Intentional Professional Development: Survival Skills

Things Successful People Know for Navigating Difficult Situations

C. K. Gunsalus

Developing values-driven, effective leaders and advancing institutional integrity through intentional professional development.
It's your job to build professional skills and manage your career to match your values and aspirations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIO: research misconduct allegations, investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dysfunctional academic unit assessment, recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing officer (degree revocation, grievances, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB director, after breach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance system oversight: discrimination, harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace violence team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing and preventing career TRAGEDIES, PRCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic policy development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dysfunctional unit intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullyproofing academic units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic leadership development, support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCR, career preparation, skills, negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentional leadership &amp; coaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Avoiding the Pitfalls

Potential Pitfalls

😊 (Not) managing yourself at work
✔ Professional disputes
✏ Authorship and attribution
📊 Data-related issues
🔍 Disciplinary + professional ethics
⚠ Compliance issues
✉ Email
Career TRAGEDIES

Temptation

TRAGEDIES
People who enter research generally share several values. Honesty, openness of operational flaws and cognitive biases.

Researchers and institutional leaders must tailor solutions to keep them in check. People who enter research generally share several values. Honesty, openness of operational flaws and cognitive biases.

Academic leaders must audit departments for flaws and strengths, then tailor practices to build good behaviour, say when C.K.G. asks researchers to list what happened at their university came to be a case study: they want to know how what makes a good scientist. The US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine says that these values give rise to research misconduct, someone will sidle up, curious about what can counter good intentions.

Clear expectations of operational flaws and cognitive biases. People who enter research generally share several values. Honesty, openness of operational flaws and cognitive biases.

Every aspect of science, from the framing of a research question through to publication of the manuscript, is susceptible to influences that can counter good intentions. Consider this true story. A professor asked

A table of tragedies.
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One of us (C.K.G.) teaches leadership skills and works with troubled departments. At almost every session, someone will sidle up, curious about a case study: they want to know how what happened at their university came to be known externally. Of course, it didn’t.

From what we’ve observed as a former university administrator and consultant (C.K.G.) and as a graduate student and working professional (A.D.R.), toxic research environments share a handful of operational flaws and cognitive biases. Researchers and institutional leaders must learn how these infiltrate their teams, and tailor solutions to keep them in check.

People who enter research generally share several values. Honesty, openness and accountability come up again and again when C.K.G. asks researchers to list what makes a good scientist. The US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine says that these values give rise to responsibilities that “make the system cohere and make scientific knowledge reliable”.

Yet every aspect of science, from the framing of a research question through to publication of the manuscript, is susceptible to influences that can counter good intentions.

C.K.G. coined the mnemonic TRADERIES (Temptation, Rationalization, Ambition, Group and authority pressure, Entitlement, Deception, Incrementalism, Embarrassment and Stupid systems) to capture the interlocking factors that can lead scientists astray.

Consider this true story. A professor asked a beginning graduate student to verify that numbers on a data sheet matched those in a figure in a scientific manuscript, and to state in an e-mail that the data were accurate as far as he could tell. The paper described work that had been completed before the student arrived on campus and about which he knew little. Later, the student discovered that the paper was submitted the day he sent his confirmation e-mail—and that he was listed as a co-author. We can imagine his reactions. He might be tempted to let the inappropriate authorship stand to gain a publication and avoid confronting his adviser. He could rationalize that he was new and the...
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Researchers and institutional leaders must learn how these infiltrate their teams, and of operational flaws and cognitive biases.

People who enter research generally know externally. Of course, it didn’t. Happened at their university came to be one of us (C.K.G.) teaches leader ship skills and works with troubled departments. At almost every session, someone will sidle up, curious about appropriate authorship stand to gain a publica tion and avoid confronting his adviser. He in an e-mail that the data were accurate as far numbers on a data sheet matched those in a paper described work as he could tell. The paper described work that had been completed before the student arrived on campus and about which he knew that he was listed as that he was new and the could rationalize that he was new and the Embarrassment and Stupid Systems (see ‘A table of tragedies’).

Consider this true story. A professor asked a beginning graduate student to verify that scientists astray capture the interlocking factors that can lead to Embarrassment and Stupid Systems to Embarrassment and Stupid Systems.

Entitlement, Deception, Incrementalism, Ambition, Group, authority pressure, Temptation, Rationalization, Entitlement, Deception, Incrementalism, Embarrassment.
We can always justify improper actions to ourselves.

**Example**

- Think about being getting ready to submit a paper for publication that will determine your job prospects.
  - Experiments to complete
  - Limited time to repeat and iterate
  - Believe the research is good and important work
  - Data *almost* tell the best story

**Career TRAGEDIES**

- Temptation
- Rationalization
- Ambition
- Group, authority pressure
- Entitlement
- Deception
- Incrementalism
- Embarrassment
- Stupid Systems
So much about what goes wrong is about **POWER** — and how we treat those around us.

Things go right when you have **SKILLS** to respond if you see something going on, or that affects you.

**How things go right**

- Know and articulate your values
- Develop good habits and professional skills
Long-term Relationships

Job vs. Life

Don't conduct your personal life at work

Try to have a personal life that work doesn't infect
Establish Boundaries

Chronological
Establish Boundaries

Chronological  Topical  Personal

Manage yourself

Anger and aggression escalate situations, and can put you in the wrong.
Good moods promote creative thinking and openness to ideas.

People process information differently in different moods.

Emotion is a self-fulfilling prophesy.

A Little Social Psychology

👍 Egocentrism bias

🔄 Reciprocity norms

👎 Sinister attribution bias

Never attribute malice to that which incompetence will explain.

Never attribute to incompetence that which temporary inattention or miscommunication will explain.

Knoll Corollary
Likability

MATTERS

- Listen
- Listen
- Listen

? Ask questions
Negotiators who ask more questions get better results.

- How good are your questions?
- How well do you listen?
Go-to Questions

- “Can you show me?”
- “Can you help me understand?”
- “Is this right?”
- “Just to be clear, you’re suggesting...?”

1. As a mark of a person who learns and cares about learning
2. To avoid cognitive errors (sinister attribution bias)
3. To prevent problems, defuse aggression spirals

Words you have prepared, in advance, and practiced, for predictable situations.
### Some Useful Scripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Script</th>
<th>Script</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I need some time to reflect. Perhaps I could get back to you in about 20 minutes?”</td>
<td>“Could you clarify what you would like me to do by sending me instructions?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I’m so rushed right now, I couldn’t do this justice. I’ll carve out some dedicated time Wednesday afternoon.”</td>
<td>“What do you mean when you say….”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### More Useful Scripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Script</th>
<th>Script</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I am not sure I understood you correctly. Could you please repeat?”</td>
<td>“I hear what you’re saying and I respect how strongly you feel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Let’s agree to disagree for now and both go have a good think about this. Let’s try again tomorrow.”</td>
<td>“I’m not comfortable discussing that.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Authorship

80% of academic integrity complaints on campus concern authorship

Complaints include problems brought by collaborators and students. Misplaced and disappointed expectations lead to hard feelings.

Issues

- Multiple author collaborations rising
- Unarticulated assumptions (expectations)
- Increasing complexity of relationships and arrangements
- Varying collaboration standards

Good pre-existing relationships are highly beneficial.
Professionalism

Disciplinary Codes of Ethics

Employer Standards, Code of Conduct, Framework

Resolving Disputes Professionally

---

Resolving Disputes Professionally

- Seek informal resolution
- Do it in person, not in writing
- Exercise judgment in timing (for you and others)
- Keep a sense of proportion
- Remember the unseen audience
Resolving Disputes Professionally

- Consider alternative explanations (especially that you could be wrong)
- Ask questions, do not make charges
- Identify documentation and location
- Separate personal and professional concerns
- Assess your goals
- Seek advice; listen to it

Many things do not belong in email.

- No control over propagation
  - Easily forwarded
  - Easily misaddressed
- No control over access
  - Accessible under FOIA
  - Accessible in investigations
  - Accessible in lawsuits
Confidential
Private
Ephemeral

how things go right

Know and articulate your values

Develop good habits

Use analytical decision-making framework

Prepare personal scripts

Listen, ask questions

Conduct disputes professionally
It's your job to build professional skills and manage your career to match your values and aspirations.

*Note: Just because you see some practices “winning” doesn't make them right or ethical.
Remember:
Everyone in an organization has the opportunity and responsibility to be an ethical leader (even if not in a traditional or formal leadership role).

That's where we come in.

The Leadership Collection
Quick tips, executive briefings, and videos on various ethics leadership topics.

AUDIT: Academic Unit Diagnostic Tool

Research Ethics
Targeted to research universities and other research institutions.

Specialized Programs
Leadership program all athletes and coaches in all Department of Intercollegiate Athletics programs for values into action: success on and off the field.

Coming soon:
Choose your own adventure — pick what's important to you and we’ll guide you to the right content to fit the right amount of time.

Secondary School Ethics Outreach curriculum designed to be delivered by near-peer leaders.

---

Professional IQ: Prevention and Solving Problems at Work
A Massively Open On-line Course (MOOC)

1. Foundations of Professional Identity
2. Shaping your Professional Brand
3. Leadership and Influence
4. Professional IQ Capstone

Coursera Certificate Eligible; a 4-course specialisation
Three Parting Lessons:

Choose your bosses and colleagues for character

Conduct disputes effectively

Have good luck

“Action expresses priorities”
Thank you!