUAL ISSUE**

“Nearly all men can stand adversity, but if you want to test a man’s character, give him power (sic).”

Attributed to Abraham Lincoln

As discussed briefly in the previous section, at the root of the human story is the experience of searching. For those of us who are parents or educators, in our children and students we easily look into a mirror and see our own journeys. This “mirror gazing” provides us with an essential core understanding of ourselves as evolving and maturing persons.

When we are in the womb, we are in a state of symbiosis. Barring disease, trauma, or other unknown factors, we rest in a certain form of stasis. Our needs are provided for us as we develop and evolve. Then there is the moment of birth. We are thrust into a world where the cord is cut, and things are no longer as seemingly automatic. Our reaction to this entry is all bound up so poetically in our first act: crying out. From this moment onward, we seem to begin a search, a journey. Without knowing it,
we as human beings take our first grips, and crawls, and steps, looking to find again that “other” that might complete us and bring us back to some measure of the symbiosis in which we once rested and in which our every need seemed to be provided.

We might find this image to be a powerful metaphor for understanding all of our future human endeavors as experiences of “the quest.” We seek to find that which can fill up the emptiness within. Yet from the moment we begin our journey, we start to experience harsh realities that what we seek may not come easily, or at all. We encounter controversy, denial, and failure. We meet up in our lives with the experience of what we might refer to as ultimate “no’s.” How do we respond?

Over our growth and development, all of us enter into the world of human experience and meet up with individuals who try to exert over us a sense of power and control. Our response is to develop the same. Building upon the primordial human experience of infancy’s neo-narcissism, we begin to engage in the act of power that becomes central later on to our ability to defend ourselves, to control the factors of our lives, to compete with others for necessities and wants, and to establish our individual identity as a protected presence in family, school, community, and daily living. Power becomes our way of life. And part of the experience of power, is the experience of control and domination.

As is true of so many other aspects of human living, the realities of power, control, and domination come to influence human enterprises and professions, including academia and research. The need to be in control leads to all forms of competition—those that are healthy and even those that are unhealthy. Parenthetically, we might surmise that the need for power and domination is ultimately what tempts the researcher to those unethical practices we call today research misconduct: plagiarism, fabrication and falsification. When universities emphasize the number and magnitude of funded research awards for the granting of tenure, the individual academic will begin subconsciously to compete in ways that are “all about the money” and not about the knowledge, application, and utility for the human good that is the ultimate purpose of research. Fear becomes the dominant factor and changes the identity,
structures, and approaches to research and its administration. Development becomes a financial growth activity alone, and never seems to approach the need for new ideas to meet new human issues, problems, and opportunities.

There is a deeper calling: a need to balance the financial and product outcomes of research with a vital commitment to the purpose of research as serving the human experience.

There is then a deeper calling: a need to balance out the financial and product outcomes of research with a vital commitment to the purpose of research as serving the human experience. It is in this context, then, that we come to understand the need for something new. That “something new” is the service of prudent, wise, and gifted entrepreneurs who are able to lead, administer, and manage the practical and practicable life of the research enterprise while keeping the eyes and intentions of researchers and the institutions’ leaders focused on what we call in ethics, the Greater Good.

**CONFRONTING THE CONTEXT: PARADIGM SHIFTS AND CHARACTER FORMATION IN SERVANT LEADERSHIP**

“We need heroes, people who can inspire us, help shape us morally, spur us on to purposeful action --- and from time to time we are called to be those heroes, leaders for others, either in a small, day-to-day way, or on the world’s largest stage.”

*Lives of Moral Leadership, Introduction, p. xvii*

Robert Coles

The developments in the culture of research described in the preceding sections may appear to be daunting for those in the leadership roles of research administration and management. They may well be. However, it should be underscored that they are a natural response to a wide variety of cultural and psychosocial elements in contemporary society at large. From this perspective, perhaps these developments and issues should more positively be seen as invitations to creative explorations and the positive evolution of the role of research administration and management.

Assuredly, research administrators have critically important managerial
roles to ensure that research activities are conducted successfully, comply with the wide and expansive requirements of research sponsors, are performed in ways that respect the resource requirements of the institution and related entities, and become a leverage for the development of future opportunities in light of the performing institution’s mission. Yet given the reflections in the preceding sections, there is much more to the role and practice of leadership in the research milieu. In essence, research administration is not just a practical and practicable function. It is also a form of service that is meant to assist, aid, and deepen the very purposes for which the research itself was sponsored, funded, awarded, and is being performed, namely the advancement of knowledge and the betterment of the human condition. Such a wider expanse demands more and more in the leadership role of research administrators. In short, as stated previously, research administrators have an important role of service not just to the management of research activities but also to the importance of the mission of the institution for the Greater Good. This is what is called “servant leadership.”

. . . there is much more to the role and practice of leadership in the research milieu. In essence, research administration is not just a practical and practicable function. It is also a form of service that is meant to assist, aid, and deepen the very purposes for which the research itself was sponsored, funded, awarded, and is being performed, namely the advancement of knowledge and the betterment of the human condition.

This concept and practice of servant leadership is far from easy. It demands that research administrators are able to integrate successfully their needed role in the daily oversight of research regulatory/legal requirements and support services with the practice of a style of leadership that serves rather than dictates, that promotes pride-in-mission rather than mere job obligation,
and that prevents the worst by promoting the best. Such postures require mature self-reflection on one’s professional and personal identity and the development of character traits and goals that become powerful sources of enrichment in the research context. Let us take time then to turn to what are suggested below as three fundamental paradigm shifts and several key character traits central to the development of servant leadership for research administrators.

**Three Paradigm Shifts in the Practice of Servant Leadership**

Thomas Kuhn is very famous in our scientific communities for his development of the concept of paradigm shift. Kuhn detailed how important knowledge discoveries and scientific explorations changed the very way that human beings think, live, and exist. Paradigm shifts are not easy changes. They are deeper challenges that alter the very foundations upon which life is lived and the ways in which we human beings conceive of ourselves, others, and the world. The development of servant leadership constitutes a change in the way leadership is conceived and practiced. In research administration, the practice of servant leadership is an invitation to a deeper identity and richly productive form of authentic and meaningful service. However, it calls for true paradigm shifts in the way that we understand our role and our identity, and how we carry them out in service of the public trust and the common good of our institutions. The following seem to be three important paradigm shifts that servant leadership poses in research administration and management.

**From hierarchy to history**

All institutions, by their nature, have some type of structure and organization. This is as true for individual families as it is for universities and corporations. With structure, there is a need for what the Armed Forces calls the “chain of command.” To meet a mission effectively and efficiently, any human organization needs a competent and effective structure for daily living as well as important decisional moments. As history demonstrates, the development of such structures creates hierarchies. There is nothing unusual or problematic per se about this. Many times, such as in the family experience, hierarchical roles and responsibilities are laid out and completed almost subconsciously. On the other hand, large organizations develop, maintain,
and practice hierarchies with far greater and more visible complexity. In government, hierarchy is met with organized patterns of behavior that express meaning (cf. the definition of ritual). Such patterns express and ensure the continuation of the government itself as well as each part of its mission. When hierarchy is made so complex, it can begin to become an end in itself. The maintenance of the hierarchy can become more important than the mission the hierarchy is meant to serve. Power, as discussed previously, is always a temptation.

For servant leadership in any organization, the individual leader needs to become conscious of the temptation to power and self-contained hierarchy. Servant leaders consciously and deliberately move away from any and all patterns that make their leadership a source of self-aggrandizement and status. Servant leadership requires an individual to become committed to a shift from hierarchy to embracing the “history” of the professional community that makes up the organization. History, in this context, is not the study of past events. History, in the sense of narrative studies, means the identity and lived experience of the women and men who make up the organization, institution, or community. Servant leaders focus not on status or rank. They are not centered upon the needs of those in charge. Rather, they focus on the needs of the women and men who make up the rank and file of the institution and work daily to carry out its mission as a type of lived historical experience.

In research organizations, this is critical. While sponsored research has its goals and its requirements, research administrators practice authentic servant leadership when they immerse themselves into the life of the organization and into the professional contributions of the women and men who are engaged in all aspects of the research being conducted. By becoming more deeply aware of the mission of the organization and the gifts/needs of its members, research administrators are more able to assist the institution’s leaders in the development of the organization’s mission and its ability to be poised for future opportunities.
...research administrators practice authentic servant leadership when they immerse themselves into the life of the organization and into the professional contributions of the women and men who are engaged in all aspects of the research being conducted.

From obligation to ownership

For many, a job is simply that—a job. Especially in times of economic challenge, the ability to find employment is predicated upon two overarching and extremely valid concerns for oneself and one’s family: financial benefit and healthcare coverage. Much as in Abraham Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, citizens understandably look to employment for survival. However, beyond that, there is something more.

As we mature and develop as persons, we come to discover our talents and gifts. As we do, we are encouraged by family and mentors to conceive of ways in which our talents and gifts can engage us in future careers that are highly fulfilling as well as productive. Certainly, not all of our dreams can be fulfilled. In some cases, because of a wide variety of factors, what we thought were dreams can turn into nightmares. Yet the process here is what is important. At our best, we hope that the careers upon which we embark will bring to each of us a sense of personal fulfillment. Yet often we are confronted in the workplace with a more rudimentary sense of “just getting the job done”—in other words, a callow sense of being obliged to complete assigned tasks without any appreciation of perhaps their greater purpose.

While faithfully leading and assisting requirements and obligations, the service of research leaders today is met with an invitation to develop and mature a sense of “ownership” of mission.

Despite this inevitability, there always remains inside the human animal the desire for “something more.” There is a hunger and a thirst for meaningfulness. This is as true for human organizations as it is for human individuals. It is very true for research
organizations.

It is possible that research administrators can perform their service as a type of elementary obligation alone. Research administration, after all, is a “job.” When overseeing and/or assisting the conduct of research, one is immediately confronted by regulatory requirements from sponsors and the institution that can be overwhelming. There is an understandable sense of obligation to fulfill requirements. Such requirements lead to a concentration on compliance.

There is a need to practice and engender in others a sense of ownership of who the institution is, what the organization does, and how the mission of the research institution is of benefit to others both within the institution itself as well as without.

Yet the nature of research itself, as already discussed, is something far greater. While faithfully leading and assisting requirements and obligations, the service of research leaders today is met with an invitation to develop and mature a sense of “ownership” of mission. It is not enough simply to fulfill one’s role out of a sense of obligation or compliance. It is not enough simply to meet the minimum standard. There is a need to practice and engender in others a sense of ownership of who the institution is, what the organization does, and how the mission of the research institution is of benefit to others both within the institution itself as well as without. Research administrators become servant leaders when they move from performing their works away from rudimentary obligation toward an ownership of mission that is imbued with pride and possibilities.

From prevention to promotion

In the areas of research ethics, regulatory affairs, and research law, research leaders and related experts are extremely aware of the profound proliferation of regulatory requirements for the ethical conduct of research. Sometimes even the most cursory review of these requirements is startling. However, they are clearly understandable. To understand why so many regulations have come to exist, one need only remember the horrors of
the Holocaust, eugenics, the tragic USPHS syphilis study perpetrated on the men of Tuskegee, the abuse of animals in various experiments, the misuse of appropriations, or the falsification/fabrication of data for personal prestige or power that come with the notoriety of publication. There is no question about why sponsored research comes with so many complex regulatory requirements. However, there is a danger.

The human being, understandably, can approach requirements from an isolated sense of prevention. Rightly so, it is important to prevent harm and protect against all misdeeds or dangers. Such is the critically important and central reason that our cities and societies have robust law enforcement agencies and experts. Yet we realize that the good order of society is not met only by enforcement and protection against or prevention of crime. To concentrate on the one prevents the worst assuredly. But there is something more.

... research administrators practice servant leadership when they interact with investigators and develop in their institutions programs of educational enrichment that look to make others aware of the high goals and ends of regulations themselves.

In research administration, the proliferation of complex regulations to prevent unethical or inappropriate conduct can lead to, and is often evidenced in, a type of inquisitional form of enforcement. One need only ask investigators or staff how they feel after having encountered “this committee” or “that regulatory affairs specialist.” Sometimes the reaction can be quite surprising or alarming. Sometimes investigators do not feel helped but hindered. They come to resent requirements and look for ways around the system’s directions.

Besides the dynamics of individual cases of the professional interactions between research staff and research administrators in regulatory affairs, there is a deeper and more positive
opportunity here. There is an invitation to a third paradigm shift, namely to prevent the worst by promoting the best. Without question, research administrators must ensure that the goals and requirements of regulatory compliance are achieved in all aspects. Concomitantly, though, research administrators practice servant leadership when they interact with investigators and develop in their institutions programs of educational enrichment that look to make others aware of the high goals and ends of regulations themselves. The success of such initiatives, however, is not just about styles of communication or the invention of workshops. Most deeply, research administrators as servant leaders must learn to embody within themselves new and more positive attitudes of promotion. While definitively ensuring that all staff members understand requirements and regulatory directives, such are communicated and engendered best in others when the research administrator understands and embodies their positive aspects and end-points or goals. Servant leadership in research administration truly succeeds when one integrates the goals of preventing the worst with those of promoting the best.

Character Formation for Servant Leaders

Change is never easy. Paradigm shifts are even more demanding. The change in one’s fundamental horizons and behaviors demands deep and abiding changes within one’s psychology and one’s outlook. Engaging in such changes requires the development of deliberate postures that themselves also require the hard work of personal and professional development and maturation. To put into action the paradigm shifts discussed above, it seems worthwhile to suggest a series of traits that are important for becoming servant leaders. Such traits are not aimed only at elemental changes in the way one communicates or behaviorally is observed. Such traits must be rooted deeply within the personhood of the individual servant leader. They are therefore part of one’s ethos per its original definition, namely the fundamental character of individuals or institutions. The following are five traits that are indicative of and essential to the development of authentic servant leadership. They have special importance and impact in the
professional identity and contributions of research administrators and managers.

**Conscious**

Research administrators as servant leaders must be conscious. This may seem like an obvious statement. It is not. In the context of these reflections, by “conscious” is meant total awareness. The first step in becoming a servant leader is to become most deeply self-aware and aware of those around one. While this may seem or sound easy, it is not. Self-awareness requires a sense of personal honesty that is, at times, even brutal.

To be self-aware and therefore self-conscious, one must be open to who one really is. Gaining such knowledge requires intense personal reflection and also the humility to ask for, listen, hear, and weigh carefully how one is perceived, experienced and known by others. As any of us realizes, such self-honesty is never easy. In fact, it can be difficult and even painful even if it is about accepting one’s gifts and positive attributes. Its pain comes not in what we discover about ourselves. Rather, the pain comes in learning to accept precisely who we are with our positive attributes as well as our limitations and our defects of character. Learning to accept ourselves as the gifted yet fragile and limited human beings that we are is the most fundamental step in becoming a leader.

The second step is similar, namely to be conscious and aware of those around us. As we learn not to judge ourselves, we learn also not to judge those who are around us. That also takes an extraordinary sense of honesty. Who is it with whom we share our lives and daily work? How do we perceive them? How do they perceive us? What are our feelings about them? How perhaps do we judge them? Why do we have the judgments about them that we do? Are those judgments and feelings on target or appropriate? Why or why not? In short, servant leaders are truly conscious, aware, accepting, and humble about one’s own self and about all the other “selves” with whom we share the pathways of our profession.

**Connected**

Servant leaders in research administration, as well as in other professions, must be connected. Again, this character trait may seem obvious or easy to understand and to effect. Like being conscious, it is not. We humans are contingent beings. We are always
“in relation to” others and to the self. Conscious as we are of self and others, there is a need for us to understand that we are fundamentally relational. Yet our society, especially in the West, has for decades and centuries long been influenced by the powerful impact of utilitarian individualism. We are individuals clearly. Yet we are also clearly always in relationship to self and others. Hence, this means that the human person is ever in a state of ontic tension. Our very ontology, i.e. our being, is caught up in a type of creative tension between being the internally unique individuated selves that we are, while concomitantly being externally connected with all the other unique selves with whom we share life and work.

Yet there is always the temptation to avoid the connectedness that is essentially ours as human beings and is required for being servant leaders. Fear and power, as previously discussed, can enter into the workplace or into the family such that we distance ourselves from those with whom we share our daily pathways. Whether for purposes of self-preservation or other felt needs, there is the temptation to distance the self and disconnect from others. For those in the highest levels of authority such as in research institutions, this is clearly dangerous.

Each research institution’s mission is tied to social, cultural and human needs as well as needs arising from the goals of enterprise success.

Each research institution’s mission is tied to social, cultural and human needs as well as needs arising from the goals of enterprise success. Each institution also has a unique history and present conditions regarding values, goals, resources, and opportunities as well as limitations and restrictions. Servant leaders in research institutions must be well connected to all of the facets of the organization’s history, origins, mission, goals, and external collaborators as well as sponsors. Without a healthy sense of clear connectivity and the tending of those connections, including among staff and investigators, the success of the organization and the life of the workplace are endangered. Therefore, servant leaders must be committed in an ongoing fashion to remaining connected and developing healthy and productive
relationships both within and without the organization such that the mission of the group grows and develops to success. This trait of connection is especially important for research administrators if, as servant leaders, they are to assist investigators, staff, and executives to advance and develop the potential for positive impact on the public trust to which all are committed.

**Competent**

All of us in research administration realize that in our profession we must always strive to be competent. Competence is a never-ending task that requires continuing education in all of its forms. In research administration being competent has particular meaning. In the history of the profession, research administration began as a necessity to ensure that research grants and contracts were fulfilled in accordance with the terms and conditions of each sponsor. There was, therefore, a particularly strong emphasis on the necessity of research administration as a practical reality with practical and practicable methods and outcomes. Yet as the years unfolded, research administration has become more and more intrinsic to the research enterprise such that it is more than just a practice. It is a processive profession in and of itself.

...research administration has become more and more intrinsic to the research enterprise such that it is more than just a practice. It is a processive profession in and of itself.

Remaining competent is itself also a process. The process of competence involves three distinct areas. First, the research administrator must be about the continual acquisition of knowledge concerning research, the specific disciplines so engaged, the laws and regulations that govern research and its administration, and the importance of the particular institution’s specific research mission and its unfolding history. Second, research administrators must deepen their skills and abilities to engage, lead, and serve the members of the institution in pre-award processes, post-award requirements, and transformation or transition of present engagements for future opportunities and challenges. Finally, research administrators must ensure the depth of
their competence through the processes of ethical formation both on the personal and professional levels such as have already been described in the preceding paragraphs and sections.

Yet the competence of research administrators as servant leaders has yet another dimension. The acquisition of knowledge, the continuing improvement of skills, and ethical formation only come to fruition when such competence is disposed not at the serve of self but at the service of the community and the public trust. The term “competence” has its origins in words such as “power.” Yet we have already discussed how alluringly dangerous power is. The truly competent servant leader and research administrator is one who acquires all one needs to be excellent not because one wishes to be powerful, but rather to be empowered within the self and to empower those that we serve in the research community. Real competence leads to selfless service of others.

Committed

Professional leadership requires commitment. Yet commitment is not a static reality. It has levels and degrees. In our human development, we make a wide variety of commitments over time.

These commitments themselves change and evolve. Sometimes they dissipate. Other times, they grow slowly or minimally. And at still other times, the commitments we make in life deepen in vast and unforeseen ways.

In general, whether it is in the relationships we make or in the professions we embrace, there seem to be what could be termed three levels of types of commitment: commitments of the head, commitments of the hands, and commitments of the spirit or heart.

In professional life, there is obviously a first commitment of the head. We need to be employed. We look for those positions that we believe tap into our talents and are consistent with our personal goals. We seek for and accept a position. We realize our occupational needs and capacities. We become a member of “the team.”

Immediately, however, our professional commitments engage more deeply in the second level, a commitment of “the hands” that work and labor. We perform our tasks with varying degrees of investment for a wide variety of reasons. Most successful professionals faithfully and firmly engage their occupations and institutions with clear commitments of head and hands.
However, in the course of one’s professional career, very often there is an invitation, albeit undetectable in many ways, wherein we become committed to our profession and/or our institution and colleagues more personally, more deeply, and with ultimate value. We enter into this third level of commitment when we align our values and even our dreams with those of the mission and institution we serve. This is when we move from having a job to having a career or even a vocation.

For research administrators, the development of one’s servant leadership requires an eventual entry into all three of the above levels of commitment, especially the last. We become engaged in the management of research and realize that our talents and gifts make an impact. As we become more invested in the various facets of research administration, we find ourselves invited into greater responsibilities. We become committed to put our hands to the plough to take on more duties even at the expense of our personal schedules and wishes. However, research administration becomes servant leadership when the individual begins to become truly dedicated to the mission of the organization as a system of valued, selfless giving. One begins to align one’s professional goals with the service of the organization so as to serve those the organization benefits. Such a sense of commitment calls upon the individual to seek the common good of the organization, the benefit of one’s colleagues, and the continual growth and development of the mission and horizons of opportunity that beckon the research organization into the future. In short, this involves a deep and expansive sense of being committed. To enter into the processes of this level of commitment is characteristic of the servant leader in any profession.

Catapulted

In the final analysis, all of the formational characteristics of servant leaders are not static realities. They are processes. In research administration, given the vast and dizzying complexities that arise from the management of discovery and innovation, there is always within one’s professional service an overwhelming sense of movement. In some ways, these movements and activities seem entirely unique and different. We might, however, wish to consider that the complexities of the daily life of research administrators as servant leaders can
actually be understood as three forms of being “catapulted.”

In the first instance, the research administrator as servant leader is catapulted into the self. The daily blur of complex and innumerable responsibilities ultimately makes one ask why one has even decided to remain in research administration. The labors expended, the struggles one meets, the challenges from peers, and the seemingly never ending revisions of requirements demand the development of a sense of internal self-reflection to discover talents and strengths to endure the pressures of the moment and bring about success. This sense of catapulting is a discovery of self that, if authentically engaged, results in the development of new and unforeseen potentials for one’s personal growth, positive professional contributions, and the enrichment of one’s colleagues.

In a second instance, the research administrator as servant leader is catapulted into controversy and challenge. Servant leaders are able to confront potential problems and also to battle those realities that could undermine the mission of the moment. Research itself is a challenging process of discovery, innovation, invention, and application. Experiments are predicated upon the potential for the problematic and even for failure. To confront these requires a level of courage that does not shrink in the face of the problematic. Research administrators, consistent with the nature of research itself, become servant leaders when they allow themselves to be catapulted to meet the possible problems of the moment and can draw upon their ingenuity to discover new means, as discussed previously, to prevent the worst and promote the best.

However, a third form of catapulting is intrinsic to servant leadership for research administrators. No institution can survive unless it stands ready to be catapulted into unforeseen horizons of opportunity that will change, deepen, or even open the institution to the potential of a quantum leap in its mission. Servant leaders develop the courage to stand ready to face unforeseen potentials and possibilities for mission and opportunity. In research administration, this may call the individual to consider alternative methodologies for a wide variety of support services. It may call the members of the research administration department to be prepared to explore
new means by which to serve the needs of individual investigators or the institution as a whole to meet requirements or the professional development of one’s colleagues. It may mean that research administrators become partnered with investigators and leadership to seek out new and unprecedented opportunities for new research investigations and endeavors.

In short, the ultimate form of catapulting occurs when the individual research administrator becomes a servant enough to lead and set forth an example of courage to face the unforeseen future and to be ready to realign and deepen one’s professional commitments to meet the challenges and invitations of professional life that may be breaking open. Research administrators truly become servant leaders when they throw themselves into the experience of being multi-dimensionally catapulted.

The character traits and paradigm shifts explored above seem to bring us to yet something perhaps even more profoundly enduring to consider. When we amass all of the shifts and traits together, perhaps we become faced with the birth of a new and encompassing identity for the research administrator as servant leader.

Indeed, while we have reflected above on the performative actions of the research administrator (in other words our “doing”), the real question comes as to the ultimate identity that we are being moved to embrace as servant leaders.

In other words: “Who is it that we be?”

**THE CHALLENGE OF LEADERBEING: THE CONSUMMATE EXPERIENCE**

“Welcome, O life! I go to encounter for the millionth time the reality of experience and to forge in the smithy of my soul the uncreated conscience of my race.”

*Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man,* Chapter 5

James Joyce

Ultimately, we must come to understand that servant leadership is a “being”, not just a doing. This is as applicable for research administrators as it is for any other form of leadership in the professions. As mentioned briefly at the end of the previous section, we can become caught up in the performative. This is one of the psychosocial aspects of Western culture that has developed for centuries. We are creatures who look to
measure quality oftentimes, perhaps too often, by quantity. We look to someone’s “doing” to measure the value of her or his “being” within the professional community. Without question, substantive work demands substantive performance and outcomes. Yet there is a balance that has to be respected in this. Servant leadership in any profession is not ordered only to the performance of various activities. It has its ultimate foundations and its “end-point,” or as the Greeks would term it, “telos,” in the actual being and meaning that is bound up in the flesh and blood and spirit of servant leaders. Hence, servant leadership involves most powerfully the never-ending process of “becoming a leader as person.” We term this here “LeaderBeing.”

In discussions we have had on this topic, there is a curious observation. Individuals who have reflected on the concept of LeaderBeing keep asking questions as if there is a final end-point to a person’s becoming such. This is a curious tendency on the part of a social enterprise context that, as stated previously, persistently tries to define value as a quantitative experience rather than a qualitative one. LeaderBeing is a qualitative metaphor, if you will, that seeks to open up an experience that is itself never ending. One enters into the process of LeaderBeing as an act of Becoming for one’s lifetime. It never ends. Indeed, process philosophy has much to teach us all. Like the stages of human development, LeaderBeing is a never ending, lifetime process. It never rests. Those who begin the pathway to LeaderBeing enter into a process of deepening, of change, of maturity, and of development. It is an ongoing reality exactly the same as the process of human maturation. Yet would there be a marker of some type that can affirm the presence, the processes, and the emerging potency of LeaderBeing among professionals?

In language, the terms “consummate” or “consummation” hold, like many other linguistic morphemes, many-meanings. They are, as scholars tell us, polyvalent terms. They are not defined. Rather, the terms
are a kind of doorway to an ongoing experience. One does not learn the terms. One enters into them to discover their unfathomable nature. Consummate moments seem to be those that capture the brilliance or essence of some human experience. The consummation of a human activity seems to be the end-result of some arduous labor. Yet both terms also do not always indicate an end point. They also can point toward beginnings. At the end her life on the way to her tragic execution, Mary, Queen of Scots, is quoted as having said, “In my end is my beginning.” In a certain respect this one quotation at a tragic moment of death points toward the deep and abiding understanding of all consummate experiences both the tragic and the exhilarating. Consummations do not necessarily bring something to an end. Rather, consummations are existential moments when an atom is split, energies explode, births occur, and new forms of life and reality can be freed up into history.

LeaderBeing perhaps can be understood best as a consummation. First, it is not a thing. It is a process within the person of the servant leader. By entering into the maturing growth that is LeaderBeing, the servant leader gives flesh to the processes of real human leadership that makes a difference. And as others observe the servant leader so involved, they also are moved to change, and grow and develop. Indeed, the consummation of real LeaderBeing in those who would dare truly to be servant leaders gives birth to something new and unforeseen among one’s peers, within one’s organization, and outwardly toward those the organization is called to serve.

For research administrators, servant leadership practiced best by LeaderBeing as a consummate experience is itself a serious challenge in today’s professional environment. Yet it is also a brilliant flame that should attract the moth within each of us. Indeed, we come too close and we will be singed. Perhaps when we are so caught up in assisting our institution’s research mission by LeaderBeing, we might seem to be in danger of losing something within the self. Yet we are also being called to new forms of possible service, however small or tall, that can crack open something, somewhere in our institution to see and embrace horizons of renewal and recommitment. Perhaps the energy and
enthusiasm that comes with our sense of servant leadership can move, even in the smallest of ways, all those around us to a sense of re-dedication to innovation, invention, discovery, and experimentation that will result in an increase of knowledge, new therapies that will improve health, new processes to save lives, or new opportunities where battling forces might be moved to put down weapons and search for justice and peace. One never knows what magic can happen when you enter into the consummate experience of LeaderBeing. Perhaps Forrest Gump was right all along. Life is like a box of chocolates. You never know what you’re going to get! But the first step is opening the box and entering into the experience of it all in the first place!

CONCLUSION

In 2001, Peter Jackson thrilled the world’s imagination with the start of his now famous film adaptation of J.R.R. Tolkien’s trilogy, Lord of the Rings. Born of the pages of Tolkien’s work, Jackson shaped characters with powerful personalities. The characters in the film trilogy captured so well the images we citizens have of the central characterizations of human living itself. Indeed, each of them lives in each of us to some degree. Inside we are all a heroic Frodo, a dedicated Sam, a wise Gandalf, and others. But also inside us is the potential for being a Gollum.

Gollum is a fascinating character. If we think for a moment who or what he represents we might be truly startled. To summarize his importance briefly, we know that in our world we have today many therapies for all forms of addiction that inflict so many of our friends and colleagues. It seems, in a certain sense, we have developed in today’s world 12 Step Programs for each. Perhaps, however, there is one that is missing --- the one that is the groundswell of all the rest --- the addiction to power.

Addiction is an interesting word. One might understand its meaning in a Latin phrase, “ad dicere.” We might translate that as “to speak unto.” Alternatively, we might rephrase it as “that to which I give my word, my oath.” Gollum, having experienced the allure of the One Ring To Rule Them All, gives himself over to its power. He becomes addicted to it. He is changed from being himself a Hobbit into a horribly hateful creature with a dual personality, who vacillates from fear to rage, and who in the end has one and
only one end, namely his tragic death and complete termination in the fires of Mount Doom. He perishes into nothingness with his “precious.”

This image of the One Ring To Rule Them All is most powerful. In a certain respect, Tolkien perhaps captured in his time some of the subliminal cultural misgivings of the Industrial Revolution and the advancing of the modern business world at the start of the 20th century. He clearly captured the character of the disease of addiction itself. Perhaps today he also gives to us research administrators one half of a mirror-image in which we are asked to consider who we are as servant leaders in the culture of research that is engaged in each of our institutions or agencies. Is our role really only about power and prestige, product and purse strings? Is it really only “all about the money?”

Perhaps another mirror image helps us balance out what the culture of research really is and therefore points to how we can provide the substance of LeaderBeing as research executives, administrators, and managers. Perhaps there is another image of “The Ring” that is the other side of the mirror in which we can ask ourselves: “Whom do we choose to be?”

In the 19th century, a group of women in Dublin, Ireland took a chance. In the spirit of their leader at that time, they came together to meet dire social needs in their country. In the alleyways, women, men, and children were dying of cholera. No one would take them in. They suffered alone until dead, and then their bodies rotted in the shadows. At the same time, young women in factories suffered horrific abuse at the hands of owners and those in power. Other similarly inhuman situations were in evidence in their times. These women decided for various reasons to take a chance and do something about it. Their common dedication ultimately changed them as people and opened up unforeseen futures.

Interestingly enough, they suffered at the hands of those in their time who were upset that “these women” were doing things that men alone should have been doing! Indeed, for whatever reasons, they upset the expected hierarchies of their times with a day-to-day carrying out of social justice services for the poor and the underserved. In time, these women decided to cut their expenses by dressing in common. They cared for each other deeply like members of a
family. Eventually, they even came to wear a sign of their commitment to the poor --- a simple, silver unadorned ring. Some of them came to America. They landed in Pittsburgh unrecognizable, yet wearing their rings of service, and founded hospitals and schools and soup kitchens all over the country. Forced by the powers of their time to settle down into something “acceptable,” the world eventually came to know them as the Sisters of Mercy. They continue today to carry out the meaning of their ring of service that ties them to the poor and the dispossessed. Their ring became not an object to be worn, but a series of never ending bands of relationships with themselves and with those they serve.

This symbol of the ring of service is very powerful. Not necessarily tied to the Sisters of Mercy, there is a story about a group of sisters who had a curious ritual practice when one of their members would approach her golden jubilee of membership. When a younger sister would make her final vows to serve others, she would choose a motto of some type that was engraved on the inside of her profession ring. Over the years, the engraving would understandably dim. When that young sister grew older and became a golden jubiliarian, she would meet with her superior. Her superior would ask her in ritual fashion if she would like to have her motto re-engraved into her ring. It was the practice of that community that the sister would respond likewise in ritual fashion: “Reverend Mother, that is most kind and generous; but, no thank you. I appreciate the offer. But there is no reason to engrave again my motto into my ring. My motto is engraved by now into my heart.”

Research administrators have a dynamic and pulsing call as servant leaders within our respective institutions. Within our particular agencies and within the culture of research itself, we are called to enter into the never-ending experience of LeaderBeing. Such an entrance will demand paradigm shifts within the self and the deepening of our personal and professional character. But as we gaze into the mirror, we ask who shall we become? Gollum or the jubilarian? Do we wear the ring whose self-centered endpoint can only lead to Mount Doom? Or will we don the One Ring To Serve Them All?

What ring will we choose to wear?
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ABSTRACT

Research managers at science-intensive institutions appear as a continuously evolving group of professionals whose identity is somewhat fragmented, even to themselves. In Portugal, specialized research manager roles have rapidly emerged over the last years alongside the development of a small but consolidated scientific system. In order to get an inside view of the professional identity associated to research management in Portugal, the authors conducted a semi-structured discussion session with a group of professionals. The session aimed to find operational definitions of research management in a broad sense, identifying competencies and skills required to perform such roles, and discuss perspectives on career development in the current scenario. This article departs from the perceptions collected within the group of professionals to inquire about the future environment of the profession.
INTRODUCTION

The urge to create socio-economic value from scientific knowledge, the general demand for accountability of publicly funded research, and the complexity of research funding and management raise the need for specialized research managers at science-intensive institutions. These professionals facilitate processes of knowledge transfer and account for a wide span of areas such as project management, technology transfer, communication, and funding opportunities. The profession of research manager/administrator developed in the late 1950s in the U.S. (Roberts et al., 2008), with the creation of professional associations (e.g., the Society of Research Administrators International has over 4,000 members). In Europe, this profession is recent. Several professional associations in Europe took the initiative to create a framework for the professional development of their members (e.g., European, British associations; (Poli & Toom, 2013). Yet, research managers appear to be a continuously evolving group of professionals whose identity is somewhat fragmented, even to themselves. Traditional definitions of research managers as those who “coordinate the daily operational tasks” for a research project, program, group or department (Bushaway, 2003) seem too restrictive. Instead, research managers have been described as a diverse group of professionals, geared to build research capacity, often with M.Sc. or Ph.D. degrees and willing “to be active in extending their job beyond their given job description” (Poli & Toom, 2013, n.p.; see also Schuetzenmeister, 2010; Witchurch, 2008).

In Portugal, where a small but consolidated scientific system has developed steadily over the last 20 years, specialized research manager roles have also rapidly emerged, often carried out by highly academic qualified staff. This has occurred without the simultaneous development of an adequate career structure. Indeed, in a recent Special Issue on Research Austerity in Euroscientist (Coutinho, 2013), a member of the Portuguese Prime Minister’s Scientific Advisory Board highlighted the need for a “career structure for research-supporting personnel in administration or in the management of facilities and laboratories” as one of the key issues in maintaining the high level of scientific competence acquired by the country (Coutinho, 2013, n.p.).
Professional identity is the starting point for establishing common standards and professional development, which is also strategically important at the institutional level. In order to get an inside view of the professional identity associated with research management in Portugal, we conducted a semi-structured discussion session with a group of Portuguese professionals aimed at finding operational definitions of research management in a broad sense, identifying competencies and skills required to perform such roles and discussing perspectives for career development in the current Portuguese environment.

**FINDING COMMON UNDERSTANDING – THE FINCAPÉ FORUM**

The FincaPé is an informal forum of professionals who meet to discuss best practices and exchange ideas about their professions and ongoing projects. This community is composed of a blend of about 70 professionals spanning the communication, management, research, technology transfer and other related fields, and working in science-intensive institutions. The forum represents a rich community of predominantly two professional identities: science communicators and managers. The FincaPé meetings are held every two months in Lisbon and each session has approximately 20 persons.

To discuss the professional identity of research managers, we held a FincaPé session in which 21 professionals participated from 16 institutions in the Lisbon metropolitan area. The majority of the participants (15) worked at public or private university or research centers in the areas of biomedicine, technology, business, or social sciences, and held mid-level managerial positions. In addition, some participants worked for two different private research foundations, a public funding agency, a researcher’s professional association, and a science communication association. Among the 21 participants, 62% were female and at least 43% held a Ph.D.

In this session we asked participants to identify the areas in
which they believed that they fell within research management in the broad sense; and to identify the competencies relevant for a research manager. Written notes were collected anonymously and discussed in the group. Then we divided the participants into three groups to discuss topics related to career prospects; these views were later shared with the whole audience.

**WHAT IS SCIENCE MANAGEMENT?**

When asked to identify the professional areas that should be included in—and excluded from—research management in the broad sense, a great diversity of answers emerged (29 different responses; see Figure 1). Those areas most often cited as falling within the scope of research management included science-related funding, management, communication and support, whereas the most cited areas to be excluded from the scope of research management were those clearly transversal to research and non-research institutions (such as accounts, human resources, information technology). Interestingly, participants revealed mixed feelings about lab management, financial management, technology transfer, and research, which may reflect the backgrounds and personal experiences of the FincaPé community itself.

**THE BASIC SKILLS OF A RESEARCH MANAGER**

With regard to the competencies or skills that the group considered relevant to carrying out research management functions, the total of 84 answers, depicted in Figure 2, can be grouped into four sub-groups: communication-, management- and research-related skills; and transferable skills. The first three subgroups correspond to skills that can be acquired through formal education or professional experience (in communication, research or management, respectively), whereas the last subgroup corresponds to skills more related to the individual him/herself.

The transferable skills seemed to be considered to have a substantial weight in research management roles, and some of them, such as motivation, proactivity, and creativity, suggest professionals are prone/willing to “to be active in extending their role beyond their given job descriptions” (Witchurch, 2008, p. 377) and eager to build capacity within their institution. It is interesting to note that a background in research and knowledge of the scientific system
Figure 1. Areas in which participants believed themselves to be included, and excluded, in research management, as well as number of times cited
Figure 2. Competencies or skills considered relevant by the group to carrying out research management functions.
were valued, according to several answers; the overall list suggests an interesting blend of academic skills (e.g., analytical capacity, research experience/background), and skills that are usually related to non-academic professionals (e.g., writing skills, knowledge of management principles).

**HOW ABOUT CAREER DEVELOPMENT?**

When questioned about the types of institutions that may hire research management professionals, the group identified academic institutions as the main employers, referring also to R&D companies, governmental agencies, and hospitals. This choice seemed narrow since, for example, service providers such as consultant firms, museums, science centers, NGOs or others were not included.

With regard to career opportunities in Portugal, the group was not optimistic. The group recognized unanimously that research managers should be part of the support structures of research-based institutions, and should be hired under full social benefit work contracts (rather than fellowships, which are extensively used in Portugal). However, the participants also perceived that despite their relevant role in research-related institutions, the number of “real” job opportunities was very low. Their comments suggested that there are at least two major obstacles to career development: a difficulty with “fitting” into traditional career opportunities in academia, which offers a sharp dichotomy between purely academic profiles and purely administrative profiles (the latter for all non-academic professionals); and very few real opportunities to transfer between institutions during mid- and senior career stages. These two barriers were correlated with the need to develop a clearer definition of the research manager position in order to facilitate the effective emergence of the professional career in research management.

Current funding austerity may render job opportunities for research managers even more difficult to attain: it was noted that public Portuguese universities currently have serious restrictions on recruitment, while private institutions may have more hiring flexibility. On the other hand, it was suggested that universities and research centres abroad could provide realistic career opportunities.

Finally, when questioned about the modus operandi of research management professionals, the group
highlighted “project-oriented”, “service providing” and “research-action” approaches. This variety of specializations may account for added value in fulfilling specific needs at research-based institutions.

**LOOKING AHEAD**

We took advantage of a rich community of research management professionals participating in the forum to think about their professional identity in Portugal. The perceptions of these professionals highlighted a substantial diversity of areas of action, sometimes controversial, as well as a wide range of required competencies. Although clearly influenced by the composition of the group, this suggests that the concept of research manager is not completely framed, and reinforces the idea of a loose professional identity. Interestingly, the need for a clearer identity was perceived as crucial for career development.

Studies conducted in other European countries have also identified in the concept of research manager, features such as loose identity, mixed backgrounds, willingness to extend beyond a given job description, and emphasis on the transferable skills (Allen-Collinson, 2009; Witchurch, 2008). These studies have advanced the idea of a *third space* as an emergent territory between academic and non-academic domains, to be colonized primarily by professionals working within the *third space*, and where the above-mentioned features are most prominent. Furthermore, the idea of a *third space* defies the conventional dichotomy prevailing in academic institutions, of an academic domain and an administrative domain that supports it (Witchurch, 2008a).

**A unifying trait of the professionals populating this semi-academic field could be the need and capacity to systematically cross the boundaries between academic and administrative roles, thus defying the existence of such sharp boundaries and, additionally, empowering the system in a multi-level and multi-disciplinary fashion.**

We were struck by the match between the perceptions collected during our session with Portuguese professionals and those described in
the literature. Does this mean that our community also moves in a third space? Are our observations somehow indicative of an emergent trend in the professional identities of research managers in Portugal? We envisage the third space as the future environment for the profession, lying as a semi-academic field somewhere between the academic and non-academic domains. A unifying trait of the professionals populating this semi-academic field could be the need and capacity to systematically cross the boundaries between academic and administrative roles, thus defying the existence of such sharp boundaries and, additionally, empowering the system in a multi-level and multi-disciplinary fashion.

We envisage the third space as the future environment for the profession, lying as a semi-academic field somewhere between the academic and non-academic domains.

We believe that looking more attentively to this community is important as it could help science institutions better face challenges ahead and maintain high levels of scientific competence.
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Using a Client Survey to Support Continuous Improvement: An Australian Case Study in Managing Change
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ABSTRACT

With the arrival of online survey tools that are low-cost, readily available and easy to administer, all organizations have access to one of the most effective mechanisms for determining quality improvement priorities and measuring progress towards achieving those priorities over time. This case study outlines the use made of this simple tool by a research office in one of Australia’s most research-intensive universities during a substantial change management exercise over the period 2008–2011. The rationale for reaching out to the University’s researchers as clients; basic principles followed to ensure high response rates and robust results; uses made of the data; and contribution to the change process are described, with a view to assisting research management professionals who are setting in place similar monitoring systems as an alternative to, or complementing, process-related (time and effort on task) performance data.
CONTEXT

The research office that is the subject of this case study was substantially restructured in 2008 with the specific and simple objective of improving researchers’ satisfaction with the University’s research management services. The objective was not a gratuitous one. Researchers require robust management systems to support their activities in a funding environment that is highly competitive and carrying a significant compliance burden. If they are not well supported, they are likely to scale down, or fail in, their grant seeking activities; funding will diminish; and there is a risk that whole research programs could be shut down due to compliance breaches. An effective barometer for excellent research management will undoubtedly be how it is perceived by those who rely on it.

An effective barometer for excellent research management will undoubtedly be how it is perceived by those who rely on it.

Over the period covered by this case study, the research office managed significant volumes of applications (around 1,200 annually), grants (upwards of 1,500 under management), accounts (over 5,000 individual research accounts), and upwards of $200 million AUD in external research funding. As are all research offices of this size and scale, it was a high pressure environment where deadlines were externally driven, workloads had significant peaks at certain times of year, and a great deal was at stake for individual researchers and the university.

The office’s restructure represented the second significant restructure of research management delivery at the university in a three-year period. The first restructure had caused significant disruption to existing workflows and disquiet among the grants management staff. A quite complex matrix structure had been set in place, with dual reporting lines leading to a lack of clarity as to where actual responsibility for actions lay.

The first restructure had been operationalized via an external consultancy with no continuity through early stage implementation. Unsurprisingly there was little ownership of the arrangements among office staff and external stakeholders. During one-to-one conversations, researchers reported “not knowing who to talk to any more” and provided numerous instances of grant management issues having arisen and been left unresolved. The unfortunate consequence was that the staff who could have made a positive difference were firmly entrenched in ‘bunker mode’. From their perspective, the fault lay with the restructure. Past arrangements were better and it was unfair that the perceptions of
poor service delivery were being seen as ‘their fault’.

**RATIONALE FOR USING THE ONLINE SURVEY TOOL**

Sharon Cole, in her article “Reframing research administration” (Cole, 2010) concluded that a co-operative approach involving faculty and administrators and attention to organizational culture are vital ingredients for successful improvement in research services delivery. The situation was evidence of this and the survey tool was directed at both of these imperatives. It would provide an avenue for broad stakeholder input and engagement in the change process and demonstrate the office was listening and responding in a proactive way.

The 2007 restructure had adopted a hierarchical approach with a twist—a small Operations Unit was established alongside the customer-focused Grants and Ethics Teams, to ensure consistency of process, deal with generic activities (creation of ‘shell’ records; file establishment; system-driven communications), manage and continuously improve systems (including database management), and conduct quality assurance. The customer-focused teams, on the other hand would have a firm focus on researchers, with service and relationship-building as key drivers for their work.

The structure was very different from anything in place in the larger Australian universities; it introduced high levels of accountability and challenged the formerly very autonomous management culture. Low morale among the staff, weary of change, meant that over the first twelve months most positions were re-filled. This led to further controversy and unease amongst stakeholders.

Given the climate of discontent and the major change agenda, the client survey tool was going to provide a ‘line in the sand’. Researchers would be able to rate all services provided by the office and remark on whether they perceived any improvements, as well as provide comments and suggestions and endorse particular members of staff whom they had found helpful over the last 12 months. The responses would provide the office with clear direction on what areas of the business to prioritize in order to achieve positive outcomes. As importantly, the survey would ensure that those involved in and impacted by the change management process focused on the relevant time period. Researchers had hitherto been demonstrating long memories—quoting poor service or an instance of bad practice from several years prior if canvassed for their opinion of the Office. The survey would lock down those observations and relegate them to history.

All the same, the exercise was met with scepticism from some quarters, not least a number of key staff who expressed such reasons as ‘you will never make some researchers happy’ and ‘the ones
that like us won’t respond’ to argue the futility of the exercise.

BASIC PRINCIPLES FOLLOWED

The survey was voluntary and more in the nature of a conversation than a quantitative tool to test particular assumptions. All researchers who had applied for a research grant received an email invitation to provide feedback (rather than complete a survey) on the office’s services, so that issues could be addressed and future service delivery could be improved. The information collected did not include personal information. However, the respondent was given the option of providing an email address if they wanted a staff member to contact them to discuss an issue they had raised. The purpose of the exercise was clearly described—the office was committed to continuous improvement and feedback would be used to develop and improve services over time. People who participated would be informed of findings and the progress that was being made to address issues raised.

All of the office’s stakeholders, including other university professional staff, were individually contacted and invited to provide their views. This amounted to around 1,100 individuals who had interacted with the office in any one year, rising over time. In later years, a friendly invitation to complete the survey was also added to staff email signatures. This re-enforced the message that the office was looking for input on how to improve services, created impetus (the invitation was connected with their experience of service delivery), and led to much higher response rates (rising from just over 20% in the first survey to more than 35% in 2011). The consistency in the responses received suggested this return rate was adequate for good judgment at the outset, and more than enough by 2011.

Only a few questions were asked. Respondent burden was kept low and the invitation alerted respondents to the fact that the survey would be a quick 5-minute exercise. Every question was neutral, with a view to simply covering all service delivery aspects. The wording of questions was simple and unambiguous so as to provide clear guidance on quality improvement opportunities.

The questions were a mix of ratings and open-ended opportunities to elaborate on service delivery and never failed to produce a rich set of responses and a real sense of how the office was performing. The questions looked back—“do you think we’ve improved or gone backwards?” They also looked forward—“what would you like to see us change for next year....?”

The ratings scale was a 6-point scale ranging from very high to very low, and did not allow respondents to ‘fence sit’. The middle rankings had the descriptors ‘better than average’ and ‘worse than average’. This would force respondents to put forward a considered view even if they had not thought a great deal about
the office’s services in the past. The underlying message was ‘tell us what you really and reasonably think we should be achieving’.

The seven standard annual questions were neutral in the sense that they did not try to focus on any particular known issue or concern, and covered:

- Respondent role (stage of career, researcher, executive, administrator, new to UNSWA, new to the office). Respondents could indicate that they had multiple roles. This allowed us to analyze the rankings by stakeholder group.
- How they rated the office’s services. This was presented as a table of services, from pre-award support to legal and ethics clearances, provision of research data, communications, and training. Opportunity for an open-ended comment was provided at the bottom of this table. Interestingly, a not uncommon open-ended comment was “I didn’t know you did all of those things”, suggesting the survey was raising awareness of the comprehensive nature of the office’s pre-and post-award service delivery.
- What they liked about the office’s services in the year
- What they would like to see changed in the following year
- Whether they thought services had improved, stayed the same, or gone backwards (or had no view)
- Whether they would like to commend any particular staff members
- Whether they would like to make any further comments

Sometimes other ‘omnibus’ questions were cautiously added about particular management issues—for example, in 2011 two questions were added about perceptions of training delivery and whether researchers would like to receive communications via new media (Twitter, Facebook, etc.). The importance of maintaining a balance between survey burden and opportunity to learn more was a foremost consideration.

USES MADE OF THE DATA

Initial concerns that the exercise might provide a vehicle for a minority of disgruntled people to unreasonably criticize the office were quickly dispelled. The feedback was always remarkably consistent across the respondent pool and, as many a market research professional will say, they had a commonsense ‘feel’ to them, confirming in the main what staff already knew about service delivery weaknesses and providing a mandate for addressing issues raised.

Those staff who expected the worst were pleasantly surprised to find that the number of people who rated their services on the positive side of the scale outnumbered those who expressed dissatisfaction, and that only a very few researchers had extremely negative views. What emerged was a sense that the office’s clients were equally and reasonably invested in service improvement. They became, in a very real
sense, part of the quality improvement team through having aired their views.

What emerged was a sense that the Office’s clients were equally and reasonably invested in service improvement.

The results were reported back to stakeholders after analysis and the actions that had been taken to respond to issues raised formed a brief preamble to the next year’s call for feedback. Year-on-year comparisons were reported to the Committee on Research and the Vice Chancellor’s Advisory Council, ensuring that senior management were as well informed as those close to the coalface, and aware of the continuous improvement efforts and achievements being made. Individual staff used examples from actions arising when preparing their documentation for their annual performance appraisal, creating grassroots buy-in both to hearing what people had to say about service delivery and doing something about it.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE CHANGE PROCESS

The results were a primary input for the annual research office staff retreat. As themes emerged, staff became active in contributing to addressing identified needs not just during the planning day but throughout the year. For example, the main concerns expressed one year were around an apparent lack of consistency in advice given at the pre-award stage. The grants teams responded by leading a comprehensive recruitment and training strategy for the casually appointed compliance advisers and introducing checklists and in-round debriefs that ensured consistency of advice.

The following year, the scales tipped further into the positive and the feedback from researchers then focused on a desire for personal attention and value-added strategic counselling, over and above the (now consistently provided) basic compliance advice.

Similarly, a concern regarding phone responsiveness was met with the appropriate technical and team response, and with due acknowledgment to the changing nature of office communications.

Over time the only difficult-to-address issues became those for which the office’s operations were reliant on the input of other departments. In those instances, the customer feedback was a primary, objective driver for the negotiation of service-level agreements that had quality assurance at their core.

Commendations were passed on and successes from year to year celebrated. The office developed a continuous improvement culture and its stakeholders continued to demonstrate their willingness to articulate room for improvement, in a positive way, by providing constructive input and taking
The Office developed a continuous improvement culture and its stakeholders continued to demonstrate their willingness to articulate room for improvement, in a positive way, by providing constructive input and taking the time to provide praise where praise was due.

**FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

At the time this case study was prepared, the office was relying primarily on the annual customer satisfaction survey and a handful of other high-level indicators to measure its annual service effectiveness. Transaction times were being used only in the area of ethics application review, where deadlines tend not to be set by funding agency grant rounds, making internal tracking more important. However, the electronic grants management system in use at the office provides for load reporting as well as transaction time reporting and the workflows are well-documented, allowing case-by-case consideration of staff resourcing, process effectiveness, and staff responsiveness.

While the annual call for feedback provided an important catalyst for positive change and responsive service delivery, a next step in optimizing efficiency and effectiveness might lie in seeking improvements at a more granular level and taking a more comprehensive approach. Smith and Gronseth (2011) outlined a comprehensive Quality Management Systems approach to improving research administration at the Mayo Clinic as one way forward. Its RISE initiative includes guidance on structuring a team-driven change exercise that captures key performance data on system efficiencies that can be analyzed at regular intervals and such supporting initiatives as the designation of particular staff as Research Quality Coordinators who look for continuous improvement over time.

...a next step in optimising efficiency and effectiveness might lie in seeking improvements at a more granular level and taking a more comprehensive approach.

**CONCLUSION**

The office’s annual call for feedback using an online tool was a simple and effective means of addressing a number of pressing change imperatives. In providing
an annual opportunity for everyone involved in the research enterprise to pause and reflect on how things had gone that year and to quickly and easily engage in a basic conversation about service provision, it built a culture supporting change. It allowed those who wanted change to articulate exactly what kind of change they were seeking, across any and all aspects of service. It allowed staff to respond and report back on how they were addressing issues over time. And it allowed those who wanted to acknowledge good service to do so, ‘on the record’. It put everyone on the same page, and kept people focused on, and rewarded for, continuous improvement. Importantly, news of performance and progress was incorporated in whole-of-university reporting at the senior executive level. Past perceptions of faculty as impossible to please, and administrators as only interested in getting the rules right, were able to be seen for what they were—a mythology with little foundation and without justice to all concerned.
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CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY

Rating scale used: Very high; high; better than average; worse than average; low; very low
n/a option provided for all questions
Response required on all questions

RespondentID
CollectorID
StartDate
EndDate
IP Address
Email Address
FirstName
LastName

1. Please indicate what role/s you have within the University by ticking which of the following applies to you. If you have multiple roles, please tick all that apply.
This allows stratification of responses, to see how well client needs are being met at different stages of a research career, and amongst those who support research as well.
  • Early career researcher
  • Mid-career researcher
  • Senior researcher
  • Researcher holding an executive role
  • Researcher that arrived at the University in the past year
  • Researcher that has not used research office services
  • Research administrator
  • Other (please specify)

2. How would you rate our services in 20XX? (Please tick one box for each area – compulsory to chose one.)

Very high; high; better than average; worse than average; low; very low; n/a for each of these.

The question is presented in table form with the various services below forming a line in the table and radio buttons for the rankings, which are expressed across the top. A response for each line is required before moving on. Note there is no ‘fence sitting’ allowed. ‘average’ is not an option, so that people are forced to express a positive or negative view. This makes them really think about what message they want to send to the office.
  • Helping you submit your grant application
  • Providing relevant, appropriate assistance and advice in administering your grant/s
  • Communicating grant deadlines and requirements
  • Opening research accounts
  • Assisting you in obtaining legal advice
  • Assisting you in obtaining ethics clearances
  • Providing information and advice on research ethics requirements
- Providing you with high quality research data
- Helping you use funding body application systems e.g (ARC RMS or NHMRC RGMS)
- Sourcing timely and quality information from our website

Any comments regarding the services outlined above?
Open ended response – people tend to want to comment on one or two services or experiences. A box ‘per service’ is not offered, so as to keep the survey short/respondent burden low.

3. **What did you like about our services in 20XX?**
Open ended response

4. **What would you like to see us change in 20XX?**
Open ended response

5. **How do you believe our services have changed in 20XX as compared with prior years?**
   (Please tick one box)
   - Improved
   - Stayed the same
   - Gone backwards
   - No opinion

6. **Are there any staff members that you would like to commend for their service in 20XX?**
   (drop down list of staff members)

7. **Please feel free to provide any further comments or advice**
Open ended response

8. **If you would like someone from the Office to contact you to discuss your feedback please provide your name and contact details here:**
Open ended response
Science Research Group Leader’s Power and Members’ Compliance and Satisfaction with Supervision

Yi Meng, Jia He, and Changkun Luo
Third Military Medical University

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the correlations between science research group members’ perceptions of power bases used by their group(lab, team) leader (coercive, reward, legitimate, expert and referent) and the effect of those perceptions on group members’ attitudinal compliance, behavioral compliance, and satisfaction with supervision. Participants were postdoctoral and Ph.D. students at a research institution in the UK that is a world leader in its fields. Three questionnaires, including the Rahim Leader Power Inventory (RLPI), the Compliance with Supervisor’s Wishes (CSW), and the satisfaction with supervision facet of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), were used. The results of statistical descriptive analysis indicated that group members perceived expert power used by the leader as the greatest among five power bases; while the results of the multiple regression analysis indicated legitimate power and expert power were positively related to attitudinal compliance; legitimate power, coercive power and expert power had positive correlations with group members’ behavioral compliance; and referent power, reward power, and expert power were positively associated with group members’ satisfaction with supervision. Based on the findings, this study offers recommendations for the effective exercising of power in research groups and draws implications for advancing administration in science institutions.
INTRODUCTION

“Leadership is a process whereby an individual influences other individuals to achieve a common goal in a group or an organization” (Northouse, 2010, p. 3). The essence of leadership is influence over followers; the role of power in leadership is to act as an engine of influence (Bass & Bass, 2008). However, no research has been conducted on the power-influence processes underlying the relationship between power and effective leadership; as Pfeffer (1981) pointed out, power has been neglected in management studies. While Yukl (1989) stated that some studies on the power-influence approach attempted to explain leadership effectiveness in terms of the degree of power possessed by a leader, types of power, and how power is exercised, Gordon and Yukl (2004) concluded that the answer remains elusive despite the countless studies carried out to identify effective leadership over the past half-century. People have lost interest in the topic of power because of the flat organizational structure and empowerment popular in today’s world. Nevertheless, power still exists in flattening organizations and empowerment still involves sharing power with others. As always, understanding power is significant for understanding organizational behavior and leadership effectiveness (Benfari, Wilkinson, & Orth, 1986; Pfeffer, 1981; Rahim, 1989; Yukl & Falbe, 1991).

Earlier research (Rahim, 1989; Rahim & Afza, 1993; Rahim, Antonioni, Krumov, & Ilieva, 2000; Rahim & Buntzman, 1989; Rahim, Kim, & Kim, 1994; Student, 1968; Yagil, 2002) on leader power mainly focused on business and political organizations, and seldom on the area of education, health, and other public service organizations, and even more rarely on science research institutions. Nevertheless, science research organizations contribute not only to human progress but also directly to the national economy. Research groups are the basic units of research institutions, where great inventions and discoveries are made. The performance-related outcomes desired by a leader for research groups include infinite commitment and satisfaction by group members. Thus, leaders should be aware of multiple sources of power in work situations and how they affect the attitudes of group members.

The aim of this study was to clarify correlations between research group members’ perceptions of the power bases used by their leader and the effect of those perceptions on group members’ compliance and satisfaction with supervision. The framework for this study...
is shown in Figure 1. The five power bases of French and Raven (1959)—reward power, coercive power, legitimate power, referent power, and expert power—were defined as independent variables of the correlation, while members’ attitudinal compliance, behavioral compliance and satisfaction with supervision were dependent variables. This study attempted to supply the missing link in leadership effectiveness research; draw implications for administrators in building and maintaining an advanced institution for science research; and give recommendations for effective leadership practice in research groups. The specific objective was to obtain answers to the following questions:

1. How do science research group members perceive their group leader’s use of coercive power, reward power, legitimate power, expert power, and referent power?
2. What is the correlation between science research group members’ perceptions of leader power bases and group members’ attitudinal compliance, behavioral compliance and satisfaction with supervision?

Figure 1. Leaders’ Power Bases and Group Members’ Compliance and Satisfaction
Power is an intangible force in an organisation (Daft, 1999). However, the phenomenon of power is pervasive in all groups and organizations; yet the concept of power is so complex that each one of us probably thinks about it a little differently. From among numerous definitions, two are more popular. The first defines power as a force (Bass & Bass, 2008; Pfeffer, 1981). The second defines power as a capacity (Greiner & Schein, 1988; Rahim, 1989). Nevertheless, “all definitions seem to be concerned with the exercise of social influence to fill some need or meet some goal” (Greiner & Schein, 1988, p. 13). In this study, the term power was defined as the capability of an individual agent to influence the behavior or attitudes of one or more designated target persons (Rahim, 1988). This definition implies that this study on power was limited to the influence of one individual (group leader) over other individuals (group members).

Where does the capability of one person to influence another one come from? In other words, where does power come from? Power bases have been conceptualized in a variety of ways by scholars. French and Raven (1959) presented a power bases taxonomy: legitimate power, reward power, coercive power, exert power, and referent power. Benfari, Wilkinson, and Orth (1986) added three more power bases to French and Raven’s: information power, affiliation power, and group power. Another way to conceptualize power bases is a simple two-factor taxonomy of position power versus personal power developed by Bass in 1960 (Bass & Bass, 2008). Power can derive from one’s personal or social position. The findings of Student (1968) indicated a qualitative distinction between referent power and expert power (personal power) on the one hand, and reward power, coercive power and legitimate power (position power) on the other. Such findings supported Bass’s categories. According to Yukl and Falbe (1991), these two types of power are...
relatively independent and each includes several distinct but partially overlapping components. Moreover, they extend the number of power sources within three broad categories: information power, persuasiveness, and charisma. However, “some problems in overlap within two pairs of scales need to be resolved” (Yukl & Falbe, 1991, p. 442). Gaski (1986) also pointed out that these alleged power sources appear to have already been captured within the French and Raven framework.

So far, the power bases suggested by French and Raven seem to be fairly representative and popular in application. Earlier studies (Hinson & Schriesheim, 1989; Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985; Rahim, 1989) provided empirical evidence of this framework. Hence, this study employed the power bases described by French and Raven. Admittedly, legitimate power, reward power, and coercive power derived from leaders’ position are called position power; while expert and referent power from a leader’s own training, experience, and personal qualities are called personal power (Rahim, 1988; Rahim, Kim, & Kim, 1959). The definitions of these power bases by French and Raven (1959) are provided below:

1. Reward power is based on the perceptions of subordinates that a superior can reward for desired behavior.
2. Coercive power is based on subordinates’ perceptions that a superior has the ability to punish them if they fail to conform to his or her influence attempt.
3. Legitimate power is based on the belief of subordinates that a superior has the right to prescribe and control their behavior.
4. Expert power is based on subordinates’ belief that a superior has job experience and special knowledge or expertise in a given area.
5. Referent power is based on subordinates’ desires to identify with a superior because of their admiration or personal liking of the superior.

**Outcomes of Power**

Burke and Wilcox (1971) stated that people will ask two interrelated questions when the relationship between a supervisor and a subordinate is discussed in terms of influence and control. One is why people in organizations comply with the requests of their supervisors; the other is about the various reasons for subordinates’ job satisfaction and job performance. The principal reasons for the use of leader power are to gain compliance from followers and keep them satisfied with supervision (Rahim et al., 1994).

Job satisfaction is an attitude that individuals maintain about their jobs, developed from their perceptions of job characteristics (Robbins & Judge, 2010). Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) described five areas of satisfaction: the work itself, the co-workers, the pay, the supervision, and the promotion opportunities. One facet of job
satisfaction, satisfaction with supervision, was used to identify the superior-subordinate relationships in this study. Satisfaction with the leader is a function of team performance (Jernigan & Beggs, 2005). Early studies (Busch, 1980; Rahim, 1989; Rahim & Afza, 1993; Rahim & Buntzman, 1989; Skinner, Dunbinsky, & Donnelly, Jr., 1984; Yagil, 2002) illustrate that expert power and referent power are positively correlated with followers’ satisfaction with supervision; the relationship between coercive power and satisfaction with supervision is negative; the relationship between legitimate power and reward power with satisfaction are inconsistent.

“Compliance implies acceptance of the more powerful person’s influence” (Bass & Bass, 2008, p. 263). In reality, the three distinct outcomes of the exercise of power for target persons are commitment, compliance, and resistance. Commitment is usually the most successful outcome from the agent’s perspective with regard to carrying out a complex and difficult task; compliance is necessary to accomplish a simple and routine task; the result of resistance is the agent that may not perform any task (Yukl, 2010). Early studies (Rahim, 1988, 1989; Rahim & Afza, 1993; Rahim et al., 1994) based on French and Raven’s power typology frequently touched upon followers’ compliance with a superior’s wishes and effectiveness in relation to the supervisor’s particular power bases. They found that legitimate, expert and referent power bases generally induce compliance from followers, while coercive and reward power bases are weak reasons for compliance. More specifically, referent power is positively correlated with behavioral and attitudinal compliance; expert power to attitudinal compliance is significantly positive; and legitimate power influences behavioral compliance.

**METHOD**

**Samples**

The research site was a UK-based world-leading research institution. By the time the survey was conducted, there were over 400 scientists and support staff at this institution. Participants were postdoctoral and Ph.D. students who directly carried out research in 61 groups. Based on institution records, simple random sampling led to the selection of 150 (n) samples from 281(N) group members from the 61 groups attached to 4 divisions. A total of 150 questionnaires were distributed; 97 were actually received by participants; 86 group members had respond; and 84 questionnaires were usable, for a response rate of 86.59%. The average age of the participants was 31.98(S.D=8.74) and 68.21% were male. Of 86 respondents, 47.64% were postdoctoral students and 52.46% were Ph.D. students; these reported an average dyadic tenure (years worked with research group leaders) of 2.74 years (S.D=3.52).

The insertion of each questionnaire into the pigeon hole mail rack at the
research site was the only permissible way to distribute it. A total of 53 questionnaires were still in pigeon holes two weeks after 150 packages were sent out. High group member turnover at the research site was possibly the main reason the distributed packages were not taken away: Ph.D. students and postdoctoral researchers listed in institution records had graduated or left workstations at the time of this survey. The other reason might be that some international postdoctoral and Ph.D. students lacked experience in participating in this kind of survey.

Measurement

1. Leaders’ power bases

The power bases were measured using the Rahim Leader Power Inventory (RLPI) developed by Rahim (1988). This 29-item instrument uses a 5-point Likert scale to measure subordinates’ perceptions of their supervisor’s power bases. This scale has five dimensions: coercive power (5 items, $\alpha=.649$), reward power (6 items, $\alpha=.717$), legitimate power (5 items, $\alpha=.784$), expert power (6 items, $\alpha=.791$), and referent power (6 items, $\alpha=.882$). Respondents (group members) were asked to rate these 29 statements from 1 to 5. Indices of the five power bases were constructed by averaging participants’ responses to selected items in each factor. A higher score indicated that a supervisor had larger power bases. Sample items included: “it is reasonable for my superior to decide what he/she wants me to do”, and “my superior does not have the expert knowledge I need to perform my job”.

2. Compliance with Supervisor’s Wishes

Group member compliance was measured with Compliance with Supervisor’s Wishes (CSW) developed by Rahim (1988). This instrument has 10 items; respondents were asked to rate their agreement with each item on a 1–5 Likert scale. Five items formed a subscale for attitudinal compliance, while the other five items formed a subscale for behavioral compliance. Item responses were averaged to measure attitudinal and behavioral compliance. The reliability coefficients were .754 and .925, respectively. A higher score indicated greater compliance with the leader’s wishes. Sample items included: “I prefer not to comply with my supervisor’s instructions”, and “I do what my supervisor suggests”.

3. Satisfaction with Supervision

Group members’ satisfaction with their supervision was measured using the dimension of satisfaction with supervision from the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). This 18-item instrument asked the respondent to describe his/her satisfaction with supervision, stating ‘yes’, ‘?’, or ‘no’ for each item. A 3-point scale was used to represent ‘yes’, ‘?’, or ‘no’. Based on the score for each item, the average of 18 items was used to measure satisfaction with supervision. The higher the average score, the greater was the satisfaction with
supervision. The reliability coefficient was .819. Sample items included “supportive” and “hard to please”.

Analysis

The data obtained from three questionnaires were analyzed using SPSS 18.0 for Windows. Mean scores for each item on the three questionnaires were calculated for each respondent. In this study, the independent variables were coercive, reward, legitimate power, expert power, and referent, while behavioral compliance (BC), attitudinal compliance (AC), and satisfaction with supervision (SS) were dependent variables. The number of items, mean, standard deviation and standardized Cronbach’s alpha for all variables and Pearson correlations for the five independent variables and three dependent variables were calculated. Standardized Cronbach’s alpha for each of these 8 sub-scales was used to establish the internal consistency of the items. Pearson correlations were calculated to assess intercorrelations among five power bases, for two types of compliance, and for all sub-scales on the three questionnaires. Three stepwise regression analyses were used to further investigate the relationship among the five independent variables and each of the three dependent variables. In the first, second, and third regression analyses, the five power bases were regressed on attitudinal compliance with leader’s wishes, behavioral compliance with leader’s wishes, and satisfaction with supervision score, respectively. Each dependent variable was regressed against the five independent variables at the stepwise criteria: p<=.050 to enter and p >=.100 to remove. The mean score for five sub-dimensions of RLPI provided an answer to research question 1 and the results of three stepwise regression analyses provided an answer to research question 2.

RESULTS

Table 1 presents means, standard deviations, and Cronbach’s alpha for the measures. Cronbach’s alpha is a commonly used test of internal reliability (Bryman, 2008). According to Pallant (2011), Cronbach’s alpha values above .7 are considered acceptable, while values above .8 are preferable. Among sub-scales for RLPI, CSW and JDI, only the Cronbach’s alpha for coercive was slightly less than .7. The mean scores for power bases indicated that expert power (3.82) was greatest, followed by referent (3.78), legitimate (3.45), reward (3.11), and coercive (3.08). The results from the descriptive analysis for CSW revealed that group members’ attitudinal compliance with group leader’s power (3.64) was stronger than behavioral compliance (3.54). Group members’ responses to the satisfaction with supervision facet of JDI suggested that group members’ satisfaction with their leader (2.59) was very high. Thus, research question 1 has been addressed.

Table 2 presents Pearson correlations between power bases and compliance and
Correlation analysis was used to describe the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two variables. The Pearson correlation coefficient ($r$) can only take on values from -1 to +1. The minus or plus symbols indicate whether there is a negative or positive correlation, while the size of the absolute value indicates the strength of the relationship (Pallant, 2011). Cohen (as quoted in Pallant, 2011) suggests the following guidelines for interpreting the values of the correlation coefficient: $0.10 < r < 0.29$ demonstrates a weak correlation between two variables; $0.30 < r < 0.49$ shows a medium correlation; and $0.50 < r < 1.0$ indicates a strong correlation.

Regression analysis is a statistical technique for investigating the strength of the relationship between variables. Multiple regression analysis indicates the influence of two or more independent variables on a designated dependent variable (Bryman, 2008). Therefore, with the Pearson correlations identified above, regression analysis was used to further investigate the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The results are shown in Table 3. Stepwise regression analysis for attitudinal compliance showed that legitimate and expert met the entry requirement, while the other three variables were excluded. The adjusted $R^2$ indicated that about 30.5% of the variance in attitudinal compliance could be explained by the two predictor variables ($\Delta R^2 = .305, F=19.183, p=.000$). Statistically significant correlations emerged between attitudinal compliance and group members’ perception that a group leader uses legitimate power ($\beta = .354, t=2.966, p=.004$) and expert power ($\beta = .271, t=2.267, p=.026$). Stepwise regression analysis for behavioral compliance revealed that three variables—legitimate, coercive, and expert—were included in the final equation, while the other two variables—reward and referent—were rejected. The adjusted $R^2$ indicates that about 56.2% of the variance in behavioral compliance is explained by the three predictor variables ($\Delta R^2 = .562, F=36.529, p=.000$). Statistically significant correlations emerged between behavioral compliance and group members’ perception that a group leader uses legitimate power ($\beta = .370, t=3.763, p=.000$); uses coercive power ($\beta = .403, t=5.338, p=.000$); and uses expert power ($\beta = .283, t=2.945, p=.004$). Stepwise regression analysis for satisfaction indicated that referent, reward and expert met the entry requirement, while the other two were rejected. About 55.0% of the variance in satisfaction was accounted for by the predictors ($\Delta R^2 = .550, F=34.860, p=.000$). Statistically significant correlations emerged between satisfaction with supervision and group members’ perception that a group leader is using referent power ($\beta = .531, t=5.351, p=.000$); reward power ($\beta = .187, t=2.472, p=.016$); and expert power ($\beta = .209, t=2.125, p=.037$). These results answered research question 2.
Table 1
No. of Items, Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Cronbach’s Alpha for Subscales of the RLPI, CSW, and JDI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coercive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Pearson Correlation among All Independent Variables and Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Coercive</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.221*</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Reward</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.218*</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.341**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Legitimate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.642**</td>
<td>.414**</td>
<td>.528**</td>
<td>.637**</td>
<td>.328**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Expert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.664**</td>
<td>.498**</td>
<td>.522**</td>
<td>.597**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.Referent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.246*</td>
<td>.300**</td>
<td>.711**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.AC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.717**</td>
<td>.340**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.BC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.415**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.SS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed) ** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Table 3
Stepwise Regression Analysis among Three Dependent Variables with Five Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>β (Standardized Coefficients)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>19.183</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.883</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legitimate (.354)</td>
<td>2.966</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expert (.271)</td>
<td>2.267</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Predictors (Constant), Legitimate, Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>36.529</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.345</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legitimate (.370)</td>
<td>3.763</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coercive (.403)</td>
<td>5.338</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expert (.283)</td>
<td>2.945</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Predictors (Constant), Legitimate, Coercive, Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>34.860</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.327</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Referent (531)</td>
<td>5.351</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reward (.187)</td>
<td>2.472</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expert (.209)</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Predictors (Constant), Referent, Reward, Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of this study was to clarify the relationship between research group members’ perceptions of the power bases used by their leader and the effect of those perceptions on group members’ compliance and satisfaction with supervision. To this point, there has been no previous field study of those correlations in the science research area. Findings from this study will aid efforts to refine and broaden management theory relating to power and effective leadership.

To achieve the purpose of this study, two research questions were asked and studied. The first was answered using statistics descriptive analysis: from a list of five power bases, group members perceived that expert power was used most often by the leader, followed by referent power, legitimate power, reward power, and coercive power. This finding differs from that offered in earlier studies (Rahim & Buntzman, 1989; Rahim, Kim, & Kim, 1994), which showed that legitimate power was the greatest power employed. The leaders of science research groups in this study are gurus in biology, genetics, biochemistry, chemistry and physics; therefore, it is reasonable for these leaders to use expert power most often, rather than legitimate power. The second question was addressed by stepwise regression analysis: legitimate power and expert power were positively associated with attitudinal compliance; legitimate power, coercive power and expert power were positively correlated with behavioral compliance; referent power, reward power, and expert power were positively associated with satisfaction. These results were similar those from previous studies (Burke & Wilcox, 1971; Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985; Rahim & Afza, 1993), which tended to suggest that legitimate power, expert power, and referent power were related to compliance, while expert power and referent power were related to satisfaction.

The implications of this study for leadership practice include the following: group leaders can be more effective in promoting their group members’ satisfaction by combining their own referent power, expert power, and reward power; and leaders can acquire their group members’ compliance by increasing their use of legitimate power and expert power. Expert power had a notably significant effect on both satisfaction and compliance. The possible reason for such results could be that knowledge and expertise are valued by group members in research settings. Yukl (2010) suggested the following ways to use and maintain this power: explain the reasons, importance, and perspective of a proposal by using evidence; avoid making rash, careless, or inconsistent statements; never lie, exaggerate, or misrepresent the facts; listen to the others’ concerns and suggestions seriously; and act confident and decisive in a crisis. In terms of science research groups, the most convincing way to display expert power is by solving
important problems, making good
decisions, providing sound advice, and
successfully completing challenging but
highly visible projects. Nevertheless,
expert power should be used carefully to
avoid lowering group members’
creativity, which is the most precious
contributor to research group tasks.
Moreover, the group leader should
remember that “expert power used by
itself is very limited power base” (Benfari,

The implication for administrators of
research institutions is that the authority
of group leaders (legitimate power)
should be defined in as clear and explicit a
manner as possible in institutions’
documents, such as the organization
charter and written job descriptions.
Those documents should be consistent
with the basic values and culture of the
organizations in order to promote
leadership effectiveness. In addition, as
referent power relates to satisfaction with
supervision, the human resources
department should consider the
individual’s personal characteristics and
integrity in selecting a group leader
although the basic requirement is
expertise capacity.

Three limitations apply to this study.
The first has to do with the study’s
generalizability, since the research work
was only conducted at one institution. The
second is an objective limitation from the
research site concerning confidentiality
and the condition of anonymity. The last
was a subjective limitation, in which the
study only paid attention to independent
and dependent variables, while
extraneous variables were ignored, such
as leaders’ age, leaders’ gender, length of
time as a group leader, and so on.
However, representatives of the research
site and the strong psychometric
properties of the three published research
instruments used are study strengths.

Future studies could replicate this
study with a larger sample size at other
leading research institutions in different
countries, or examine further outcomes of
the use of power in a research group, such
as group creativity. Also, the qualitative
approach—a case study employing
interview and observation techniques—
might be used to better understand some
of this study’s interesting findings, such as
the removal of the group leader’s use of
referent and reward power from
equations of attitudinal and behavioral
compliance. In addition, extraneous
variables ignored by this study, such as
gender, age, time spent being a group
leader and so on, should be considered by
future studies.
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The Toll of Workplace Bullying

Robert Killoren
TCP Consulting

OVERVIEW

In the fall of 2013, a story broke in the news about a victim of bullying. A football player left his team because he was being bullied. But this wasn’t some local newspaper reporting on a little kid on a Pop Warner team. It was national news about a professional lineman for the Miami Dolphins. The player, Jonathan Martin, reported that he was leaving the team because he could no longer take the abuse he was getting from some teammates (Pelissero, 2013).

In a January 2014 interview that aired on NBC, he described what almost any victim’s experience would be like: “I wish I would have had more tools to solve my situation,” Martin said to interviewer Tony Dungy, the former NFL head coach of the Indianapolis Colts (Connor, 2014). “I felt trapped, like I didn’t have a way to make it right. It came down to a point where, you know, I felt it was best to just remove from myself from the situation.” People found it hard to believe that this highly paid, highly educated (Stanford graduate), mountain of a man could be bullied. But that’s the nature of bullying. It does not matter how big victims are, or how smart they are, or how old they are. They can be kids in the school yard or executives in a board meeting. Bullying can happen to anyone, anytime, anywhere.

Bullying may be more common than most people think. According to a study commissioned by the Workplace Bullying Institute, one in three employees experience bullying in the workplace either as a victim or as a witness suffering collateral damage (Zogby International, 2010). Seventy-five percent of those instances involved top-down bullying by a supervisor. Few organizational or operational flaws can wreak as much havoc as a bully in the workplace, and yet many bullies get away with their abusive behavior every day. Many employers do not know that workplace bullies exist or they choose to ignore the warning signs. This can result in tragic consequences for an office.
... one in three employees experience bullying in the workplace either as a victim or as a witness suffering collateral damage ... Seventy-five percent of those instances involved top-down bullying by a supervisor.

Persistent and unchecked bullying can literally make people sick (Workplace Bullying Institute, 2012). It can result in emotional, psychological, and even physical harm (Rospenda, 2005). It can cause anxiety, hypertension, or heart disease (Kivimäki et al., 2003, p. 782). It can lower your body’s immune system and make you feel hopeless, helpless, and worthless. It can lead to serious sleep disorders, and weight gain or loss, and cause an increased number of sick days.

Depression is the most common symptom of workplace bullying. A report commissioned by Safe Work Australia, stated that: “Workplace bullying was strongly associated with increased incidence of significant depression symptoms” (Butterworth et al., 2013). The study revealed that 40% of respondents to the survey who reported being bullied on the job had significant depression symptoms compared to 14% who had no history of workplace bullying. Authors of a study conducted in France reported that workplace bullying was found to be a strong risk factor for depressive symptoms for men and women (Niedhammer et al., 2006); a study conducted in Sweden also found that even being a bystander to workplace bullying can lead to depression (Emdad et al., 2013). Symptoms of depression include (NIH National Worksite Program, 1995):

- Persistent sad or “empty” mood
- Feelings of hopelessness, pessimism
- Loss of interest or pleasure in ordinary activities, including sex
- Feelings of guilt, worthlessness, helplessness
- Decreased energy, fatigue, being “slowed down”
- Thoughts of death or suicide, suicide attempts
- Sleep disturbances (insomnia, early-morning waking, or oversleeping)
- Irritability
- Eating disturbances (loss of appetite and weight, or weight gain)
- Excessive crying
- Difficulty concentrating, remembering, making decisions
- Chronic aches and pains that don’t respond to treatment.

And in the workplace, symptoms of depression often include:

- Decreased productivity
- Morale problems
• Lack of cooperation
• Safety risks, accidents
• Absenteeism
• Frequent statements about being
tired all the time
• Complaints of unexplained aches
and pains
• Alcohol and/or drug abuse (NIH

Paul Harvey, associate professor of
organizational behavior, said in a recent
news release from his institution, the
University of New Hampshire: “Although
the effects of abusive supervision may not
be as physically harmful as other types of
dysfunctional behavior, such as workplace
violence or aggression, the actions are likely
to leave longer-lasting wounds, in part,
because abusive supervision can continue
for a long time” (Harvey, quoted in Wright,
2013). It can be a hidden disease in an
organization or office, leaving upper
management wondering what’s going on.

This is because bullying can often go
undetected (McAvoy & Murtagh, 2003)
(Williams, 2011). Victims of bullying are
frequently silent about the abuse they are
getting. They could be unaware of the fact
that what they are experiencing is not
normal. In other words, they may not even
know they are being bullied. That may
seem surprising, but bullies can seem like
perfectly ordinary supervisors if that’s all
the employees ever see. People whose work

is constantly rejected for insignificant things
and returned with sarcastic notes and
scribbled comments throughout may just
think they must be stupid and a poor
worker. They blame themselves and just
keep trying to work harder in fear that they
are going to lose their job. They may not
even recognize they are being manipulated
by the abuser.

Victims may also feel ashamed to admit
they are a victim of a bully. They see
themselves as merely weak and unable to
stand up to the boss. But instead of taking
out their indignation at being belittled all
the time by the bully boss, the anger gets
shunted to beating up on themselves. They
suffer in silence, and soon their work begins
to suffer as well (Razdan, 2008). In many
cases workers actually create self-fulfilling
prophecies of failure in their careers by
riding the downward spiral of despair.

Some bullying persists because victims
feel powerless to do anything about it. In
rough economic times, employees working
under the supervision of a bully cannot
easily find another job to move to, so they
feel trapped in their current situation with
no alternatives (Bruzzese, 2011). They feel
oppressed but they have to keep their
mouths shut for fear the bully boss will
simply terminate them if they file a
complaint and then they would be even
worse off than before. Miserable with a job
is preferable to miserable without a job, and
so tolerate abuse without reporting it (Marano, 1995).

One of the really tricky things is that bullies often produce the results their superiors want to see (Petrecca, 2010). They often are the kind of managers that meet corporate goals, and they do it on time. Who can argue with success, right (Lebowitz, 2013)? It may seem to the victim that if they file a complaint with upper management their charges will be ignored or worse yet that they may show themselves as some kind of loser who is unwilling to be a team player. Bullies recognize this vulnerability in some victims and will then even double-down on their abuse.

Likewise, depending on the psychological makeup of the bully, their bullying may be very specifically targeted at a particular individual. In that way if the victim complains about being bullied to a higher level of authority, the bully boss knows that his boss will naturally check with others in the office about the nature of the complaint. When everyone else says they don’t have any problems with the boss, the bully boss counts on upper management to let the matter drop. This leaves the bully able to continue to abuse the victim without consequences.

This kind of targeted abuse can happen if the bully feels threatened by the expertise or social skills that an underling possesses. “Contrary to conventional wisdom,” wrote self-help author Ray Williams, “the targets of office bullies are not the new, inexperienced and less confident employees. The targets, according to research, are the highly competent, accomplished, experienced and popular employees” (Williams, quoted in Lebowitz, 2013). In this kind of situation the bully may be a co-worker rather than in a supervisory position. In order to protect their position within the hierarchy, they need to start to whittle away at the victim’s self-confidence, strength, and reputation. They will also try to undercut the victim’s efforts by blaming them of shoddy work. Bullies may actually set up a subordinate for failure by feeding them false or incomplete information about a work assignment.

Finally, some higher levels of authority don’t recognize bullying for what it is: abusive behavior. Rather, they see a “tough-love” supervisor who is hard on their employees but gets the work done and hits all the milestones. Why in the world would senior management want to upset a good thing—the authoritarian supervisor makes the higher-up bosses look good.
Anybody can be a victim. Even strong individuals can fall prey to a bully. Bullies are master manipulators who have often bullied their way to higher levels of management, leaving behind them a trail of people they have walked over.

Anybody can be a victim. Even strong individuals can fall prey to a bully. Bullies are master manipulators who have often bullied their way to higher levels of management, leaving behind them a trail of people they have walked over. Bullies know what buttons to push on their targets to frustrate them and back them slowly into a corner where the normal instinct to fight or take flight is suppressed by the bully’s abuse and a senior management that lets the bully get away with it. So often the only response of which the victim is capable is to freeze or fold. Depression, anxiety, shame, and other symptoms of great stress usually follow. Even an ordinarily strong person may be incapable of standing up to bullying that is free from reins. This behavior can often go undetected because victims, who are normally strong, are just too ashamed to admit to “allowing” themselves to be bullied. And the fact that the bully boss gets away with it simply compounds their reliance on dominant behavior to get things done and to eliminate competition (LaVan & Martin, 2008).

**ORIGIN OF BULLYING**

Where do bullies come from? This brings up the old nature vs. nurture question (Shostak et al., 2009). In the case of bullies, it appears that both nature and nurture are important in understanding bullying behavior. Geneticists have contributed to our understanding of abusive behavior. Though they have discovered no “bully gene,” they are finding out that certain gene sequences are present in a statistically significant number of patients with certain mental illnesses that may predispose them to certain behaviors. Whether or not these genes are activated, however, depends on environmental factors such as psychological stressors at key moments in a person’s development.

In terms of nurture, some individuals have learned in the school of hard knocks that life is about survival of the fittest. So their experience tells them that they must be dominant over any perceived opponent in order to get what they want and need. This kind of dominant behavior is thought to have arisen in our evolutionary history because of struggles to secure resources and mates, according to Joey Cheng and Jessica Tracy of the University of British Columbia. “Dominance,” they wrote in *Psychological*
Inquiry, “is seen in social relationships based on coercion, such as between...a boss and a victim.” The boss creates fear in subordinates by “unpredictably and erratically” threatening the victim either explicitly or implicitly. The subordinates comply with the boss’s demands in order to protect their welfare and security. “Dominants can attain a great deal of social influence” (Cheng & Tracy, 2013).

There are variations in the bully profile, according to Bullying Statistics (Bullying Statistics, 2013).

**Narcissistic Bully:** A highly self-centered individual who needs to put others down to maintain their self-importance.

**Impulsive Adult Bully:** They spontaneously fly off the handle and threaten others when they themselves feel threatened or upset by something that might have nothing to do with the victim.

**Physical Bully:** Some bullies will actually threaten to physically harm a subordinate, but this physical bully is more of an “in your face” kind of person “looming” over their victim to give them the sense of physical intimidation. They can also threaten an underling’s sense of security with their perceived power to hire and fire.

**Verbal Adult Bully:** Some of these bullies can be easily spotted; they make their commanding presence known by shouting and cursing. But the more subtle verbal bullies are harder to detect from outside the relationship because they usually utter their words where others cannot hear them. In addition, their favorite weapons may be as subtle as starting rumors about the victim or using sarcastic or demeaning language “to dominate or humiliate” a victim in a public way, such as in a staff meeting.

**Secondary Adult Bully:** This individual does not start the bullying but freely joins in. If this person sees someone under stress from a dominant individual they tend to gang up on that victim. This is called piling on or mobbing.

While the primary targets of bully bosses are the ones who suffer the most abuse they are not the only ones. Bully bosses poison the entire work environment from top to bottom, affecting everyone including co-workers and the legitimate authority of the whole company or organization . . . .
abuse they are not the only ones. Bully bosses poison the entire work environment from top to bottom, affecting everyone including co-workers and the legitimate authority of the whole company or organization (Preidt, 2013). The news release from the University of New Hampshire also pointed out that “second-hand vicarious supervisory abuse [can lead to] greater job frustration, tendency to abuse other coworkers, and a lack of perceived organizational support” (Wright, 2013). Organizations that do not recognize and mediate instances of bullying in the workplace send a message that they endorse the actions of the supervisor and that can cause an overall decrease in quality and productivity. Joe Grimm, a professor of journalism at Michigan State University and editor of The New Bullying: How Social Media, Social Exclusion, Laws and Suicide Have Changed Our Definition of Bullying, defined office bullying as “a manifestation of aggression at work that leaves professionals crippled with anxiety or fear” (Grimm, cited in Crocker, 2012).

The bully is quite often one who really knows how to work the system. They can spout all the current management buzzwords about supportive management but basically use it as a cover. By keeping their abusive behavior hidden, any charges made by individuals about his or her bullying will always come down to a “he said, she said” thing. They may have a “kiss up and kick down” personality, wherein they are always highly cooperative, respectful, and caring when talking to upper management but the opposite when it comes to their relationship with those whom they supervise (Petrecca, 2010).

Some bullies can even anticipate trouble and ward it off by planting seeds of doubt in the minds of their own supervisors about the work habits of the person whom they are targeting: “You know, I’m really concerned about Jean. Her work has been poor lately and she hasn’t been much of a team player. I’ve been trying to find out what’s bothering her, but she just acts hostile in return.” After saying that, the bully knows that any complaint that Jean might lodge with upper management will be looked on suspiciously.

Scientific research on the personalities of bullies dates back at least to the 1950s and the “Authoritarian Personality Study” at the University of California at Berkeley (Adorno, 1993). Taking a look at the traits identified by these researchers in authoritarian personalities gives us a good picture into the typical bully’s psyche (Portis, 2011):

- A bully’s mistakes are always concealed or blamed on underlings
- A bully keeps the target under constant stress
- A bully’s power base is fear, not respect
• A bully withholds information from subordinates and keeps the information flow top-down only
• A bully blames conflicts and problems on subordinate’s “poor attitudes” and “character flaws”
• A bully creates an unnatural work environment where people constantly walk on eggshells and are compelled to behave in ways they normally would not.

If you find yourself in this kind of nightmare scenario, what can you do? Unless you can recognize the situation for what it is, i.e., the bad behavior of an individual and not a legitimate authority, you may become another victim. The most typical reactions to bullying, as we have stated before, have to do with the survival instinct—“fight or flight”—and these are probably a victim’s healthier responses to bullying.

Flight is a legitimate and valid response to bullying. In fact, it is a very common one, especially in organizations in which upper management cannot or will not deal with the bullying. One can rather easily spot an office with a bullying problem—there is an exceptionally high rate of turnover. While not all places with high personnel turnover are sites of workplace bullying, nearly every place that has a bully in charge will have elevated staff turnover and absenteeism. In hard economic times, however, flight may not be an option, and fighting may be your only choice (Bruzzese, 2011).

Fighting the bullying can require near heroic action, especially if the bullying targets just one or two individuals. It can also be a difficult challenge.

Fighting the bullying can require near heroic action, especially if the bullying targets just one or two individuals. It can also be a difficult challenge. There are some times when confrontation is called for. First, there is always a chance that the bully boss is laboring under the impression that this is the way to get things done and does not recognize the havoc being wreaked on subordinates. A private meeting with the boss in which you clearly, professionally, and unemotionally tell him or her what you perceive to be happening and how you feel you could work much more efficiently and effectively with support and positive reinforcement just might clear things up right away. If the person doing the bullying is unaware of the harm they are causing, you may have opened their eyes. But even if that is not the case, the bullying personality may back off when presented with a strong counter personality. So standing your ground and making your case might prove successful for that reason.
Then again, confrontation may be totally wrong in your situation and could set off even more harassment and verbal abuse or increase the risk of being fired. If you sense that could be the case in your situation, a less confrontational approach might be called for. Then it is time to use the organization’s human resources operation to aid in a resolution.

Begin by documenting everything (The Muse, 2012): meetings, conversations, emails, or written notes about those occasions in which you have felt threatened or intimidated. Note any bad rumors that have suddenly appeared about you. But do not stop with verbal signals—try to capture moments in writing when the boss uses gestures, facial expressions, or other obvious body language that suggests intimidation, violence, force, or ridicule. Identify any witnesses who may have seen or heard what happened. Note the date and time, the circumstances, specifically what was said, or what orders you were given. You can then send this information to yourself in an email that records the date it was sent. This documentation will become especially important if things were to “escalate, or official or legal consequences arise” and you need “to protect yourself and your job” (Kane, n.d.).

Once you have some specifics in hand, visit with your HR representative (Kane, n.d.). Present your observations in an organized fashion and explain the difficulties you are having with your supervisor as objectively as you can. Be sure to mention when the inappropriate behavior first started and how often it occurs, noting when you began to keep records if the bullying started before you began recording instances. If you have witnessed the boss bullying others in the office record these as well and mention their names as possible corroborators. Ask that the records be placed in your personnel file and afterwards send an email to the HR rep mentioning your meeting and what documentation you handed over for your file. Find out what the next steps are in the process. Will there be an investigation? Does the institution have policies specifically against bullying or are the institution’s policies on harassment broad enough to include bullying. Ask when will you hear back from HR and what formal grievance procedures are available as a next step?

For example, if you are suffering from depression and are being treated for that you might even be eligible for protections under the Americans with Disabilities Act. “The Americans with Disabilities Act prevents employers with 15 or more employees from discriminating against people with serious health problems (including depression), and it requires them to accommodate disabled employees. In order to be protected by the law, however, employees must disclose the nature of their
disability to their employers” (Harding, 2010). However, consider that step carefully because the stigma attached to mental illnesses still exists in our society.

As a last resort, if the organization does not address and the bullying continues, you have every right to seek an employment attorney to find out what legal remedies might be available (The Muse, 2012). This is a difficult path because many organizations do not have policies specifically on bullying and most places do not have laws covering it.

If you direct an office, you need to be sensitive to workplace bullying. You can read up on the topic at the very helpful website of the Workplace Bullying Institute, in Washington, DC (www.workplacebullying.org). You need to assure your staff that workplace bullying will not be tolerated and that they can always come to you anytime they are threatened or intimidated by a supervisor or another employee. Know and watch for the signs of a bully or victim of bullying so that you can identify and remediate bullying in your operation.

Finally, do a self-inventory of the ways in which you relate to your employees. To a certain extent we all engage in manipulative behavior from time to time and sometimes use our authority to get our way. We too need to be sensitive to the feelings of our personnel and watch for warning signs when dealing with them. You may be doing something that is being entirely misinterpreted by the employee, and causing them anxiety and loss of sleep. Those situations can be quickly and effectively dealt with in a short conference.

Bullying is a serious problem and as directors, managers, and staff members we need to ensure that it does not occur in our workplace. Otherwise our operations may be suffering. The old maxim, “it’s the process, not the people,” is not true all the time, especially if there is a bully in your midst. A bully can wreck a perfectly good process. As their name suggests, they can be a real bull in the china shop.

The finding of the Wells Report, which was commissioned by the National Football League to investigate the alleged bullying of Jonathan Martin, was that he was indeed subject to a persistent pattern of workplace harassment. The Report’s conclusion is worth sharing: “[E]ven the largest, strongest and fleetest person may be driven to despair by bullying, taunting and constant insults. We encourage the creation of new workplace conduct rules and guidelines.
that will help ensure that players respect each other as professionals and people” (Wells, 2014).

You may have noticed that we overlooked one area of research administration workplace bullying, perhaps one that is most significant. Well, we will have to wait for another time to talk about faculty bullies.
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Abstract

Leadership is defined as “the position or function of a leader, a person who guides or directs a group” (Dictionary.com). Most think of a leader as the head of an organization. I challenge that: every single person is in a position to be a leader even if they are not the head of an organization and do not have direct reports. There are many different organizational structures for an Office of Sponsored Programs, but typically there is one director, one or two associates/assistant directors, and coordinators or grants specialists. The director and associate/assistant director(s) have direct reports, but in many cases the coordinators do not. Does that mean that coordinators are not leaders? I think not. Coordinators assume the role of leaders in their daily work life and need to be an effective leader in the organization. Being a leader has less to do with position and title and more to do with having or attaining the main characteristics of a great, successful leader, which are: excellent communication skills, being able to build and work in a team effectively, having effective interpersonal skills, and being positive and producing win-win situations. These characteristics are not stand-alone—they interconnect. An effective leader will have these common elements.
CHARACTERISTICS OF A LEADER

In researching what makes an effective leader, many characteristics came to light. For this article I focus on those that are essential to making a great and successful leader in research administration. The top four must-have characteristics are Communication Skills, Team Building, Interpersonal Skills and Positive ‘can-do’ attitude. The most elementary of the characteristics and yet the one that is most often missing or misused is communication skills.

Communication Skills.
Communication skills are used daily by research administrators and therefore having the ability to communicate effectively and accurately is essential to accomplishing daily tasks and responsibilities. There are many means of communication. In the electronic age in which we live today a great majority of communication occurs via email, texting, Facebook and the many other electronic mediums that exist. Although these are important and each carries its own benefits, the most effective form of communication is still face-to-face. It allows for an immediate interchange and most often a positive outcome.

The top four must-have characteristics [of a leader] are Communication Skills, Team Building, Interpersonal Skills and Positive ‘can-do’ attitude.

In research administration reaching out to meet someone in person automatically lets that person know that you care about them and their work enough to make the effort to meet with them. That in itself promotes a positive setting that will make a potentially difficult conversation go much better. Face-to-face communication does have its own challenges for research administrators due to the time-sensitive deadlines that are always looming. If you are working with a faculty member on a proposal that is due in 2 days and multiple items are missing or incorrect, meeting face-to-face becomes impossible because you may also have 8 other proposals you need to submit in the same time frame. As a result, most often email becomes the most used form of communication and one that we no longer seem to be able to live without.

Email can be utilized effectively if used correctly. Whenever possible, use
what I refer to as the ‘two-email rule’. If a given situation is not resolved with two emails, pick up the phone and discuss it verbally. Email can be misconstrued and the wrong tone can be read in an email and taken badly, making the communication go south rather quickly. When meeting face-to-face is just not possible and a quick email does not resolve the situation, picking up the phone and having a conversation is preferred. Explaining something verbally will avoid time, of which research administrators do not have a lot, and may resolve the issue favorably. Additionally, do not be afraid to ask a colleague or supervisor for assistance in explaining a situation or making the call alongside you.

It is recommended that when time allows, research administrators visit faculty members in their offices or labs even if it is just for a quick check-in to say hello. Ask about their research; ask if they have heard the results of a proposal; ask about their family; or simply state, I am dropping by to say hello and ask if there is anything I can do for you at this time. Showing interest in faculty research lets the faculty member know that we are vested and care about their work. Officially meeting someone face-to-face will make the next email and phone conversation go more smoothly because you previously established a relationship with that person. This same concept applies to visiting departmental research administrators and others in the department with which we constantly work. They are no different than we are. We all enjoy the personal touch and knowing that the person with whom we are discussing our work genuinely cares about us and our work will go a long way in communicating effectively.

As part of having great communication skills the leader absolutely must be a great listener. Listening to employee’s ideas, thoughts, and any frustrations is the key to working on problems together. Employees will be more vested in a company that has a leader who listens to their ideas and contributions and seriously considers them.

As part of having great communication skills the leader absolutely must be a great listener. Listening to employee’s ideas, thoughts and any frustrations is the key to working on problems together.
There are leaders who are great public speakers, but without the ability to truly listen to the team, that leader will not be an effective one. Everyone has something to contribute; if we built the right team everyone will have different skill sets that will complement the team. This brings us to the next characteristic that makes a successful leader in research administration.

*Team Building.* Building a strong team is just as important as having a great leader. A leader is not expected to be an expert in all areas, but the best leaders will surround themselves with people who have strengths in different areas. The collective whole and not the individual comprise a strong team. Team building is essential. An office with a divided team will not work toward one common goal. Building a team takes time and starts by sharing the common goal or objective for that team. In a large organization it would be by clearly defining the mission of the organization so that all team members know what the ultimate goals are. Susan Heathfield, a human resources expert who wrote “12 Tips for Team Building; How to Build Successful Work Teams”, emphasized that “Belonging to a team, in the broadest sense, is a result of feeling part of something larger than yourself. It has a lot to do with your understanding of the mission or objectives of your organization” (Heathfield, n.d., n.p.). Knowing the bigger picture sets expectations and allows individuals to feel part of the overall organization, even if their direct contributions are only one piece of the puzzle.

Smaller teams that are created within a group should follow the same concepts. The leader should identify the goals, set the expectations, and engage the team members’ participation. Listen to the teams ideas closely and allow each individual’s thoughts to be shared.

In our Office of Sponsored Programs it became evident that our policies and procedures manual was outdated and needed revising. As the leader of that team I initially thought that revising this document was my responsibility and after several years of not making much progress for one reason or another, I decided to form a team for the task. I started by discussing it at one of our weekly staff meetings; stating that we were looking to form a team of five members and I asked for volunteers.

There were two reasons for asking for volunteers: to engage those who had
an interest in writing procedures, and to have employee buy-in. I certainly could have made this a direct assignment, but I am sure it would not have had the same effect or outcome. Much to my surprise I had more than five volunteers, a team was formed, and work began. What began as a Policies and Procedures Manual Committee quickly turned into a Website Committee. The team collectively realized that it would be so much more effective for our faculty and staff to have the information on our website. The team set regular meetings, set goals for one another, and held each other accountable. Just recently, the website was unveiled and the mission was successfully accomplished. The team members feel proud of their accomplishments every time they search the site or continue its improvements. 

Teamwork is powerful.

Interpersonal Skills. A great leader has the ability to build a good rapport with everyone, which is the definition of interpersonal skills. Having interpersonal skills is a quality that most employers look for in prospective hires because it is the most critical skill to have. Having the ability to connect with people and get along with everyone makes you an approachable person, which is an absolute must as a research administrator. Being approachable is critical at many levels. In an office, if you are not approachable your colleagues will not seek your advice, which is counter to being a leader. In working with faculty it is essential that they feel that we are open-minded and available at all times and will listen to their concerns. Interpersonal skills are one of the most critical characteristics of a successful leader and ties in with being positive, which leads us to the last characteristic of a leader in research administration.

Having the ability to connect with people and get along with everyone makes you an approachable person, which is an absolute must as a research administrator.

Positive ‘Can-do’ Attitude. A great research administrator will have a ‘can do’ attitude and always attempt to achieve a ‘win/win’ situation. Stephen Covey wrote about the “Win/Win” in The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People, stating that “Win/Win is a frame of mind and heart that constantly seeks
mutual benefit in all human interactions. Win/Win means that agreements or solutions are mutually beneficial, mutually satisfying. With a win/win solution, all parties feel good about the decision and feel good about the action plan” (Covey, 1989, p. 206).

Mr. Covey also stated that the “Win/Win is a belief in the Third Alternative. It’s not your way or my way; it’s a better way, a higher way” (Covey, 1989, p. 206). These are such powerful statements and as research administrators a critical characteristics to have.

When approached with a problem the first response cannot be, ‘no that cannot be done’; it needs to be, ‘let’s discuss this further and find a way to accomplish what is needed’. Approaching the situation positively builds a great relationship and lets others know the leader is approachable and willing to work towards one common goal. The opposite is also true. If the immediate response is ‘that cannot be done’, it automatically sets a negative connotation for the rest of the conversation. Turning it around takes much more effort and at times becomes impossible, raising frustrations and a demonstrated lack of commitment. The next time you are negotiating a contract and have to communicate with a faculty member about the importance of not giving up the Intellectual Property (IP) or publication rights, have the discussion with a ‘can-do’ attitude and think of the “Win/Win” (Covey, 1989, p. 207). Approach the conversation positively.

**CONCLUSION**

As this article demonstrates, these characteristics are intertwined and a great leader possesses all of them, even if they are stronger in one area than another. I wish I could say that everyone in a leadership position has these characteristics. The sad reality is that many people in leadership roles do not have great leadership skills and are not great leaders.

... these characteristics are intertwined and a great leader possesses all of them even if they are stronger in one area than another.

There are good leaders, there are bad leaders, and there are great leaders. The good news is that leadership skills can be learned and achieved and a great step towards becoming a great leader is
realizing that you need additional training and development and striving to attain the required skills. If you are reading this article and have realized that you may be lacking a characteristic or two, you have taken the first step toward becoming a successful leader. Take the next step, identify someone whom you know does have these skills and seek their wisdom; or seek out a leadership skills course and sign up for it; or simply read a leadership book and choose a different path and become the leader you know you can be.
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Attributes of Successful Leaders in Research

Kelly M. Willenberg
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What makes a leader successful? As the Director of Research at the Vanderbilt-Ingram Cancer Center’s (VICC) Clinical Trials Office, I had to think of new ways to engage employees when I became the director nearly 15 years ago. The staff started a GLUE (Greater Loyalty Utilizing Empowerment) Committee. We established the committee to help keep our employees happy and build connections. Isn’t that what all leaders want? I quickly learned that keeping all employees happy at all times was impossible but the GLUE committee provided an avenue for bonding that built many much-needed bridges during challenging times.

After nearly 30 years in this field, I have to say that I truly believe that effective leadership is the ability to build relationships with all customers. A turning point in my career was when I realized that relationships with not only my employees, but the physicians were important. The principal investigators and physician scientists with whom I have worked have taught me to trust my instincts even if it meant doing something that was uncharacteristic or unpopular. The relationship with my employees improved my leadership skills. Even today, I look back at some of these relationships and the memories are positive.
What makes a leader successful? . . . After nearly 30 years in this field, I have to say that I truly believe that it’s the ability to build relationships with all customers.

Another attribute of successful leaders is being able to focus and having undying passion. I do not think there is a person who knows me who does not think I am passionate about what I am doing. Sometimes, though, for a leader this can be to a fault. Partnering with people to create ideas builds teams, preventing burnout. As a driven leader, one must find that balance so they neither navigate nor deteriorate from the goal.

With the complexities that we face in clinical research, finding a balance with the stress is also a good quality to have. One big task is to lead your “stressed out” staff to stress relievers and humor. For some, the responsibilities are too enormous to handle and they walk away. This is where the GLUE Committee did its magic by having the creativity to set a positive tone with stress relief for the staff, and which helped me as a leader.

As a leader you also must continuously learn and grow. Health care is a moving target and there are numerous ways to find information. SoCRA, HCCA, and NCURA all provide avenues for learning and keeping current with the issues we face.

Curiosity is a trait that I want in employees. I want drive and a hunger and desire to learn.

Curiosity is a trait that I want in employees. I want drive and a hunger and desire to learn. There is never a stupid question in clinical research. From the moment I begin working with someone, I get excited when they ask questions or bring issues to my attention. In order to meet compliance, questions must be asked and answered. As a leader, I believe that staff should trust me so they are confident in bringing their matters to me. This shows integrity. I believe that a leader who promotes integrity leverages success while leading.
I believe that a leader who promotes integrity leverages success while leading.

Look at yourself in the mirror. Do you see a leader of whom people are proud? Do you encourage communication? What intangibles can your staff say about working for you? Do you actually talk to your staff? Do you know their families and ask how they are doing? Are you reasonable with their requests? When was the last time you showed a staff member gratitude? These are all attributes of a strong leader. I believe there are five rules for successful leadership.

Rule #1: Do not just talk to your staff. Listen to what they say.

It is common for leaders to just talk and never truly listen to what people are saying back at them. Just because you have more experience does not necessarily mean you have all of the answers. Listen and learn from your team and you will reap the benefits.

Rule #2: Think about the first words that come from your mouth in a tense situation.

Most people spontaneously reply when there is a heated discussion. Have a scripted answer that provides you time to think before you react, especially when dealing with your staff or busy physicians. This will go far in working with them. You might say, “That is an excellent discovery. Let me take some time to consider what you have said and get back with you.”

Rule #3: Leave your ego at home.

All of us are egotistical. In academic medicine where there is some competition, egos can sometimes damage relationships. Defining roles will build confidence that everyone knows their place in the organization. “I” is not the operative word you should use, but “we” as a leader.

Rule #4: Respect open-mindedness in the workplace.

Flexible scheduling has always been successful no matter where I worked. Grasping differing cultures and ideas and blending them is challenging but can be one of the most successful things you do as a leader. Learn as you go and do not be afraid to ask.

Rule #5: Find the humor and make work fun.

I recall some of the holiday parties we had at Vanderbilt and it makes me smile. Some of our employees formed a
band called “The Placebos”. They played at many employees’ events; to this day, I think that band was probably one of the best “successes” ever in my time as a leader. I did not have to do anything but support what the committee did and encourage them to have functions where our employees could enjoy themselves and relax. “The Placebos” are forever engrained as one of the true benefits that positively affected our functioning as an office.

So as you can see, the attributes to successful leaders in research involve understanding human nature first and not ignoring the needs of your team. I go back once again to the GLUE Committee and recall the value in leading by example and supporting what the employees did. The power of team building was by far more important than my support of the committee’s work. In my mind now it was the GLUE that kept us together as a team. That relationship did more than I could have alone in my time at the VICC and the advantages gained were not all mine!
The Importance of Trust in Leadership

David L. Mineo
DL Mineo Consulting

In a *Harvard Business Review* article, Robert F. Hurley cited a 2002 survey that he had conducted of 450 executives. His findings showed that 69% of the respondents agreed with the statement, “I just don’t know who to trust anymore” (Hurley, 2006). Recently on “Face the Nation”, Bob Schieffer stated, “When the United States takes a position in the world and then goes back on its word, the world is left in a very dangerous place” (Schieffer, 2013). When a leader speaks it is important to be able to have confidence in the honesty, truthfulness, and sincerity of the words. This is the essence of trust.

If one looks at the different philosophies on leadership, each espouses various attributes that are essential to create a bond between the leader and the followers who are being led. This article is intended to focus on how the bond is created that provides the leader with the vehicle for success. Trust is the glue that binds the leader to her/his followers and provides the capacity for organizational and leadership success.

This article is intended to focus on how the bond is created that provides the leader with the vehicle for success. Trust is the glue which binds the leader to her/his followers and provides the capacity for organizational and leadership success.

In reviewing the multitude of leadership theories and in discussing
the volumes of attributes, steps, and other individual elements that make up each theory, there are many common items. For example, thirty-three attributes that form the basis of leadership development have been suggested by the Center for Creative Leadership’s leadership development model. And other programs provide their own premises upon which a leadership program is grounded. In reviewing the theory around another program, the Everything DiSC Work of Leaders® Assessment by Insight Publishing (A Wiley brand), there are three broad activities that make up their model: Vision, Alignment, and Execution. This model, like most other models, speaks to multiple activities, including creating clarity, creating a sense of urgency around leadership undertakings, providing the opportunity for dialogue, and being inspirational. All of these are admirable actions but can they happen without trust in the leader who is attempting to champion the philosophies of Vision, Alignment and Execution or any other set of leadership attributes?1

...the foundation of a great workplace is created by organizational credibility, respect and fairness which form the foundation of trust.

In looking at the Dimensions of a Great Workplace® model, the foundation of a great workplace is created by organizational credibility, respect and fairness, which form the foundation of trust. These elements are further broken down as follows: (1) credibility, which includes open and accessible communications, organizational competence in coordinating human and material resources, and integrity in carrying out vision with consistency; (2) respect, which includes supporting professional development and showing appreciation, collaboration with employees in relevant decisions, and caring for employees as individuals with personal lives; and (3) fairness, which includes balanced treatment for all in terms of rewards, absence of favoritism in hiring and promotions, and lack of discrimination and process for appeals. This model is literally grounded in the foundation of trust; the Great Workplaces Institute is the organization
that conducts the annual Great Places to Work® survey cited in major publications (Burchell & Robin, 2011). As someone who has dealt with individuals in leadership positions for over forty years in academia, government, and the private sector, it is incredible how many individuals want immediate returns as opposed to taking the time to build trust and undertaking activities that allow that trust to flourish. An example of this occurred when a new director came into an organization. She immediately started going to some funded centers and talked about new directions in which she wanted these organizations to move and told them as they moved in those directions that federal funding would be provided. Unfortunately, funding was not available to do the multitude of things she wanted done, as is normal in the current research environment. The outcome was that over a very short time she lost the trust of these organizations and their leadership. They continued to move in the directions she dictated but at an extremely cautious pace. This diminished the changes that could have happened had she gained their trust. Her overall effectiveness was lessened because as others saw this behavior they simply worked to minimize the impact on their organizations.

Let’s look at another example of leadership. In almost every situation a newly appointed organizational leader wants to make an immediate impact. This is the goal of every new leader—to impact the organization in a positive fashion at breakneck speed to demonstrate value. So here is a story of an individual who took over an organizational unit that was considered ineffective in carrying out its responsibilities. The basis for this was a report that had a number of recommendations about the organization suggesting moving individuals and replacing them with higher-quality staff. The report was extremely well written by the senior individuals who had conducted the review. Upon accepting the position the new leader reviewed the report but decided to conduct an independent review before undertaking such drastic measures. Upon reviewing processes he discovered that certain activities were being completed that were redundant and unnecessary. This literally slowed down work processes and made the workplace more challenging for staff. Upon discovering this, the new leader
informed effected parties about a new process to replace the old processes and gained support for the changes, in essence improving the working environment through a small business process change. The change gained the support of all and staff immediately saw organizational improvements and started to “trust” the new leader. Building upon this capital of trust, new initiatives could be undertaken, a sense of urgency in improving the operations also occurred, and the organization met and exceeded its organizational goals each year. Staff could be counted on to do more because they knew they had the support and trust of the leader. Trust continued to grow and the organization continued to excel in both good and bad situations. The job of this leader was to remove barriers to his employees’ success. The position he took was that he worked for the staff; the staff didn’t work for him. By empowering them, he demonstrated trust in them and they returned this trust in other ways such as openness and admission of mistakes when they occurred. Can you place such trust in your employees? Can you see how if you do these things as a leader, magical things will happen in your organization?

So now what about the essence of this topic? What is the recipe for gaining trust between the leader and the follower? Hurley (2006) conducted work on the elements that allow us to trust. His premise was that there are multiple items to consider, including a safety score and a certainty score when evaluating trust. The safety score includes such items as: (1) the leaders’ willingness to take risks; (2) degree of optimism she/he expresses; (3) how much influence the leader has over others; (4) openness; (5) willingness to express thoughts and feelings; and (6) degree to which the leader is concerned over what the boss thinks. The certainty score is a situational analysis and includes the: (1) stakes, (2) familiarity of the situation, (3) familiarity of others with the situation, (4) alignment of interests, (5) degree of support for each other, (6) predictability of the leader, and (7) degree to which communication occurs about the situation (Hurley, 2006).

In reviewing the safety score, an analysis of the degree to which one is placing themselves at risk is where the leader’s influence is so important...
Because while one cannot always mitigate the situational risk, the leader can greatly influence how staff feel about his/her support, caring and other personal elements of leadership; the higher the degree of confidence in each element above, the greater the trust in the leader. Leaders who do the following things will succeed and allow those they lead to succeed as well. Steps toward creating trust include taking actions that demonstrate a genuine concern for others, being willing to acknowledge areas of weakness, and compensating by sharing or delegating responsibility—in other words, under-promise and over-deliver. If you cannot fulfill your promises, explain why honestly, and describe the values that drive your behavior so that others see consistency rather than randomness.

In conclusion, the trust that leaders place in those they lead allows both the leader and her/his followers to excel. It is not a momentary event but a series of investments over time that truly allows success. Along the way leaders, like their followers, will make mistakes; however, an honest and caring approach will allow those mistakes to be overcome.

A little girl and her father were crossing a bridge. The father was kind of scared so he asked his little daughter, “Sweetheart, please hold my hand so that you don’t fall into the river.” The little girl said: “No, Dad. You hold my hand.” “What’s the difference?” asked the puzzled father.

“There’s a big difference,” replied the little girl. “If I hold your hand and something happens to me, chances are that I may let your hand go. But if you hold my hand, I know for sure that no matter what happens, you will never let my hand go.

In any relationship, the essence of trust is not in its bind, but in its bond. So hold the hand of the person whom you put faith and trust in rather than expecting them to hold yours.”

In conclusion, the trust that leaders place in those they lead allows both the leader and her/his followers to excel. It is not a momentary event but a series of investments over time that truly allows success.
ENDNOTES

1. DiSC (Inscape Publishing, A Wiley Brand). The DiSC Model of Behavior was first proposed by William Mouton Marston, a physiological psychologist with a Ph.D. from Harvard. His 1928 book, *Emotions of Normal People*, explains his theory on how normal human emotions lead to behavioral differences among groups of people and how a person's behavior might change over time. His work focused on directly observable and measurable psychological phenomena. He was interested in using practical explanations to help people understand and manage their experiences and relationships. Walter V. Clarke, an industrial psychologist, was the first person to build an assessment instrument (personality profile test) using Marston’s theories around 1956. DiSC was further updated by John Geier, Ph.D., who created the original Personal Profile System® (PPS) in the 1970s. The assessment instrument has continued to evolve and currently the Everything Disc® assessment suite is a Wiley Brand.
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ABSTRACT

The Martian’s Daughter – A Memoir chronicles events covering the better part of the twentieth century from the perspective of its central figure. It also tells the story of a remarkable woman determined to neither live in her father’s shadow, nor accept society’s prescribed roles. It portrays her effort to navigate a fractured family relationship, as well as rarefied spaces in academia, government, and big business that were slow to welcome women. It is instructive for those navigating contemporary organizational cultures.

Though its title suggests a science fiction tale, The Martian’s Daughter – A Memoir is actually a grand tour of twentieth-century history through the eyes of Marina von Neumann Whitman. Whitman is the daughter of John von Neumann, a Hungarian émigré who made key contributions to the Manhattan Project as well as to mathematics and the fledgling efforts in computer science during the formative years of the modern U.S. science establishment. From her unique position, she recounts a series of events from the 1920s to the present, a period of significant scientific, technological, and social change.
The Prologue opens with Marina at her father’s bedside, as he lay dying of cancer in 1956. It is a familiarly tragic scene made surreal by the presence of her father’s military minders. They are charged with ensuring that he reveals no national secrets while under the influence of chemotherapy drugs and painkillers. The encounter sets a pattern for Marina’s life experiences as ordinary on one level and simultaneously extraordinary on another.

The early chapters tell the story of her parents’ meeting in pre-World War I Hungary and their later emigration from 1930s Berlin during the Nazi government’s rise. Their ticket out is von Neumann’s 1933 appointment as one of the five founding faculty members (along with Albert Einstein) of the Institute for Advanced Study (IAS) at Princeton University. He and his wife settle in Princeton, and Marina is born shortly thereafter. From there, von Neumann and a group of fellow Hungarian ex-patriots, collectively known as ‘the Martians,’ go on to make significant scientific and technological contributions to the coming war effort.

The von Neumann marriage is short-lived—Marina’s parents divorce when she is two years old. However, the split is quite amicable, and they take the unusually progressive step of deciding upon joint custody. They agree that Marina will live with her mother until the age of twelve. Thereafter, she will live with her father until ready for college. Thus, she spends her formative years under the tutelage of her mother, a would-be socialite who alternately sets the local social calendar and teaches young Rosie-the-Riveters to assemble radar sets during the War.

Marina’s teenage years begin in the late 1940s, during the post-war boom. Her father’s status among the U.S. scientific elite has been cemented following his work on the Manhattan Project and his development of game theory. In his lofty academic circle Marina meets a Who’s Who of prominent scientists and begins to consider life beyond normal options for the mid-century woman.

Marina attends Radcliffe College, where she majors in government and meets her future husband, Robert Whitman, a Ph.D. student and English instructor at neighboring Harvard University. Over her father’s objection, she and Robert marry and begin their lives as faculty and wife at Princeton. Soon after, Marina applies to the
graduate economics program at Princeton, only to be declined by the institution, which responded that it had no facilities (i.e., bathrooms) for women. Undaunted, she instead enters the program at Columbia University and later graduates with a Ph.D. in economics in 1962.

At this point Marina enters truly uncharted territory for the mid-century American woman. She accepts a series of positions that take her to the heights of the Nixon Administration, as well as to the executive suite of General Motors (as the first female executive in the automobile industry) and to the boardrooms of several Fortune 500 corporations. In each instance she faces the challenge of being the first woman. With intelligence, perseverance, and unwavering support from her life partner, she overcomes (nearly) every obstacle.

In a poignant ending, the book closes with Marina contemplating her life following the death of her mother.

**Evaluation**

The author has taken an already-remarkable life story and turned it into an appealing and accessible piece of writing. There are occasional, unsettling changes in tone, as when she recounts her daughter’s handling of a college roommate’s crisis, but overall the book is even-toned and engaging. At times it also has a “Forrest Gump” feel, where the main character is curiously center-stage (and on the right side of history) for all of the major historical events of the period. However, this is more a structural aspect of memoir as a form than any self-aggrandizement on the author’s part. Throughout she conveys genuine experience and authentic emotion about the events she recounts. Her accomplishments are earned and her experiences are shared, warts and all.

**What Does It Mean for Research Administration?**

For students of sponsored program administration, the book provides interesting anecdotes about the origins of the occupation. Readers get a glimpse of the formation of the research administrator role in the post-war period as a prototypical jack-of-all-trades supporting researchers. This role is embodied in the experiences of the author’s own mother, the “first” administrator at the then newly-formed Brookhaven National Laboratory.
Whitman also recounts the evolution of “science”, when it got “big” and moved beyond the university classroom and laboratory to take a place at the forefront of national defense. Lastly, this memoir highlights the increasing intersection of the academic, military, government, and corporate spheres, a trend that continues today.

This story is also useful on a more practical level. Research Administration has long been an occupation that welcomes women at all levels, but there is still room for improvement at the upper ranks. According to Shambrook et al. (2011), women make up 80% of those employed in research administration across all levels. However, where earnings for one in two men are at the highest salary levels, only about one in three women earn similar amounts. The authors themselves recommend further research into this disparity. For those aspiring to higher positions, the author’s experiences are case studies of the challenges for the “first up the ladder.” Her successes (and failures) demonstrate the value in taking risks and being adaptable to different organizational environments. The recent announcements that GM has appointed the first female CEO in the automobile industry (Trop, 2013) and that findings from a Pew Research Center survey show that young women now earn $0.93 for every dollar earned by a man (Pew Research Center, 2013) offer timely evidence of the author’s contributions as trailblazer.
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ABSTRACT

In Long Fuse, Big Bang, the author posits that millions of years of human conditioning often limit us from achieving significant accomplishments, because we are built to focus on immediate tasks and reserve energy for responding to threats to our basic survival. We can overcome these natural limitations, however, by being aware of how our brain is conditioned and by taking calculated, incremental steps to achieving the “big bangs” in our workplaces. Different from many business strategy books, this book is based on the author’s unusual career and offers a fresh perspective on effecting change in the research administrator’s personal and professional life.
Research administration is, at the very least, a career path that requires juggling multiple deadlines, making difficult and often unpalatable decisions, and responding to the needs of endless masters, including faculty, sponsors, administrators, and students. As a result, our typical work day is often fraught with stress, which triggers our mind and body to respond in a primal, survivalist mode. When stress occurs, the body’s sympathetic nervous system immediately reacts and chemicals like adrenaline, noradrenaline, and cortisol are released into our bloodstream. In turn, our respiratory rate increases, and blood is directed away from organs and into our muscles and limbs, which require extra energy and fuel for running and fighting, commonly known as the “fight or flight” response. This ancient conditioning is unconscious and remains with us today, so that in our present times we cannot reasonably react by running from unhappy faculty or picking up a club to fend off problematic cost transfers, even though our body is prepared to do exactly that. These automatic stress responses, which are meant to guarantee our survival, can accumulate over time and create not only multiple health and welfare risks, but sabotage our efforts to achieve bigger accomplishments in the workplace.

In *Long Fuse, Big Bang*, Eric Haseltine addresses how this hard-wired response to handling day-to-day stresses prevents us from achieving “big bangs,” which he describes as revolutionary changes that completely transform products or processes. These big bangs must have long fuses—projects, initiatives, or investments that arise from logical strategic planning rather than from our risk-averse fight-or-flight mechanism. In other words, he maintains that we focus on reacting to the small stuff that we are faced with in our daily tasks, called “the tyranny of the urgent.” This “stifles the pursuit of the important”, severely limiting our abilities and results in making smaller and less satisfying accomplishments.

He states that “we spend so much time lighting short fuses to firecrackers (the endless meetings, deadlines, impatient bosses) and never lighting long fuses to dynamite (the big bangs)” (pp. 13–14). This certainly can be a problem in research administration—we invest most of our time and energy each
day putting out fires and ultimately delay strategic planning for “big bang” goals, such as expanding services for anticipated needs or reviewing best practices to reduce inefficiencies.

In *Long Fuse, Big Bang*, [Haseltine] addresses how this hard-wired response to handling day-to-day stresses prevents us from achieving “big bangs,” which he describes as revolutionary changes that completely transform products or processes.

In order to help overcome this biological conditioning that is designed to protect us from mortal threats and survive in the wilderness, we as research administrators in the present must learn why it is so difficult to accomplish big goals so that we may co-opt, not fight, the brain’s ancient logic. When we avoid a big project and feel that it is too large or time-consuming to undertake, it is because our brain has already chosen the less strenuous activity for us. In prehistoric times it was impossible to know when you would eat your next meal, so the body is programmed to conserve calories, which translates in the here and now to choosing smaller tasks or prioritizing workload by immediate deadlines. This also explains why we experience physical and emotional reactions to deadlines, multi-tasking and planning for the future—we’re expending energy that our bodies are determined to conserve.

To show how we can build big bangs and bigger accomplishments into our work, he provides interesting examples from his own unusual career experiences and those of others who implemented new concepts, ideas, and technologies into workplaces that otherwise would have been very difficult, if not impossible. We can learn techniques to break down large projects into small tasks and expend less energy so as to provide the brain the quick rewards it needs while we at the same time work towards long-term goals.
We can learn techniques to break down large projects into small tasks and expend less energy, so as to provide the brain the quick rewards it needs while we at the same time work towards long-term goals.

From a research administration perspective, the strategies discussed are particularly inspiring when thinking about how to manage resistance to big-picture ideas and obtain buy-in from faculty and administration. So even though this book is not written specifically for research administrators, the strategies presented easily can and arguably should be applied to our work.

In the vast market of business strategy books, *Long Fuse, Big Bang* is surprisingly different. The examples from Haseltine’s multifaceted career are highly interesting, and in each he breaks down the contributing success factors in a compelling and entertaining manner. Each chapter details various scenarios for achieving long-fuse, big-bang success by counter-acting our natural instincts. His personable and relaxed style draws you in, and he concludes each chapter with a concise summary in case you missed his main points. Most importantly, we are reminded that we are human, and even though programmed with ancient survival instincts that can complicate the way we work in the 21st century, we have the power to transform our thinking and behaviors to achieve long-term success.
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