

2015

Research and Leadership Development Through Participation on a Inter Professional Research Team

Kaprea F. Johnson

Old Dominion University, johnsonkf@vcu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/chs_pubs

Part of the [Counseling Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Johnson, Kaprea F., "Research and Leadership Development Through Participation on a Inter Professional Research Team" (2015). *Counseling & Human Services Faculty Publications*. 40.
https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/chs_pubs/40

Original Publication Citation

Johnson, K. F. (2015). Research and leadership development through participation on a inter professional research team. *International Journal of Research*, 2(12), 293-306.

Research and Leadership Development through Participation on a Inter professional Research Team

Dr. Kaprea F Johnson

Assistant Professor of Counseling Office: Old Dominion University, 167-9 Education Building, Norfolk, VA 23529 Phone: 757-683-3221
Email: Kfjohnso@odu.edu

Abstract

This case study details one research team and includes a conceptual tri-level leadership model for team participation and project organization. Participants included seven students and one assistant professor. Findings highlight team development, recruitment, expectations, leadership gains, and implications for the profession.

Keywords: research teams; mentorship; interdisciplinary; leadership

Over the past decade, researchers have highlighted the importance of scholarly research teams and have recognized their role within graduate education; however, studies have left out the importance of leadership in the development of these teams and the experiences of team members (Hollingsworth & Fassinger, 2002). Research teams are defined as two or more researchers examining a subject matter in collaboration (Pierce, 2005). A large portion of the literature on research teams are in journals related to medicine and health sciences (Newington & Metcalfe, 2014; Salazar, Lant, & Kane, 2011; Susan, 2006). Within social sciences, anthropologists and psychologists have used research teams for over 35 years (Douglas, 1976; Gnagey, 1979; Kuper & Marks, 2011; Levitt, Kannan, & Ippolito, 2013). This literature identifies teams as essential in graduate education across disciplines (Borrego & Newswander, 2010; Duthie et al., 2010; Turner, 2006); however, few scholars are providing direction on the experiences and development of these teams, specifically for counseling students (Paradise & Dufrene, 2010).

While there are a limited number of studies on research teams in counseling programs, several

studies recognized the importance of establishing research teams for this field (Black, 2004; Lambie & Vaccaro, 2011; Paradise & Dufrene, 2010). These studies indicated research teams are important for graduate students because they assist in building relationships, strengthening research self-efficacy, and building professional identity. Research teams are naturally a group of students, therefore a group model is the best approach to team development as it accommodates more students, provides effective observation, allows for reflective integration, and mentors several students at one time (Paradise & Dufrene, 2010).

Mentorship for counseling students and specifically research mentorship strengthens professional identity, improves self-confidence, assists in the development of professional skills, enhances scholarly productivity, and increases satisfaction with scholastic programs (Mijares, Baxley, & Bond, 2013). Mentorship also produces numerous research-related benefits including development of knowledge of the research process, establishment of professional networks, alleviation of pressure to produce solo research, increased research self-efficacy, increased levels of



expertise, realization of the importance of discovering fresh knowledge, leadership ability, and authorship (Briggs & Pehrsson, 2008; Brown, Daly, & Leong, 2009; Lambie & Vaccario, 2011; Paradise & Dufrene, 2010). While mentorship is not present in all research teams, some literature shows a positive relationship between mentorship and team participation (Hollingsworth & Fassinger, 2002). Mentorship is also beneficial to mentors including personal and career satisfaction, research collaboration, and improved productivity (Briggs & Pehrsson, 2008; Brown et. al., 2009; Kram, 1985). In addition to all of the benefits listed above, research teams also aid in the development of leadership abilities (Lambie & Vaccaro, 2011).

Interdependent Leadership Theory

Building leaders who are good consumers of research and who can later be leaders in clinical settings is advantageous to the profession. One approach to develop leaders is interdependent leadership through experiential learning environments (Bowers et al., 2013). Interdependent leadership is an emergent approach that redefines the way in which leaders and team members interact (Palus, McGuire, & Ernst, 2012). Traditional leadership models demonstrate leaders in a top-down hierarchical process of distributing beliefs and influence, often commandeering the decision-making process for the better good of the group (Palus et al., 2012). Interdependent leadership, unlike traditional models, assume that all members of the team can make equally relevant contributions. Chen, Kirkman, Kanfer, Allen, and Rosen (2007) even suggested that interdependence on multilevel teams is critical to empowerment of the team and people involved. They found that members on an interdependent team interact more closely and thus are more likely to share

perceptions of team empowerment and have highly effective performances (Chen et al., 2007).

Interdependence theory implies that teams are able to out produce individuals working independently (DeOrtentiis, Summers, Ammeter, Douglas, & Ferris, 2013). Positive interdependence is a social interaction in which an individual can achieve their goals if and only if others involved also achieve their goals (De Ortentiis et al., 2013). Positive interdependence elicits positive interactions where team members are supportive and willing to work together to reach shared goals thus increasing overall team effectiveness (De Ortentiis et al., 2013). In an effort to determine efficacy of shared leadership, Wang, Waldman, and Zhang (2014) conducted a meta-analysis of existing literature and investigated factors which impact team effectiveness. Results indicated a moderately strong, positive relationship between shared leadership and team effectiveness (overall $p = .34$, $k = 42$). The use of this approach with counseling research teams is an apparent gap in the literature and led to this study's primary research question, what are the experiences of students on a research team built using the qualities of interdependent leadership?

Tri-Level Leadership Model (TL²M)

The Tri-Level Leadership Model has its theoretical backing in interdependence theory and motivational theory. The model focuses on empowering constituents to feel safe enough to take on challenges and ask questions, and empowered enough to move from novice researcher (i.e. completing clerical task, literature reviews, etc.) to feeling comfortable to complete more upper level research and leadership related task (e.g. writing a manuscript, leading a



conference presentation, collecting and analyzing data).

Method

This study used a qualitative single-case study approach to describe the development of an interprofessional research team (IPRT) and understand the experiences of the members (Stake, 2000; Yin, 2003). A case study approach was chosen to provide a real-life view of the development of one research team and preliminary experiences of its members. This case study was explanatory in nature, as the IPRT developed organically and existed for one full semester prior to the study (Fall 2012). Data collection began mid-way through the second semester of the team's existence and analysis concluded mid-summer (i.e., from spring term 2013 to summer term 2013). Institutional review board approval was granted for this study to be conducted.

The primary research question is: What are the experiences of students on a research team built using the qualities of interdependent leadership? Sub questions were (a) How was the team developed? (2) What experiences did students have on the team? (b) What was the perception of productivity on the team; (c) What were students' experiences with leadership?

Studies on research teams have frequently focused only on the experiences of team members or the benefits of developing teams rather than providing practical knowledge on the construction of a research team (Galassi, Stoltz, Brooks, & Trexler, 1987; Hulse-Killacky & Robinson, 2005), which is a goal of this study. The unit of analysis for this study was an interprofessional education research team, specifically the structure and the experiences of team members.

Setting and Researchers

The setting for this case study was a research one university in the southern region of the

United States, with a CACREP approved counseling program. The research team was housed in a counselor education and human services department comprised of an undergraduate human services program and masters and doctoral counseling programs. Two researchers, whom both completed an advanced qualitative research course, conducted data collection and analysis. Demographics for the two researchers include: (a) male doctoral student, aged 35-40, from the northeast region of the United States and (b) female doctoral student aged 30-35, from Taiwan.

Participants and Demographics

At the time of the study, there were 15 people on the IPRT, not including the faculty team leader. The team leader agreed to be interviewed and provided her conceptual model of the team. Participation of team members was solicited at the final team meeting of the spring 2013 semester and via email afterwards. Eight team members did not respond to requests for participation, including several undergraduate team members; however, they did not state reasons for non-participation. Participation in the study was voluntary and volunteers were asked to complete a demographic sheet and an informed consent. Team members who did participate were graduate level counseling students ($N=7$) with an age range between 25 and 38 and a mean age of 31. Self-report indicated ($n=6$) who identified as female and ($n=1$) as male; ($n=3$) who identified as White American, ($n=1$) (each) who identified as Asian, Taiwanese/Chinese, African American, and Caribbean American; ($n=4$) pursuing a PhD, ($n=2$) pursuing a master, and ($n=1$) pursuing an Ed.S.



Team role identifications and future career aspirations exhibited the most diversity, as participants could make multiple selections. Self-report team role identifications included co-researcher ($n=6$), writer ($n=6$), presenter ($n=5$), editor ($n=3$), project developer ($n=2$), and web master ($n=1$).

Self-report future career goals included ($n=4$) faculty, ($n=4$) counselor/clinician, ($n=1$) school counselor/LPC, ($n=1$) researcher, and ($n=1$) PhD student. All participants identified as active team members, meaning they committed a minimum of eight hours per month. The team leader was an African American female assistant professor in counseling, aged between 25 and 35.

Data Collection

Data collection began mid-spring semester of 2013 by first defining the conceptual model of the team's leadership structure, organization, and development. The team leader developed a tri-level leadership model, to describe the team's framework, organization, and responsibilities across two projects. A member of the study research team conducted a 45-minute individual interview with the team leader about the development, implementation, and maintenance of the team. The interview was recorded and transcribed by the two researchers mentioned earlier.

To address the secondary research question, participants on the research team were given an anonymous open-ended seven item questionnaire asking about their team involvement, their reasons for joining, and their expectations from team membership. Participants were also asked to share overall team experiences, perceived gains and challenges, and other positive or negative factors from team membership and a follow-up question was asked on leadership experiences.

Questionnaires were completed near the end of the 2013 spring semester following the semester's last team meeting. Participation or non-participation in this study was stressed to be voluntary and would not influence relationships with the team, department, or university.

Data Analysis

The focus of data analysis was identification of themes related to the development of the IPRT and experiences of its members; accordingly, thematic analysis was used (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Focus was placed on identifying, analyzing, and reporting themes and patterns within data (Braun et al., 2006). This method of analyzing participant responses organized and described the qualitative data in rich detail enhancing its value (Hazel, Laviolette, & Lineman, 2010). Investigators followed Braun and Clarke's (2006) six step guide to thematic analysis. The six phases for analysis included becoming familiar with the data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the report.

Sequence of Analysis. Thematic analysis was conducted by two doctoral students on the research team. The tri-level leadership model was examined for preliminary themes. The analysis of the model was the basis for questions posed to the team leader during the interview. The transcribed interview was reviewed for themes and subthemes using the six thematic analysis steps and consensus coding. After collection of the team member questionnaires, both doctoral students utilized thematic analysis to identify patterns and connect ideas amongst data. Disagreements over coding in the data were discussed until agreement was reached. Throughout the coding process, the



researchers took notes to identify any questions or concerns found within the data.

Bracketing. Researchers bracketed their biases and assumptions prior to data collection through journaling. Both researchers were members of this IPRT and entered this project with certain expectations and biases. For example, having been on the research team for two semesters prior to completing analysis of results the researchers were intimate with various products, opinions, and perceived benefits of the team. Both researchers participated on other projects with the team as researchers, writers, editors, or presenters, and had their own opinions of benefits and challenges of being a member. Also, being active with the team through projects and team meetings the researchers expected more positive than negative comments to come from analysis of results.

Trustworthiness. Trustworthiness strategies included maintaining an audit trail, use of member checking of data analysis, use of field notes, and bracketing of assumptions and biases by the researchers. Following data collection and coding, member checking was attempted by sending results to participants seeking their changes; however no alterations were requested and all seven team members participated.

Results

Based upon analysis of the results, data was organized into three areas: (1) the tri-level leadership model with sub- themes as team development, implementation, and team maintenance; (2) Team member experiences; (3) Leadership experiences.

Tri-Level Leadership Model (TL²M)

When reflecting on development and implementation of the team, the team leader conceptualized the IPRT organizational structure

as a tri-level leadership model. This model permitted promotion of leadership and research competencies as members moved through various research tasks (e.g., clerical work and coding, data collection and analysis, project development and methodology design). Described below are the levels, functions, and purpose of the model. The Tri-Level Leadership Model (TL²M) has three distinct levels which guide mentorship and leadership development, research competence, and how projects are developed and completed. Themes highlighted in level one, *team development*; level two highlighted *team implementation and maintenance*; level three is *Continuance*.

Level one highlighted the *Team Development* theme. The model began with the team leader(s), initially only a faculty member but eventually included an advanced doctoral student. At this level, the team leader's primary responsibilities included recruitment, project development, and developing research training materials. The faculty leader said this about recruitment, "Recruitment involved advertising through the department list-serv and through word of mouth and the response was overwhelming. Many students emailed initially and about 13 or so actually joined and attended the first meeting."

Project development began with existing projects from the team leader but other projects grew from within the team. The leader developed research training materials based on specific projects. For example, the first project included searching for and summarizing articles and conducting a content analysis. The faculty leader described this process as,

Doctoral students focused on the content analysis, undergraduate students focused on finding articles, and master's students



summarized and organized the articles located on Dropbox. All members were offered training on content analysis, summarizing articles, and how to use Dropbox. This process made for little to no confusion about roles and responsibilities.

The second level of the model, highlighted the themes of *Implementation* and *Team Maintenance*, and included doctoral, master's, and undergraduate students embarking on their first team project. The faculty leader described the implementation process,

On the first project tri-level leadership began, with doctoral students sharing co- leadership of projects and duties with me [team leader] and I directly mentored them weekly. Master's students, mentored by the doctoral students, took higher research responsibilities and received research training equivalent to the doctoral students.

Undergraduate students mentored by master's students, on the first project, received the same training as the more advanced students, but only handled clerical or coding tasks. Further explanation described the maintenance of such a team,

This structure allowed doctoral students to mentor master's students, master's students to mentor undergraduate students, and undergraduate students to have access to multiple mentors and research training. The mentorship responsibilities of doctoral and masters students also served as leadership training. The leaders/mentors were responsible for their team. This in essence help maintain the team, the function of them team and productivity.

The third level of the model, *Continuance* began with the second team project and was described by the faculty leader as,

Students [undergraduate or graduate] from the first project demonstrating initiative, leadership ability, and interest shared leadership tasks on a new research project or expanded on their current responsibilities. These new project leaders were encouraged to explore any research task such as project development, methodology design, data collection and analysis, or writing. They still had support from me as the faculty member but they were encouraged to take risk and to make decisions with their team.

At this model level, master's students were encouraged to share or take lead authorship in publications or presentations resulting from the project. New team members were added into the project and given training, as well. This collaborative process of research mentoring/apprenticeship was to continue on future projects permitting students from prior projects to expand their research skills and leadership duties with each new project.

The TL²M included team meetings permitting any member the opportunity to present research ideas and allowing leaders to delegate tasks. By effective IPRT implementation, the team leader hoped students with a range of research competencies would gain valuable knowledge, experience, and confidence in research and would explore more advanced research than they would have independently.

Team Member Experiences

Seven out of 15 team members participated in the research study. Team members who chose not to participate did not offer reasons. Three primary themes were identified from participants (a) motivation for joining the research team; (b) experiences pertaining to team participation; (c)



and leadership experience. Each theme is described below in detail with quotes.

Motivation for joining the research team.

Participants reflected on their reasons for joining the research team. Team members offered three reasons for joining the team including (a) gaining experience in research activities (e.g., research, conference submission, presentation, publication, writing/authorship, and mentoring); (b) building a resume for employment or graduate study application; (c) and for socialization and team collaboration. One participant, pursuing an educational specialist degree, stated her motivation for joining the team was to “gain more research experience which would eventually provide an opportunity for better employment options and preparation for applying to the PhD program.” A doctoral student participant stated “my reason is for publication” as motivation for joining the team and a master’s participant stated her motivation was “learning how to do research- professionally- also authorship, presenting, mentoring, and social [experiences].” Other students stated their motivation was “working with a group of motivated individuals and learning how to write research at a higher level” and “to learn more about collaborative research and writing teams.”

Team participation. Team experiences were divided under two sub-themes, expectations and overall team experience. These sub-themes are detailed below.

Expectations. Participants had high expectations for the team which included developing publications, improving research skills, learning how to write/research within a collaborative team, and to gain conference/presentation experience. A doctoral participant stated “I wanted the collaboration experience as well as the research, presentation,

and publication experiences too,” and another doctoral participant stated “I hope I will have at least two publications (journal articles) before I graduate.” A master’s student’s expectations focused on growth, “[I expect] to learn about the research process, learn about writing research, and eventually to possibly get involved in a project that gets published.” Team members summarized their thoughts of participating on the team with some of the following words or phrases: intimidating, overwhelming, fun, academically lucrative, demanding, fast paced, and difficult to balance projects with schoolwork. Overwhelmingly, team members felt the collaborative elements of the team (i.e., writing, project development, and team meetings) were enjoyable and positive. Team members cited support and positive feedback from the team leader as strong contributions to the good working environment, as well as the team’s collective sense of humor at meetings and collaboration activities.

Reflection of overall experience. Participants reported several gains from being on the IPRT. These gains included a sense of purpose and confidence, improved research and writing skills, time management and collaboration skills, networking, support, research team management skills, and publication skills. A master’s participant offered this positive feedback “I love this team, the model/idea behind it, and what it has provided me with professionally. I learned more about writing research on this team than in class.” Similarly response master’s student said, “it has been the most lucrative (educationally) experience I have had in graduate school.” A doctoral student stated, “this is the first great research team that I ever have [sic] and it is really helpful both in my career and professional development.” Another master’s student’s



highlighted their accomplishments: “my writing and research abilities have significantly increased along with academic confidence. Also leadership/mentorship and connectedness.” A master’s participant provided this additional summary, “I think it is a great experience and appreciate how much gets accomplished and the great products the team produces-it’s not just talk we actually get a lot done”.

Participants also identified several challenges to being on the IPRT including the fast pace of projects, balancing project time with other commitments, clarity of project assignments/roles, feeling lost or inexperienced, time management, not experiencing enough team structure, being shifted between projects, and disappointment with project completion and lack of publication. A master’s participant said of challenges, “[it] can be stressful to maintain commitment to [the] paper/team when work/school gets very busy.” Another master’s student stated a challenge was “feeling a little lost or inexperienced- but help and support is always available.” Along similar lines when asked about challenges a master’s student responded “[the team is] intimidating, overwhelming, and a huge learning experience.”

Additionally, participants offered feedback indicating a spectrum of experiences from very strong, positive, and enthusiastic for the team’s value to reserved approval in anticipation of completed projects. The majority of participants ($n=5$) considered the research team a valuable and positive experience promoting their research, writing, and publishing skills. One participant abstained from providing additional feedback and one participant gave positive initial approval, suspending judgment until projects were completed.

Leadership experiences

This theme focused on the reflections on leadership from student participants. One doctoral student described their role as a leader:

I was able to co-lead one project with a colleague. We were responsible for creating the project’s methodology, developing the outline for the paper, and assigning writing duties. I was also able to take on a leadership role with two presentations created for a national conference. I put together and/or assisted in designing the presentations and helped co-lead them. The writing project is still on-going and I have continued editing and writing duties on that project, which also fall into a leadership function.

A master’s student shared a similar experience, “I never served as a leader on a research team before and I was responsible for helping masters students complete literature reviews. I was also responsible and took the lead on a paper that was written for publication.” An undergraduate student described her feelings about the team as:

The team was not oppressive and that’s what I am use to as an undergraduate student. I have served on research teams and they usually give me the grunt task without asking if I have other skills. I like this team because I was given leadership roles, was able to show my level of research skills, and the leadership role was shared amongst everyone who participated.

Another description was provided by a master’s student, “as far as leadership, I learned how to create deadlines, hold myself and others accountable, and how to distribute work load amongst a group.”

Additionally, some participants shared about their leadership role in recruitment, “I recruited two members to the team- promoting it and convincing them to contact the team leader,



recruitment being a leadership or mentoring function in my opinion.”

When asked if the leadership skills will assist in their clinical work as a counselor one respondent exclaimed, “yes absolutely”, while another doctoral student explained:

Not in my clinical work as a counselor, but they add to my growing skills as a counselor educator and researcher. For example, if possible, I would like to create a counselor education research team when I am hired as a professor and I feel my experiences on this team, in leadership and other roles, informs my interest in creating my own team and provides me with insight into how I may go about leading such a team.

Discussion

The responsibility of developing and maintaining research teams is a time consuming task, however the benefits for students are many. The primary benefit is the promotion of an egalitarian, cooperative research environment that produces completed research products and offers mentoring and training in research development and publication as reflected in student reflections. Prior research also highlights the importance of research teams to the development of students (Lambie & Vaccro, 2011; Owenz & Hall, 2011; Paradise & Dufrene, 2010). Furthermore, research teams can provide an inviting and fun environment for researchers, especially clinicians or novice students who find research intimidating (Owenz & Hall, 2011). This case study found that fostering a fun, inviting environment led to students having positive research team experiences and built leadership abilities. These findings are mirrored in existing research studies (Gelso, 2006; Owenz & Hall, 2011; Paradise & Dufrene, 2010).

In terms of leadership, prior studies were inconclusive when investigating whether or not fostering leadership was necessary within research teams (Bower et al., 2013; Burke et al., 2006), however this current study adds to the body of knowledge. The findings highlighted positive leadership experiences as a result of participation on the research team. The development of this research team demonstrated leadership fostering was an important and necessary step in the team structure. The development of leadership roles for team members had additional effects not accounted for by the researchers including ownership of the team and positive perceptions of research teams in general.

In this study, participants cited mentorship, support, and growth of research and leadership skills as benefits of team membership. Prior studies found research mentorship and collaboration are key components to engaging students in research (Gelso, 2006; Owens & Hall, 2011). Additionally, comments highlighted participants' enjoyment in the team experience, which in turn benefitted the team environment (Owens & Hall, 2011). Regarding collaboration, this case study found participants enjoyed writing manuscripts and developing projects together. Worthington (2012) acknowledged enjoying the research topic and process impacted retention on research teams. Briggs and Pehrsson (2008) mentioned relational factors (e.g., support, partnership, research role modeling) and instructional factors (e.g., assistance with generating research, career guidance, critical idea analysis) as benefits from research mentorship and collaboration. In this case study, participants felt supported in their endeavors through the structure of the team, had a sense of strong partnership and collaboration, and valued the instructional factors.



One of the major duties for a research mentor is to assist budding researchers with writing skills (Briggs &Pehrsson, 2008). Participants reported an improvement in writing skills due to team membership. In this study, organization, communication, networking, and feedback were effective characteristics of the team leader, which is supported by previous literature (Borders et al., 2012). Products are also a key component of a successful research team. To date, this IPRT has produced two national presentations, two state presentations, three regional posterpresentations, one state poster presentation, two articles currently under revision (not including this case study), one manuscript published, and two projects in development. Through using atri-level leadership model for research team development, research projects can be successfully completed and research involvement can be encouraged at all academic levels.

Limitations

The case study methodology is homogenous in that it focuses on a very specific case, one research team at one university, which limits generalizability beyond this IPRT team. In this study, eight team members chose not to participate in the study, while these students were overwhelmingly undergraduate students, their perspective in the literature is even scarcer and would have been valuable in this study. Additionally, despite consent forms that indicated members were free to participate or not without penalty, some members having negative responses to the team may not have participated due to these or related concerns, meaning valuable insight could be absent from the study. Researcher bias could have been an additional limitation because authors were members of the team.

Future Research

Future qualitative research on the tri-level leadership approach to research teams would be useful to explore because this is a seemingly new approach. Studies seeking to understand how research team membership prepares doctoral students for dissertations or improves research self-efficacy of students at all levels are also valuable. Many new educators enter the field not knowing how to write quality manuscripts thereby ineffectively contributing to the research aspect of higher education (Briggs &Pehrsson, 2008). A longitudinal study examining the differences in research contributions between doctoral students who are on research teams and those who are not would provide information of this phenomenon. The leader of this IPRTis pre-tenured and the authors, along with Briggs &Pehrsson (2008), recommend a qualitative study examining pre-tenured educators and their experiences with research mentorship. Finally, future research might examine how the conceived tri-level model of team development aligns with the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Guidelines for ResearchMentorship (Borders et al., 2012).

Implications and Recommendations

Based upon this case study, implications and recommendations will be discussed foreducators, academic programs, and future research.

Educators

This case study has several implications for educators. When developing a research team faculty must set aside time and develop an organizational structure. The tri-level leadership model was created by the team leader for this research team. Flexibility is important for research team endeavors. To make it less stressful for students, faculty should not strictly impose rules, time commitments, and mandatory trainings as



participants desire a casual and friendly environment (Jorgensen, Becker, & Matthews, 2011). Team participants in this case study noted the team leader's sense of humor during meetings which is indicative of the friendly environment fostered by the leader. Finally, it is important to be productive and have deliverables for all students involved on the team (i.e. co-authorship on presentations or publications).

Programs

Academic programs interested in developing a research team are recommended to offer, encouragement for the creation, development, and maintenance of teams and funding. Multiple faculty members are encouraged to collaborate to create teams. Funding is necessary to pay for poster printing, conference fees, and snacks during team meetings. Other ways to encourage team development include publicizing efforts, honoring the team at departmental meetings or events, or provide awards to team members.

In conclusion, research teams for higher education are important tools for expanding research competence in graduate programs. The tri-level leadership model presented in this study included successful participation of undergraduate and graduate students in a collaborative, team-based environment, guided by a counselor educator. The team was successful, measured by the products produced within an academic school year, which included several presentations and a manuscript. The feedback provided from participants contained positive and negative aspects and the positive responses indicated this IPRT model has potential value and utility for students at varying academic levels and for faculty members. The authors encourage education programs to develop IPRT teams following the tri-

level mentorship model presented here or a team structure which benefits student researchers in their program.

References

- [1] Black, L. (2004). Helping students help themselves: Strategies for successful mentoring relationships. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 44*, 44-55.
- [2] Borders, L., Wester, K., Granello, D., Chang, C., Hays, D., Pepperell, J., & Spurgeon, S. (2012). Association for Counselor Education and Supervision guidelines for research mentorship: Development and implementation. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 51*, 162-175. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2012.00012.x
- [3] Borrego, M. & Newswander, L. K. (2010). Definitions of interdisciplinary research: Toward graduate-level interdisciplinary learning outcomes. *The Review of Higher Education 34*, 61-84.
- [4] Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*, 77-101.
- [5] Briggs, C. A. & Pehrsson, D. (2008). Research mentorship in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 48*, 101-113.
- [6] Brown, L. E., & Pastore, D. L. (2011). Navigating a research mentorship: Recommendations for graduate students. *Future Focus (Ohio Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance), 32*(2), 12-17.



- [7] Brown, R. T., Daly, B. P., & Leong, F. L. (2009). Mentoring in research: A developmental approach. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 40, 306-313. doi:10.1037/a0011996.
- [8] Brown-Wright, D. A., Dubick, R. A., & Newman, I. (1997). Graduate assistant expectation and faculty perception: Implications for mentoring and training. *Journal of College Student Development*, 38, 410-16.
- [9] Bowers, B., Coehn, L.W., Elliot, A.E., Grabowski, D.C., Fishman, N.W., Sharkey, S.S., Zimmerman, S. Horn, S.D., Kemper, P. (2013). Creating and supporting a mixed methods health services research team. *Health Services Research*, 48, 2157-2179. doi: 10.1111/1475-6773.12118
- [10] Chen, G., Kirkman, B. L., Kanfer, R., Allen, D., & Rosen, B. (2007). A multilevel study of leadership, empowerment, and performance in teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 331-346. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.331
- [11] DeOrtentiis, P. S., Summers, J. K., Ammeter, A. P., Douglas, C., & Ferris, G. R. (2013). Cohesion and satisfaction as mediators of the team – team effectiveness and relationship: An interdependence theory perspective. *Career Development International*, 18, 521-543. doi: 10.1108/CDI-03-2013-0035
- [12] Douglas, J. D. (1976). *Investigative social research – Individual and team field research*. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA.
- [13] Duthie, K., Riddell, M., Weller, C., Coltan, L. I., Benzies, K., & Olson, D. M. (2010). Alberta's new health research paradigms: Are graduate students being prepared for interdisciplinary team research? *Clinical & Investigative Medicine*, 33(3), E213-E218.
- [14] Galassi, J. P., Stoltz, R. F., Brooks, L., & Trexler, K. A. (1987). Improving research training in doctoral counseling programs. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 66, 40-44.
- [15] Gelso, C. J. (2006). On the making of a scientist–practitioner: A theory of research training in professional psychology. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 5(1), 3-16. doi:10.1037/1931-3918.S.1.3
- [16] Gnagey, W. J. (1979). Peer leadership of small research teams in two introductory psychology classes. *Teaching of Psychology*, 6(2), 80.
- [17] Hays, D., & Singh, A. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry in clinical and educational settings*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- [18] Hazel, C. E., Laviolette, G. T., & Lineman, J. M. (2010). Training professional psychologists in school-based consultation: What the syllabi suggest. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 4(4), 235.
- [19] Hollingsworth, M.A. & Fassinger, R.E. (2002). The role of faculty mentors in the research training of counseling psychology doctoral students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 49, 324-330.
- [20] Hulse-Killacky, D. & Robison, F.F. (2005). An effective research team method to influence



research and scholarly development. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 30:3, 241-252.

[21] Johnson, W. B. & Huwe, J. M. (2003). *Getting mentored in graduate school*. American Psychological Association. Washington: DC.

[22] Johnson, B. W. & Nelson, N. (1999). Mentor-protégé relationships in graduate training: Some ethical concerns. *Ethics and Behavior*, 9, 189-210.

[23] Jorgensen, F., Becker, K., & Matthews, J. (2011). The HRM practices of innovative knowledge intensive firms. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 56, 123-137.

[24] Kram, K. E. 1985. *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, IL: Scott-Foresman.

[25] Kuper, A., & Marks, J. (2011). Anthropologists unite! *Nature*, 470(7333), 166-168. doi:10.1038/470166a

[26] Lambie, G. W., & Vaccaro, N. (2011). Doctoral counselor education students' levels of research self-efficacy, perceptions of the research training environment, and interest in research. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 50, 243-258.

[27] Levitt, H., Kannan, D., & Ippolito, M. R. (2013). Teaching qualitative methods using a research team approach: Publishing grounded theory projects with your class. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 10, 119-139. doi:10.1080/14780887.2011.586101

[28] Mijares, L., Baxley, S. M., & Bond, M. (2013). Mentoring: A concept analysis. *Journal of Theory Construction & Testing*, 17, 23-28.

[29] Mohamed, M., Omar, Z. Z., Ahmad, A. A., & Juned, R. R. (2012). Critical factors influencing the effectiveness of research teams among academicians. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 20(3), 695-706.

[30] Nelson, K. W., Oliver, M., & Capps, F. (2006). Becoming a supervisor: Doctoral student perception of the training experience. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 46, 17-31.

[31] Newington, L., & Metcalfe, A. (2014). Factors influencing recruitment to research: qualitative study of the experiences and perceptions of research teams. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 14, 1-20. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-14-10

[32] Owenz, M., & Hall, S. R. (2011). Bridging the research-practice gap in psychotherapy training: Qualitative analysis of master's students' experiences in a student-led research and practice team. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 13, 21-34.

[33] Paradise, L. V., & Dufrene, R. L. (2010). A research group model for graduate training in counseling. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 38(1), 101-111.

[34] Palus, C. J., McGuire, J. B., & Ernst, C. (2012). Developing interdependent leadership. In S. Scott, N. Nohria, & R. Khurana (Eds.), *The handbook for teaching leadership: Knowing,*



doing, and being (pp. 467-492). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

[35] Pierce, L. (2005). Rehabilitation nurses working as collaborative research teams. *Rehabilitation Nursing*, 30, 132-139. doi: 10.1002/j.2048-7940.2005.tb00096.x

[36] Protivnak, J.J. & Foss, L.L. (2009). An exploration of themes that influence the counselor education doctoral student experience. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 48, 239- 256.

[37] Salazar, M., Lant, T., & Kane, A. (2011). To join or not to join: An investigation of individual facilitators and inhibitors of medical faculty participation in interdisciplinary research teams. *CTS: Clinical & Translational Science*, 4, 274-278. doi:10.1111/j.17528062.2011.00321.x

[38] Stake, R. E. (2000). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

[39] Susan, B. (2006). Promoting excellence in nursing research and scholarship in the clinical setting. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 36, 224-227.

[40] Turner, M. (2006). The research team concept, II: (Still) an approach to graduate training. *Communication Research Reports*, 23, 225-230. doi:10.1080/08824090600796443

[41] Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed. Vol. 5). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.