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Abstract

Since the COVID-19 pandemic began in 2020, universities have had to implement different workstyles in response to the pandemic. The three different workstyles of hybrid (working at least one day a week remotely, and the rest of the time on-site), fully remote (working 5 days a week remotely, and no time is spent on-site), and fully in-person (working 5 days a week on-site) have been implemented at universities since the year of 2020, with no uniformity, as it varies between the different universities. This has opened up the discussion of what is management's most preferred workstyle for research administrators to utilize since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. In order to study this topic further, the student investigator administered a questionnaire regarding workstyle preferences to head research administrative managers, and middle managers, of the Johns Hopkins University Zanvyl Krieger School of Arts and Sciences. The questionnaire solicited managers workstyle preferences for the research administrators that these managers oversee, and whether or not the workstyles had an impact on trust, communication and/or perceived effectiveness. The results showed that there are managerial preferences in regards to the workstyles to be utilized by the research administrators that managers oversee. The results showed that hybrid is the most preferred option by managers for research administrators to utilize, fully in-person is the second most preferred option, and fully remote is the third most preferred option. The managers did not demonstrate a difference in trust, communication, or perceived effectiveness related to the three different workstyles. The statistically significant preference results showed that universities need to make decisions on workstyles to implement, based on the views of management, so the most efficient work can be completed between management and the research administrators, and research can be administered in a productive manner at institutions throughout the research continuum.
Thesis Reader & Advisor: Dr. Jeffrey Kantor, Johns Hopkins University.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background Information

The COVID-19 pandemic was one of the most defining moments since the turn of the century. The responses to the pandemic were vast from the various facets of society, including but not limited to; the medical response, public health response, and to the financial and business response of various realms. Research administration was no exception to this. When the world seemed to “shut-down” in March of 2020, there was an immediate response, that a majority of employees would need to work fully remote, in response to the pandemic. The journal of “Nature Human Behaviour” notes that prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, the maximum percentage of citizens of the U.S. working remotely more than three days of the week, was only at 5%.

When individuals needed to work on a fully remote basis to combat the pandemic, this workstyle change was a change that 95% of Americans had not encountered before. Additionally, Nicholas Bloom published an article for the Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research, noting that only 2% of the U.S. workforce ever worked from home in a fully remote capacity, prior to the start of the pandemic. In April of 2020, the 5% statistic reported by the journal of “Nature Human Behaviour” increased by 32%. The same article from the journal of “Nature Human Behaviour” elaborated; that as of April 2020 there was an estimated 37% of members of the U.S. workforce, that were fully remote as a result of the pandemic.

The number of individuals working in a fully remote capacity raised even more as the year 2020 continued. Nicholas


Bloom’s article noted; that as of June 2020, 42% of individuals that are a part of the U.S. workforce were working in a fully remote capacity, with the other 33% unemployed, and the remaining 26% as working fully in-person. Out of 100% of the U.S. workforce, working in a fully remote capacity was the most prevalent workstyle in 2020.

In the time that has passed since 2020, there have been various workstyles that individuals in the U.S. workforce have experienced. In October of 2021, Gallup released statistics noting that 45% of the U.S. workforce was now working in either a fully remote, or hybrid capacity; with 25% working in a fully remote capacity, and 20% working in a hybrid capacity. This was about half of the U.S. workforce, leaving 55% working in a fully in-person capacity. This number has showed a slight increase to the percentage Stanford had reported a year prior (42%). Although, the 45% reported by Gallup is encompassing fully remote work, and hybrid work, as opposed to only fully remote work. The 45% shows that the hybrid workstyle had developed as a utilized workstyle option since 2020. In regards to what workstyle is preferred of the 45% of people that are already working in a remote capacity; Gallup notes that 54% prefer the hybrid workstyle, 37% prefer the fully remote workstyle, and 9% prefer the fully in-person workstyle. This data shows that the hybrid workstyle is not only an option, but is now a preferred option of the U.S. workforce, and that remote work in some capacity is desired of the U.S. workforce. Additionally, as reported in Gallup, the 55% of the U.S. workforce that works fully in-person, in a job that can be completed in a remote capacity, are split evenly on a desire to work remotely in any capacity or not; with 37% desiring to work in a hybrid workstyle, and 11%


desiring to work in a fully remote workstyle.\(^7\) This furthers the point that the ability to work remotely in some capacity is desired of the U.S. workforce. Additionally, the hybrid workstyle is seen as a preferred option for a large population of the U.S. workforce.

In research administration, the feelings regarding the capability of remote work and the current status of workstyles occurring, are no exception to the rest of the U.S workforce. The NCURA remote work survey was administered in July of 2021 and received responses from 1,618 people from various career levels, and institutions of research administration.\(^8\) This survey generated results regarding workstyles being utilized by the research administrators, and views regarding remote work. The following figures are responses to two questions of the survey:


The results to these questions revealed that the majority of research administrators are working in some sort of remote capacity. This arrangement is important to research administrators, as majority of research administrators note that they would change jobs for more flexibility in their workstyle. This is very much in-line with the status, and feelings, of the U.S. workforce as a whole.

In March of 2020 the Zanvyl Krieger School of Arts and Sciences at Johns Hopkins University implemented fully remote work to combat the pandemic. This included the managers and research administrators of the school. This arrangement continued for close to a year and a
half, as individuals were instructed to return to on-site work beginning in August of 2021. Since August of 2021, individuals have been working in either a fully remote workstyle, hybrid workstyle, or fully in-person workstyle. This has provided new challenges for managers of research administrators of the Zanvyl Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, by having to manage the research administrators they oversee, in different workstyles, since the pandemic began in 2020. The Zanvyl Krieger School of Arts and Sciences going through these different phases of workstyles since 2020, combined with the workstyle status and feelings of the U.S. workforce and research administrators, has opened up various discussions within university leadership regarding the workstyles utilized at the Zanvyl Krieger School of Arts and Sciences.

1.2 Statement of Purpose

The purpose of the thesis was to research managements workstyle preferences for research administrators to utilize since the COVID-19 pandemic began. The focus of the research was on three different workstyle preferences. The three workstyles studied were; fully in-person, hybrid, and fully remote. Fully in-person is defined as meaning; that for five days of the week the research administrator is working on-site. Hybrid is defined as meaning; that the research administrator is working at least one day a week remotely, and the remaining days are on-site. Fully remote is defined as meaning; that the research administrator is working five days a week remotely, and no time is spent on-site. In order to research the management perceptions for each workstyle, three categories of trust, communication, and perceived effectiveness will be analyzed with its relationship to each workstyle, through three specific sections of the questionnaire. The prior literature notes these three categories were utilized in studying managerial views towards workstyles. These categories were utilized to expand the research further, specifically to the field of research administration. The literature review in Chapter 2 discusses these prior studies.
further. Additionally, the managers were asked to choose the preferred workstyle for research administrators to utilize, in a section of the questionnaire titled; Preference. The thesis aims to provide insight on the most preferred workstyle practices for management to implement for the research administrators they oversee, so the most efficient work and productive communication can occur, allowing research to thrive, and be administered efficiently at institutions.

1.3 Research Objectives

The following list contains the research objectives for the thesis:

1. Gather data regarding the managerial perceptions of each workstyle to the three categories of trust, communication, and perceived effectiveness.

2. Gather data regarding the preferred workstyle that managers prefer to be utilized by the research administrators that the managers oversee.

3. Analyze the data to see if there are statistically significant relationships between workstyles and the three categories of trust, communication, and perceived effectiveness.

4. Analyze the data to see what is management’s preferred workstyle to be utilized by the research administrators that they oversee.

1.4 Research Questions

In accomplishing the research objectives, the following research questions were explored during the thesis:

1. Do managers feel there are different relationships between workstyles and the level of trust supervisors have for a research administrator to do an exceptional job in their day-to-day work?

2. Do managers feel there are different relationships between workstyles and productive communication with a research administrator?
3. Do managers feel there are different relationships between workstyles and the research administrators’ ability to be effective in their job performance?

4. Which workstyle is preferred by management for research administrators to utilize?

**Chapter 2: Review of the Literature**

**2.1 Introduction of Literature Review**

The literature contains mixed reviews of what workstyles managers prefer employees to utilize, and which workstyles that managers view as the most effective. From the studies that have been done, leadership seem to respond both positively, and negatively to the different workstyles. A trend from the different studies was that a few characteristics were measured in regards to how the managers viewed the different workstyles. A theme from the studies was that areas of trust, communication, and perceived effectiveness were measured in some capacity to the different workstyles. How each study measured these areas varied from study to study. For example, perceived effectiveness was measured from varying characteristics, including but not limited to; concentration, productivity, and motivation. Trust was measured from the viewpoint of managers trusting that their employees contained the competence to do

---


their job on a day-to-day basis.\textsuperscript{18,19} Communication was measured more generically, in the sense of; managers viewing the most productive communication that can occur between the workstyles, overall.\textsuperscript{20,21} The literature looks at management from a broad sense as opposed to a specific field. To date, the field of research administration was very limited in regards to this topic. However, the NCURA remote work survey researched how research administrators viewed remote work, and included individuals of management. The following review analyzes the literature from trust, communication, and perceived effectiveness, and a section regarding the NCURA remote work survey is included.

\textbf{2.2 Trust}

In regards to trust, a manager needs to be able to trust that an employee can be competent in their day-to-day job in performing the duties required of the employer. One of these realms of competency for a manager, is trusting that employees can use technologies in a sufficient manner to be competent in their day-to-day work. Wakefield Research did a study on this point. Wakefield Research conducted a study titled; “Trust and Hybrid Work”, that produced a survey that was disbursed to 200 senior executives of various companies, of 500 or more employees, across the United States.\textsuperscript{22} One of the distinct questions of this survey pertained to the trust of an executive that a staff member is capable of utilizing technologies pertaining to remote work. The

https://hbr.org/2020/07/remote-managers-are-having-trust-issues


specific question in the survey was; “What percentage of your staff do you fully trust to be able to correctly navigate to remote collaboration technology needed to make remote work successful?” The responses provided the choice of a wide range of percentages of employees that the executive fully trusts in using remote technology. 7% of the 200 executives answered in the 0-24% range, 12% of the 200 executives answered in the 25%-49% range, 36% of the 200 executives answered in the 50-74% range, and 46% of the 200 executives answered in the 75%-100% range, which equated to an average of 66%. This array of data shows that more than half of executives are trusting of their employees to utilize remote technology in order to accomplish remote work. Additionally, the average percentage of employees that executives trust to use remote technology was discovered to be 66%. Over half of the employees that executives oversee, are being noted as trustworthy to be utilizing remote technologies necessary to make remote work succeed. This study noted executives favored to be trustworthy of employees in some degree of remote work, as employees can be trustworthy in utilizing remote technology.

An additional study was completed and published in the Harvard Business Review, regarding the area of trust that managers have with remote workers, and completing their duties in an exceptional level on a day-to day basis. The title of the study that was completed by Sharon K. Parker, Caroline Knight, and Anita Keller is; “Remote Managers are Having Trust Issues.” The title of the study alludes to the feelings that managers are having in regards to managing workers in a remote degree. This study was conducted by having individuals complete a questionnaire of 92 questions regarding remote work, and 215 managers were included.

Towering in an employee’s competence and performance while remote working was a topic that was discussed. The managers needed to answer in a Likert scale design of their agreement with the statement of; “the performance of remote workers is usually lower than that of people who work in an office setting.”

The following graph displays the results:

![Graph showing percentage of managers' agreement with the statement](image)

Source: Centre for Transformative Work Design survey of 215 global supervisors between April 21, 2020, and May 5, 2020


The results of the survey show that 38% of managers disagree with that statement, with 22% of managers being unsure, and 40% of managers agreeing with the statement. 40% of managers agreeing, and 22% of managers being unsure, is a total of 62% of managers either not being able to trust their employees performance while working remotely, or are unsure if they
can trust their performance. The study also noted, that there was a trend between managers not trusting that their employees could perform better in a remote setting, and trusting if their employees are competent to do their work at all. A percentage of 29% was reported, that the managers did not trust the competence of their employees to have the knowledge necessary to complete the day-to-day work. This 29% statistic is in between the 40% of managers agreeing with the statement and 22% being unsure about the statement. Trust from managers to employees to do an exceptional job, has mixed views regarding the in-person workstyle, or working in a remote capacity for an employer.

2.3 Communication

Communication is a part of every workplace, and can either be in-person, or through virtual/technological means. Different workstyles can have an effect on how managers and employees communicate. Communication in the fully remote workstyle will be through virtual/technological means, and the fully in-person and hybrid workstyle can be a mix of in-person, and virtual/technological means of communication. Communication is vital to workplace success. The importance of communication in the workplace is reflected in the literature. Expert Market notes three reasons why effective communication is so important in the workplace and it is that; effective communication has a positive impact on productivity, effective communication has a positive impact of trust between employees and enhance the team building process, and it can cost corporations money if there is ineffective communication. Among others, Expert Market has noted three statistics that to support these reasonings. Three statistics reported by


Expert Market are; productivity can increase up to 30% when effective communication skills and technology are offered to employees, 39% of employees around the world have a belief that organizations do not practice collaboration as much as they should with 75% of organizations have teamwork in an organization marked as ‘very important’, and lapses in communication can cost an organization that has 100 employees an average of $420,000 annually. Communication can not only affect the productivity of a company but also the financials of a company, and more collaboration can be a positive, as it is important to employees. Expert Market conducted a study of 125 CEOs or individuals who make decisions for various companies in North America and Europe, regarding the workstyles that the companies were currently using, with 70 companies out of 125 utilizing the hybrid workstyle, 54 companies out of 125 utilizing the fully remote workstyle, and 1 company out of 125 utilizing the fully in-person workstyle. The results showed varying benefits and drawbacks to utilizing the remote and hybrid workstyles, but the benefits looked to outweigh the drawbacks. Below are the percentages of what was mentioned by the individuals of the survey as the biggest benefits and drawbacks of the hybrid workstyle and fully remote workstyle:


The results show that there are many benefits to the employees and also to the companies, by utilizing a fully remote workstyle, or a hybrid workstyle. One of the downsides that was mentioned was technology and communication issues. The data shows that this was noted at a very minimal amount which lends to support that is not a detrimental issue that occurs frequently at institutions in hybrid and fully remote workstyles. There were only 124 out of 125 responses shown on the results for the hybrid and fully remote workstyles, because there was one individual who noted that their company was fully in-person, with their main benefit being more face-to-face interaction, and communication.33 The Expert Market data notes that CEOs and management from various companies are utilizing the hybrid and fully remote workstyles, and the many benefits of these workstyles seem to outweigh the drawbacks. Communication is listed as a downside in the hybrid workstyle and fully remote workstyle, but at a very low percentage of communication being mentioned, it does not seem to be a detrimental issue that has a negative effect across companies utilizing the hybrid, and fully remote workstyles.

Another study in regards to communication was published in the National Library of Medicine from the National Center for Biotechnology Information. This study researched relational communication in the workplace in regards to remote work since the COVID-19 pandemic began, and was completed by administering to 1,091 public-sector workers in Finland, an unrestricted qualitative 7 question survey.34 The study was not strictly for managers but was a mixed population size of managers and employees. In total, 744 members of the study were not in a leadership position, with 339 members in positions of management, and 8 members that

---


were unsure of their position status.\textsuperscript{35} While this was not all members of leadership positions or members of management, there is a significant management population size involved in the study. On the survey there was 606 respondents who discussed relational communication, and 487 of the respondents (80\% of the 606 respondents) discussed relational communication to be a challenge when utilizing remote work.\textsuperscript{36} This statistic is showing that individuals see communication being negatively affected when working in remote settings. Similar to trust, there is mixed feelings regarding how productive communication can be in the different workstyles.

2.4 Perceived Effectiveness

From the literature, how managers perceive an employee to be effective in a workstyle was measured by either one category, or a grouping of categories. The categories seen in the literature were motivation, production, and concentration. The literature contained studies that measured only one of these categories, or multiples of these categories. Similar to trust and communication, the results were positive and negative in regards to the workstyles. One study was completed in the United Kingdom, and was reported by Forbes. The University of Birmingham administered a survey to 597 managers regarding their views of the hybrid and remote workstyles, specifically in regards to motivation, production and concentration.\textsuperscript{37} The results that were received from the study were favorable to the hybrid and remote workstyles, with the percentages of managers views toward remote work and the effects to motivation, production, and concentration. The results showed that the majority of managers held favorable views of the effects of working remotely on these three categories. The study showed that 63%
of the 597 managers view working remotely as increasing motivation, 60% of the 597 managers view working remotely as increasing productivity, and 52% of managers view working remotely as improving concentration.38 This statistic showing that over half of managers had favorable views in each area of production, concentration, and motivation relays that managers had favorable views in regards to how effective employees can be working in a workstyle that utilizes remote work.

Another survey regarding perceived effectiveness was completed and documented in the Harvard Business Review. The amount of surveys that were administered was not documented in the article by the Harvard Business Review, but the results to the survey were in regards to perceived effectiveness. This study only utilized one of the characteristics in regards to perceived effectiveness, and that characteristic was; production. A separate question was asked both to the managers, and employees that participated in the survey. The question asked to the employees was; “how much less/more efficient are you working from home then on business premises?”39 The employees then had to rank the percentage in either a less or more capacity to answer the question. The question asked to the managers was; “how much less/more productive are employees who work from home at least one day per week?”40 There were some differences in the viewpoints between the employees and the managers. The figure below reflects the results of the survey to these questions:


The results indicate that a majority of managers felt that working remotely, negatively impacted the employee’s productivity. This is a counterpoint to what was expressed in the University of Birmingham study. Similar to trust and communication, there is mixed feelings of what managers perceive of workstyles reducing and increasing the effectiveness of the employees that the managers oversee.

2.5 NCURA Remote Work Survey

There is very limited research available regarding management’s workstyle preferences for research administrators that the managers oversee. The NCURA remote work survey
provides valuable insight into the management workstyle preferences, and how managers view remote work functionality. There were 1,618 responses from research administrators, of varying position levels, to the NCURA remote work survey. There was one question that was asked in the survey, that shows managers views regarding the capability to work remotely. This question that was asked to the respondents was; “how do you think telework has/will impact your organization in general (think about productivity, but also employee well-being and satisfaction)?” The following results to the question were displayed in the following figure:

![Impact of Telework](image)


The results from the survey show that research administrators have a positive view to workstyles that contain remote work capability. To investigate further, the NCURA remote work survey had the results reported by the different position levels. The following figure displays the results to this specific question by position type:
The results show that the majority of research administration employees in the levels of management and decision-making believe that the remote work capability will affect the organization that they work for in a positive way. This shows that a majority of managers and decision makers have a preference to workstyles that utilize a remote work style capability and believe that it has a positive effect to the organization that the manager is a part of.

**Chapter 3: Problem Statement**

**3.1 Statement of the Problem**

Since the COVID-19 pandemic has begun, the United States workforce has changed rapidly with entities incorporating different workstyles to combat the pandemic. With new workstyles being implemented, managers have had to adapt and manage individuals in different
workstyles. There are mixed reviews on what workstyles managers prefer employees to utilize, and view to be the most effective and productive for organizations. Research administration is no exception to this reality. Universities have had to implement workstyle policies, with no uniformity, between universities. This has included managers of research administrators needing to adapt to managing research administrators in different workstyles, without final guidance of what is the most preferred and effective workstyle viewed by managers to be utilized by the research administrators that managers oversee. Additionally, with very limited existing research on this topic in the research administration field, the support to justify these workstyles decisions at universities has been minimal, and emphasizes the need for the research of the thesis.

Chapter 4: Methodology

4.1 Description of Study

A questionnaire (attached in Appendix I), was created by the student investigator on questionpro.com, and was administered to head research administrative managers and middle managers of the over 50 different departments, programs, centers/institutes, and affiliated centers/institutes of the Zanvyl Krieger School of Arts and Sciences at Johns Hopkins University. To find the roster of management for each department, program, center/institute, and affiliated center/institute, the following website and connected links were utilized: departments, programs, centers/institutes, and affiliated centers/institutes. Also, with the student investigator working in the Zanvyl Krieger School of Arts and Sciences Deans Office, the student investigator had access to the management roster documents of the various areas.

A human subjects research proposal was prepared for approval from the Johns Hopkins University Homewood Institutional Review Board. The proposal was completed on the

Section I of the questionnaire asked preliminary managerial questions of the recipients. This section was strictly to confirm the recipient population that participated in the questionnaire. No analyses were conducted for section I, but was utilized to determine that the individuals who participated fit the criteria of being a manager of research administrators. Sections II-IV of the questionnaire, each have two questions, that are asked of the recipient. Section II is titled Trust, section III is titled Communication, and section IV is titled Perceived Effectiveness. The first question in each of sections II-IV, asked if there is a relationship between workstyles, and the designated category (either trust, communication, or perceived effectiveness) of that section. If the participant answers “no”, the questionnaire will automatically send the participant to the next section of questions. If the participant answers “yes”, a Likert scale will appear, that asks the participant to rank the relationship of each workstyle with that designated category. The scale will range from; significantly reduces, somewhat reduces, no impact, somewhat increases, significantly increases. This will provide a data source for investigating whether there are statistically significant different relationships between workstyles, and each category. This will strictly be from the managerial perspective regarding the work of the research administrators that the managers oversee.

Section V of the questionnaire is titled, Preference. Section V contains a singular question regarding the managerial workstyle preference of the research administrators that the
managers oversee. This asked the managers to select one workstyle that they would prefer for the research administrators to utilize. This question will reveal what workstyle is preferred by the managers of research administrators in the Zanvyl Krieger School of Arts and Sciences.

Statistical analyses were used to determine if there were statistically significant relationships between workstyles and the categories of trust, communication, and perceived effectiveness. Additionally, the statistics noted for preference, showed a percentage of the workstyle option chosen; the most, second most, and third most frequent. Statistical analyses were used to see if a statistically significant relationship existed regarding the preferred workstyles chosen. The analyses were completed through Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Tests.

**Chapter 5: Data Analysis**

5.1 Trust, Communication, and Perceived Effectiveness Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test

**Description**

In order to determine whether or not workstyles have a relationship on the categories of trust, communication, and perceived effectiveness, a Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test was performed for the “yes or no” style questions of each category of trust (question 6 of the questionnaire), communication (question 8 of the questionnaire), and perceived effectiveness (question 10 of the questionnaire). The “yes or no” style of each questions asked if the managers believed there is a relationship between workstyles, and the specified category. If a significant relationship exists under “yes”, further analysis would be conducted under each corresponding Likert Scale questions to see if there is a statistically significant relationship between each specific workstyle, and each category. If no significant relationship was found between work style, and the specific category of possible affect, then that completed that part of the analysis.
The significance level for statistical testing utilized for the thesis was .001. The significance level is the value used to decide if a difference is seen between the values, and is statistically significant or not. If the probability value is below the significance level, the conclusion is that a difference exists. Utilizing the .001 significance level means that there is a .10% chance that where a significant relationship is declared, it is incorrect.

Additionally, the results are analyzed to see if the chi-square value \( (X^2) \) is significant to the critical value. If the chi-square value \( (X^2) \) is greater than the critical value, then the null hypothesis can be rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is to be accepted. If the chi-square value is less than the critical value \( (X^2) \) then the null hypotheses is to be accepted, and the alternative hypothesis is rejected. In the case of the thesis, the two hypotheses are below:

- Null hypothesis: There are no perceived differences in managers perceived impact of each workstyle.
- Alternative hypothesis: Managers perceptions show significant differences between workstyles.

In order to see if a statistically significant relationship exists, a Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test was done under each category, with the answer of either; yes, and no. A Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test was done by comparing the observed to the expected values. The expected values were each 1/2 of the total responses in that workstyle and category. For each row of yes, and no; the chi-square table minuses the observed value by the expected value, and then squares that amount. Once that amount is square, the table divides that squared amount by the expected value. This revealed the chi-square value for that specific row. This occurred for each answer of; yes, and no. The summation of the two chi-square amounts reveals the chi-square value \( (X^2) \) for the full table.
Once the $X^2$ value was calculated, the probability value of that $X^2$ statistic was calculated. The calculator that was utilized is from the calculator function on the following website: Chi-Square Calculator. Additionally, once the $X^2$ value was calculated, it was then compared to the critical value. In order to know what the critical value is, the significance level and degrees of freedom needs to be utilized. The following table was utilized to find the critical value:

| Critical values of the Chi-square distribution with $d$ degrees of freedom |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $d$ | Probability of exceeding the critical value | $d$ | Probability of exceeding the critical value |
| d | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.001 | d | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.001 |
| 3 | 7.815 | 11.345 | 16.266 | 13 | 22.362 | 27.688 | 34.528 |
| 5 | 11.070 | 15.086 | 20.515 | 15 | 24.996 | 30.578 | 37.697 |
| 6 | 12.592 | 16.812 | 22.458 | 16 | 26.296 | 32.000 | 39.252 |
| 7 | 14.067 | 18.475 | 24.322 | 17 | 27.587 | 33.409 | 40.790 |
| 8 | 15.507 | 20.090 | 26.125 | 18 | 28.869 | 34.805 | 42.312 |
| 9 | 16.919 | 21.666 | 27.877 | 19 | 30.144 | 36.191 | 43.820 |
| 10 | 18.307 | 23.209 | 29.588 | 20 | 31.410 | 37.566 | 45.315 |


The critical value that was utilized in the case of the thesis for the “yes or no” questions, at a .001 significance level, and 1 degrees of freedom was; 10.828.

5.2 Preference Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test Description

In order to assess the results of preference, a Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test was
performed for the singular preference question of the study. The same significance level of .001 was utilized. The same calculator and critical value table utilized in section 5.1 was utilized in regards to the Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test for preference. The Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test will have a degree of freedom of 2 and a significance level of .001 so, the critical value will be 13.816. The same process as described in section 5.1 was also followed with this Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test, but includes three rows of values instead of two. The Chi Square value \( X^2 \) was compared to the critical value, and the probability value was compared to the significance level. If the probability value is below the significance level, the conclusion is that a difference exists. Utilizing the .001 significance level means that there is a .10% chance that where a significant relationship is declared, it is incorrect.

Additionally, the results were analyzed to see if the chi-square value \( X^2 \) is significant to the critical value. If the chi-square value \( X^2 \) is greater than the critical value, then the null hypothesis can be rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is to be accepted. If the chi-square value is less than the critical value then the null hypothesis is to be accepted, and the alternative hypothesis is rejected. In the case of the thesis, the two hypotheses are below:

- **Null hypothesis**: There is no significant difference in the preferences of the workstyles chosen by managers to be utilized by research administrators.

- **Alternative hypothesis**: There is a significant difference in the preferences of the workstyles chosen by managers to be utilized by the research administrators.

In order to properly assess the results, a Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test was done on the singular preference question, where the options are; fully in-person, hybrid, and fully remote. A Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test was done by comparing the observed to the expected values. The expected values were \( 1/3^{rd} \) of the total responses to each workstyle. For each row of
workstyle; the chi-square table minuses the observed value by the expected value, and then squares that amount. Once that amount is square, the table divides that squared amount by the expected value. This revealed the chi-square value ($X^2$) for that specific row. This occurred for each workstyle of; fully in-person, hybrid, and fully remote. The summation of the three chi-square amounts reveals the chi-square value ($X^2$) for the full table.

5.3 Results of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire link was sent to 42 members of the Zanvyl Krieger School of Arts Sciences at Johns Hopkins University. Out of the 42 members that the survey link was sent to, there were 26 responses that were used for the thesis. There were 2 participant responses that did not complete every single question, but provided enough information for the 2 responses to be considered in the analyses. Questionpro.com provided a survey portal that showed the results of the responses gathered from the questionnaire in the following figures. The following are the results that were received from the 26 responses of the questionnaire from the survey portal on questionpro.com:

1. **Section I: Preliminary Background Information**
   - **Question 1:** Are you the head administrative manager or “middle manager” for your department(s), and/or center(s)/institute(s), and/or program(s)?
   - **Results:** 26 participants answered this question. The following figure is the results:
Figure 11. “Are you the head administrative manager or “middle manager” for your department(s), and/or center(s)/institute(s), and/or program(s)?” Thesis Questionnaire Results.

- **Question 2:** How many research administrators do you oversee?
- **Results:** 25 participants answered the question. The following figure is the results:
Figure 12. “How many research administrators do you oversee?” Thesis Questionnaire Results.

- **Question 3:** With being a head administrative manager, or a middle manager, how would you describe the area of work for research administrators that you oversee?
- **Results:** 26 participants answered the question. The following figure is the results:
3. With being a head administrative manager, or a middle manager, how would you describe the area of work for research administrators that you oversee?

**Figure 13.** “With being a head administrative manager, or a middle manager, how would you describe the area of work for research administrators that you oversee?” Thesis Questionnaire Results.

- **Question 4:** What is your current work arrangement?
- **Results:** 26 participants answered the question. The following figure is the results:
Figure 14. “What is your current work arrangement?” Thesis Questionnaire Results.

- **Question 5**: What is the current work arrangement of the research administrators you oversee?

- **Results**: 25 participants answered the question. The following figure is the results:
2. **Section II: Trust**

- **Question 6**: Is there a relationship between workstyles, and the trust you have that a research administrator is doing an exceptional job in their day-to-day work?
- **Results**: 26 respondents answered the question. The following figure is the results:
Figure 16. “Is there a relationship between workstyles, and the trust you have that a research administrator is doing an exceptional job in their day-to-day work? Please be aware if you answer 'no' to question 6, that will complete this section and send you to the next section. Thank you.”

- **Question 7:** With answering yes, please indicate the relationship between each workstyle and trust?
• **Results:** 15 respondents answered for fully in-person, 16 respondents answered for hybrid, and 14 respondents answered for fully remote. The following figure is the results:

Figure 17. “With answering yes, please indicate the relationship between each workstyle and trust?” Thesis Questionnaire Results.

**Section III: Communication**

• **Question 8:** Is there a relationship between workstyles and productive communication between a manager and research administrator?

• **Results:** 26 respondents answered the question. The following figure is the results:
Figure 18. “Is there a relationship between workstyles and productive communication between a manager and research administrator?” Thesis Questionnaire Results.

- **Question 9:** With answering yes, please indicate the relationship between each workstyle and communication?

- **Results:** 17 respondents answered for fully in-person, 19 respondents answered for hybrid, and 17 respondents answered for fully remote. The following figure is the results:
Question 10: Is there a relationship between workstyles and effective job performance of a research administrator?

Results: 26 respondents answered the question. The following figure is the results:
Figure 20. “Is there a relationship between workstyles and effective job performance of a research administrator?” Thesis Questionnaire Results.

- **Question 11**: With answering yes, please indicate the relationship between each workstyle and effective job performance?
• **Results:** 11 respondents answered for fully in-person, 12 respondents answered for hybrid, and 12 respondents answered for fully remote. The following figure is the results:

![Figure 21](image)

Figure 21. “With answering yes, please indicate the relationship between each workstyle and effective job performance?” Thesis Questionnaire Results.

**Section V: Preference**

• **Question 12:** What is your most preferred work-style to be utilized by the research administrators you oversee?

• **Results:** 24 respondents answered the question. The following figure is the results:
Figure 22. “What is your most preferred work-style to be utilized by the research administrators you oversee?”
Thesis Questionnaire Results.

5.4 Statistical Analyses

*Statistical Analysis of Workstyles and Trust (Question 6):* A Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test was completed for workstyles and trust. The results for workstyles and trust are below:
Workstyles & Trust:

The Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test for workstyles and trust did not show a significant relationship as the $X^2$ value of 2.462 is not greater than the critical value of 10.828. Additionally, the p-value of 0.11663 is not less than .001. No further analysis between workstyles and trust is necessary.

Statistical Analysis of Workstyles and Communication (Question 8): A Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test was completed for workstyles and communication. The results for workstyles and communication are below:

Workstyles & Communication:

The Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test for workstyles and productive communication between a manager and research administrator did not show a significant relationship as the $X^2$ value of 5.338 is not greater than the critical value of 10.828. Additionally, the p-value of 0.069 is not less than .001. No further analysis between workstyles and communication is necessary.
The Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test for workstyles and communication did not show a significant relationship as the $X^2$ value of 5.538 is not greater than the critical value of 10.828. Additionally, the p-value of 0.018608 is not less than .001. No further analysis is necessary.

**Statistical Analysis of Workstyles and Perceived Effectiveness (Question 10):** A Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test was completed for workstyles and perceived effectiveness. The results for workstyle and perceived effectiveness are as follows:

**Workstyles & Perceived Effectiveness:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workstyle</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>$O-E$</th>
<th>$O-E^2$</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>-3,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25. “Workstyles & Perceived Effectiveness” Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test Results.

The Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test for workstyles and perceived effectiveness did not show a significant relationship as the $X^2$ value of 0.154 is not greater than the critical value of 10.828. Additionally, the p-value of 0.694742 is not less than .001. No further analysis is necessary.

**Statistical Analysis of Preference:** A Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test was completed in regards to the preferred workstyle to be utilized by the research administrators that the managers oversee. The results of the preference of workstyles chosen are as follows:
Workstyles & Preference:

The Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test for the preferred workstyle to be utilized by the research administrators did show a significant relationship as the $X^2$ value of 15.250 is greater than the critical value of 13.816. Additionally, the p-value of 0.000488 is less than .001.

**Chapter 6: Discussion of Data Results**

6.1 Discussion of Workstyles and Trust

With no significant relationship found between workstyles and trust, the null hypothesis is accepted in regards to workstyles and trust. The null hypothesis being that managers have the same feelings in regards to workstyles and trusting a research administrator in doing an exceptional job in their day-to-day work, and that workstyles do not have a significant difference in effect compared to each other with trust.

6.2 Discussion of Workstyles and Communication

With no significant relationship found between workstyles and communication, the null hypothesis is accepted in regards to workstyles and communication. The null hypothesis being that managers have the same feelings in regards to workstyles and productive communication
with a research administrator, and that workstyles do not have a significant difference in effect compared to each other with communication.

6.3 Discussion of Workstyles and Perceived Effectiveness

With no significant relationship found between workstyles and perceived effectiveness, the null hypothesis is accepted in regards to workstyles and perceived effectiveness. The null hypothesis being that managers have the same feelings in regards to workstyles and effective job performance of a research administrator, and that workstyles do not have a significant difference in effect compared to each other with perceived effectiveness.

6.4 Discussion of Workstyles and Preference

With preference having a significant relationship with how the three workstyles were chosen, the alternative hypothesis being that there is a significant difference in the preferences chosen to be utilized by the research administrators that the managers oversee, is accepted. This analysis shows the preferred options of managers for research administrators be utilized is listed in the following order of preference:

1. Hybrid- the most preferred option chosen by managers to be utilized by research administrators.
2. Fully in-person- the second most preferred option chosen by managers to be utilized by research administrators.
3. Fully remote- the third most preferred option chosen by managers to be utilized by research administrators.

While a significant relationship is showing for the preferences chosen, with no significant relationships showing between the workstyles and trust, communication, and perceived effectiveness, the reasoning for the preferences shown cannot be linked to these categories. A
possible explanation for the preferences chosen could be that managers prefer the research administrators they oversee, to be utilizing the work arrangements that the managers utilize. Question 4 of the questionnaire noted that out of the 26 participants in the questionnaire; 92.31% of managers utilize the hybrid workstyle, 7.69% of managers utilize the fully in-person workstyle, and 0% utilize the fully remote workstyle. This follows the same trend as the preferences chosen. However, an additional study would need to be developed that is fully researching this point, to confirm if there is a correlation.

6.5 Limitations of the Study

There are a few limitations in the conduction of this study. The first limitation was a choice of the student investigator, but is noteworthy to mention. Due to the amount of statistical analyses that was done in this study, a very conservative significance level of .001 was utilized. The reasoning for this was because there was multiple analyses that were completed, there was more opportunity for uncertainty to occur. In order to minimize any uncertainty of the results, a .001 significance level was chosen. If a different significance level was utilized, the results would have been different for two of the Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Tests that were completed. If a .05 significance level was utilized, a significant relationship would have appeared between communication and the workstyles, which would’ve allowed the alternative hypothesis to be accepted between workstyles and communication, which would have allowed additional analyses to be conducted for each specific workstyle and communication.

Another limitation of the study was that a few of the participants did not answer all the questions in the study. Each participant that was included provided enough information to be included. However, a few individuals did not rank each relationship to each workstyle which made the number of participants fluctuate between the workstyles in each section. Additionally,
2 participants did not answer the final preference question. It was a very minimal amount for each section, and the preference question, so it had no effect, but is a noteworthy observance to be documented.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

7.1 Conclusion from the Study

The research objectives of the thesis were accomplished. The relevant data regarding managers views of different workstyles and effects on the categories of trust, communication, and perceived effectiveness were collected and analyzed. Statistical analyses through Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Tests were performed to accomplish the analyses portions of the research objectives. Through the analyses, the research questions were able to be answered.

No significant different perspectives between the workstyles and the magnitude of effect on the categories of trust, communication, and perceived effectiveness were found. However, statistical analysis showed that there is a significant difference in the workstyle preferences that managers would prefer the research administrators that they manage to utilize.

Hybrid was the most preferred option, fully in-person was the second most preferred option, and fully remote was the third most preferred option chosen. The results of this study can be utilized by universities in making workstyle decisions for research administrators, noting the workstyle preferences that managers have, for the research administrators that they manage to utilize.

Having a scope of what is managements preferred workstyles can allow a foundation for implementation of workstyle policies at universities to be utilized by research administrators. This will result in research being administered in the research continuum in an efficient manner, which will allow research to thrive for the faculty at universities.
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Appendices

Appendix I: Thesis Questionnaire

**Introduction:** This questionnaire was prepared by Tyler Cain, Sponsored Projects Officer, at the Zanvyl Krieger School of Arts and Sciences Dean’s Office and Masters Student in the MS in Research Administration Program at Johns Hopkins University. This questionnaire is being utilized in completion of ASA473.801 Research and Thesis in Research Administration class in the MS in Research Administration Program at Johns Hopkins University.

**Topic:** The topic of the questionnaire is to measure the management workstyle preferences for research administrators, since the COVID-19 Pandemic began. This questionnaire will address three workstyles. The three workstyles are fully in-person, hybrid, and fully remote. This questionnaire will ask questions relating to a manager’s experience managing research administrators in regards to these three workstyles in 3 categories. The three categories are Trust, Communication, and Perceived Effectiveness. The last section is, Preference. The first section will ask preliminary background information regarding yourself and your department(s), and/or center(s)/institute(s), and/or program(s). The questionnaire is a total of 12 questions.

**Study Population:** Head administrative managers & middle managers of departments, programs, and centers/institutes & affiliated centers/institutes of the Johns Hopkins University Zanvyl Krieger School of Arts and Sciences.

**Definition:** Please see the following definitions for the three workstyles referenced:
- Fully in-person: an employee working 5 days a week, on-site.
- Hybrid: an employee working at least one day a week remote, any remaining days of the week are on-site.
- Fully remote: an employee working 5 days a week fully remote, no days are on-site.

**Statement Regarding Confidentiality:** The following questionnaire will be anonymous. Only, I and my thesis advisor (Dr. Jeffrey Kantor), will be able to see the content of the individual questionnaires that are received. Your name will not be noted in the thesis, and you will remain completely anonymous when the results are published in the paper.

**Further Information:** Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to reach out to Tyler Cain at tcain1@jhu.edu or (410) 516-6326.

**Statement of Consent:** By completing this survey or questionnaire, you are consenting to be in this research study. Your participation is voluntary and you can stop at any time. With completing this questionnaire, you consent to understanding the topic of the questionnaire, and understand that your information will remain anonymous. Additionally, with completing this questionnaire, you affirm that only you are completing this questionnaire with no outside influence.

Additionally, the survey can only be submitted once, please complete the questionnaire in one sitting. The survey should only take about 20 minutes.

Thank you so much for participating!
SECTION I: Preliminary Background Information

1. Are you the head administrative manager or "middle manager" for your department(s), and/or center(s)/institute(s), and/or program(s)? (A middle manager is a financial manager under the head administrative manager; team manager under the financial manager, etc.)

*Please be aware: If you are neither a head administrative manager or middle manager for your department(s), and/or center(s)/institute(s), and/or program(s), then please answer "no" to question 1, and the questionnaire will not continue. Thank you.*

- Yes
- No

2. How many research administrators do you oversee? (The job of the administrator you oversee does not have to be strictly research administration, but if they do anything at all involving assisting faculty with administrative functions of research.)

*If you are a head administrative manager please include the middle managers and research administrators the middle managers oversee in your calculation.*

- 1-9
- 10-14
- 15-19
- 20 or more

3. With being a head administrative manager, or a middle manager, how would you describe the area of work for research administrators that you oversee?

- Pre-award focus
- Post-award focus
- Both pre-award and post-award focus

4. What is your current work arrangement?

- Fully in-person
- Hybrid
- Fully remote
5. What is the current work arrangement of the research administrators you oversee?

- Fully in-person
- Hybrid
- Fully remote
- A combination of either fully in-person, hybrid, and fully remote

SECTION II: Trust

6. Is there a relationship between workstyles, and the trust you have that a research administrator is doing an exceptional job in their day-to-day work?

*Please be aware: if you answer "no" to question 6, that will complete this section and send you to the next section. Thank you.*

- Yes
- No

SECTION III: Communication

7. With answering yes, please indicate the relationship between each workstyle and trust?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workstyle</th>
<th>Significantly reduces trust</th>
<th>Somewhat reduces trust</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Somewhat increases trust</th>
<th>Significantly increases trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully in-person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully remote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Is there a relationship between workstyles and productive communication between a manager and research administrator?

*Please be aware: if you answer "no" to question 8, that will complete this section and send you to the next section. Thank you.*

- Yes
- No
9. With answering yes, please indicate the relationship between each workstyle and communication?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workstyle</th>
<th>Significantly reduces productive communication</th>
<th>Somewhat reduces productive communication</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Somewhat increases productive communication</th>
<th>Significantly increases productive communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully in-person</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>🔵</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully remote</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>🔵</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION IV: PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS

10. Is there a relationship between workstyles and effective job performance of a research administrator?

*Please be aware: if you answer “not” to question 10, that will complete this section and send you to the next section. Thank you.*

- Yes
- No

SECTION V: PREFERENCE

11. With answering yes, please indicate the relationship between each workstyle and effective job performance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workstyle</th>
<th>Significantly reduces effective job performance</th>
<th>Somewhat reduces effective job performance</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Somewhat increases effective job performance</th>
<th>Significantly increases effective job performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully in-person</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully remote</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. What is your most preferred work-style to be utilized by the research administrators you oversee?

- Fully in-person
- Hybrid
- Fully remote

Done
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Johns Hopkins University Krieger School of Arts & Sciences, Baltimore, Maryland  
January 2017-June 2020  
Graduated from the Research Administration Training Program and transitioned to a full-time position as a non-financial research administrator
- Serve as Sponsored Projects Officer for the departments of Earth and Planetary Science, Sociology, Economics, Mathematics, and Anthropology
- Work with department personnel and Principal Investigators on needed changes for proposals
- Perform the final review and approval of proposal materials for compliance before being submitted to government or private organizations
- Work with the Assistant Dean of Research Administration on award, subaward, subcontract and contract negotiations
- Prepare subaward agreements & amendments to be sent to subrecipients for review and partial execution
- Set up and process awards once deemed acceptable and complaint
- Work with departments and monitor all aspects of the award administration process
- Aid the Homewood Institutional Review Board office with administrative functions and initial review of Amendments, Continuing reviews and New applications with guidance from Sr. Research Subjects Specialist and IRB Director

**Sponsored Projects Officer (Deans Office Research Integration Team)**

Johns Hopkins University Krieger School of Arts & Sciences, Baltimore, Maryland  
July 2020-Present  
Became full-time financial research administrator for the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences Deans Office Research Integration Team
- Serve as financial sponsored projects officer to assist and provide advice with all functions of the financial research administration process for all departments of the school
- Assure compliance of school is upheld through various financial and non-financial tasks
- Utilize the many financial and non-financial systems to accomplish tasks necessary, including but not limited too; SAP, CONCUR, COEUS, OCULUS etc.
- Perform day-to-day financial transactions for departments and investigators that do not have dedicated research support staff
- Update salary information for Principal Investigators in SAP, that do not have dedicated research support staff and assure that correct payments occur from sponsored awards
- Distribute effort accordingly for investigators that do not have dedicated research support staff
- Create Purchase Requisitions for departments that do not have dedicated research support staff
- Process reimbursements for faculty and departments that do not have dedicated research support staff
- Process various financial payments (i.e. independent contractor payments) for departments that do not have dedicated research support staff
- Run monthly research base reports for the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, that monitors the financial research health of the school and its various departments
- Create financial tools and aides through Microsoft Excel
- Serve as liaison for departments to various offices around the Johns Hopkins Enterprise.
Complete financial reports for private sponsors in collaboration with the sponsored research accountant
Advise departments on proper expenses in accordance with federal cost principles, sponsor guidelines and University Policy
Review assigned department subaward invoices for compliance, and payment
Provide proposal consultation for the Johns Hopkins Carey Business School, including creation of budgets, and administrative proposal functions, for central office submission to sponsor
Advise on financial research administration services for the Johns Hopkins Carey Business School

ADDITIONAL EXPERIENCE
National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA) Presenter and Published Works
- Co-Presenter at the 2021 NCURA Financial Research Administration conference of presentation titled “Ripped from the Headlines: Hot Topics in Research Administration”
- Co-Presenter at the 2022 NCURA Financial Research Administration conference of presentation titled “Centralizing Decentralization: Exploring Hybrid Models and Structures in Research Administration.”
- Co-author of the 2022 published article titled “Not a Simple Substitution Code: Solving the Customer Service/Compliance Balance Puzzle” for the “May/June 2022 NCURA Magazine Vol.54, No.3”
- Co-Presenter at the 2022 NCURA Region II conference presentation titled “Ripped from the Headlines: Hot Topics in Research Administration”

Human Resources Intern: College Peer Mentor
Johns Hopkins Human Resources Office of Project REACH Baltimore, Maryland
- Mentor 23 students and assist with the facilitation of a six week high school internship job program for 250 high school students that are placed in various departments around the Johns Hopkins Health System

Cashier + Inventory Manager
Stebbins Anderson Towson, Maryland
- Handle cashier duties and manage inventory at Stebbins warehouse location, summers of 2012 and 2013