Chapter 7 Resources
Collaborative Research

Preparation Steps for Chapter 7 Discussion and Activity

→ This Facilitator’s Guide will lead you step-by-step through the chapter 7 discussions and activities.

→ Duplicate as appropriate the needed handouts for the activity section.

→ During the group activity, participants will need to take notes.
  Arrange to have a pen available for each participant.

→ Return to the chapter 7 homepage.

→ Watch the chapter 7 video and download it in preparation for leading the session.

→ To download the video, scroll to the bottom of the chapter 7 homepage and click on the .mp4 link under “Additional Files.”

http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284315205
Chapter 7 Facilitator’s Guide

→ Summary of facilitation steps:

1. Lead the discussion of chapter 7
2. Prepare the group for the chapter 7 video
3. Watch the chapter 7 video
4. Lead the chapter 7 video discussion
5. Lead the discussion on resolving the authorship issue
6. Lead the general discussion about authorship and collaboration

Practical Points

→ The time estimations provided for the discussions may vary significantly, depending on the number of students and the group dynamics.

→ Information contained in this document that is intended to be read verbatim to the participants is italicized.

Step 1. Lead the chapter 7 group discussion  (15 minutes)

→ Read aloud and discuss with the participants.

1. E-mail is a popular form of communication that is often employed in research collaborations. However, there are times when communication breakdowns occur. How would you react if your collaborators were not responding to e-mails? What steps would you take to remedy the situation?

2. Academic departments in various disciplines and at other universities may have different academic cultures. What are some of these differences and how might they affect collaboration?

3. The main collaboration discussed in this chapter focuses on a project that was already in progress before the student joined. How might her experiences have been different if she had played a role in starting the collaboration? Would she have had some of the same concerns or questions? Why or why not?

4. Many research collaborations are successful, but some are not. What do you see as some potential sources of collaboration dysfunction? Which of these sources do you think are more common? Less common? How would you address these issues if you faced them?
Step 2. Prepare for the chapter 7 video

→ Read the following video introduction to the participants.

*The two main characters in this video are Kaleah Davis, a third-year graduate student in biochemistry who is struggling with her lab experiment, and Suzanne Garner, a postdoc working in the same lab. Both Kaleah and Suzanne are working under the direction of Dr. Ramirez. Take a look at the video titled Who’s First?*

Step 3. Watch the chapter 7 video (6 minutes)

Step 4. Lead the chapter 7 video discussion (10 minutes)

→ Ask the participants the following questions.

1. Did you imagine that Kaleah and Suzanne would have a conflict at the end of the video? Have you ever found yourself in a conflict with a friend or colleague? What happened?
2. How would you describe Kaleah’s personality? What about Suzanne’s personality? Are these two individuals who might have problems working together?

Step 5. Lead the discussion on resolving the authorship issue portrayed in Who’s First? (10 minutes)

→ Read the following to the participants.

*Kaleah and Suzanne see their relative contributions to the project differently. In this exercise, we will try to understand both perspectives and then make a decision about who is most deserving of being first author. We will start by having two volunteers present Kaleah’s case for being first author. Then we’ll have two other volunteers present Suzanne’s case.*

→ Select four volunteers from the group to serve as presenters. Give them a few minutes to construct their arguments. The second presenter should try to introduce any points missed by the first presenter. Give the students 1 to 2 minutes each to present their cases.

→ After listening to the two cases, ask for a volunteer to play the role of Dr. Ramirez, who confers with Kaleah and Suzanne on this issue. In this monologue, the volunteer will explain to Kaleah and Suzanne his or her decision on who will be first author, second author, and third author. Remember, Dr. Ramirez will probably expect to be an author on the paper. Allow the volunteer 1 to 2 minutes to collect his or her thoughts before giving the monologue.

→ Discuss the decision as a group. Who do you collectively agree should be first, second, and third author? Feel free to introduce the following options into the discussion.

→ Alphabetical listing of authors.
→ Advisor could place himself as first author as leader of the lab group.
→ Kaleah first, Suzanne second: how will this choice affect them?
→ Suzanne first, Kaleah second: how will this choice affect them?
Step 6. Lead the general discussion about authorship and collaboration (15 minutes)

→ Questions for the discussion:

1. In general, how does one determine who should be an author on a paper? In the case of the video, we recognize that Kaleah and Suzanne should be authors. Should William and Song-Mi, the other two lab mates, also be authors on the paper? Why or why not?

2. What are some of the conventions for authorship? What do you think it means to be first author? Should the advisor always be first author? In some disciplines it is common for the advisor to be listed last.

3. How do you feel about listing authors alphabetically?

4. What could Dr. Ramirez have done proactively to avoid this conflict from the beginning?

5. To avoid conflict, what could Kaleah have done? What could Suzanne have done?

6. Consider William’s role as observer. What could he have done to promote harmony?

7. Kaleah’s project turned out to be a big success. What if Kaleah wanted to start a company built around the new method she developed? After publishing the work, does she need to get permission from Dr. Ramirez and Suzanne to commercialize the work? Can her new method be considered intellectual property? If so, who owns this property?