

Excellent and Kind Research Environments

– Perspectives from Within and Beyond

By Thomas Bandholm, Julie Midtgaard Klausen, Michael Rathleff, and Amanda Houmark-Ørsøe

How do we create research environments where people can both thrive and perform – where excellence and kindness go hand in hand? This article offers two distinct but complementary perspectives on that question. Part 1 is written by researchers who are themselves part of academia and are working from within to influence and develop its culture. Part 2 is written by a leadership consultant with many years of experience collaborating with research institutions, offering an external view with a focus on leadership and organizational development.

Part 1: Experiences from academia

When future talents do not stay

We attract some of the most talented young people who are curious, ambitious and dedicated. But many of these capable young people consider leaving research before they have even truly begun. Not because they lack will or ability, but because they experience an environment where competition is fierce (relentless) and at times opaque, recognition is scarce, and the balance between work life and family life unsustainable.

In the largest international survey of what researchers themselves think about the culture they are part of, 53 percent answered that they had considered leaving academia because of the work environment (Wellcome Trust 2020). In Denmark, new data confirm that our own young researchers are also struggling. More than one in three PhD students experience stress and exhaustion (DM & PAND 2024). Many are asking for something quite basic: feedback, support and a sense of community that does not only measure value in grants and publications.

Amid these conditions, we as researchers and research leaders face a number of unresolved paradoxes:

- How do you navigate a system that rewards the individual when you wish to promote a collective culture?

- How do you balance the demand for research productivity with the need for time for relational leadership?
- How do we ensure meaning and security in a structure that for many feels both unpredictable and unsafe?
- How do we encourage high academic quality and perfectionism – without it leading to exhaustion and anxiety?
- How do we share our own uncertainty as leaders – without undermining trust in our ability to research and to lead research?

We often ask ourselves: How do we create environments where talented people can both perform and thrive? That question became the starting point for *ELIS – Excellence and Kindness in Research Training*. ELIS is not an HR policy or a communication project. It is a bottom-up, researcher-initiated initiative that grows from below and from within. It is initiated by researchers, *for* academia, who wish to stimulate the conversation that excellence and kindness are not opposites, but prerequisites for a long and sustainable academic life.

In this article we share experiences and insights from the work with ELIS and discuss how we can rethink research environments with equal parts ambition and humanity. We write from within – as part of the culture we are trying to change.

What movement are we seeing in academia? And what does it call for?

We are in the middle of a shift in academic culture. Today, many young researchers enter the world of universities with different expectations than previous generations. They see research as meaningful work – not necessarily a calling that requires uncompromising self-sacrifice. They certainly do not seek less professionalism, but greater balance. Not less ambition, but more community. They want balance between academic ambition, personal surplus and a healthy community. One can agree or disagree with this development – and some, especially among those shaped by an earlier academic culture, may even consider this approach unserious, soft and as a sign of lacking dedication. Nevertheless, it is a tendency that increasingly shapes recruitment, retention and motivation in research environments. If we do not manage to give kindness and healthy community a legitimate place in the pursuit of excellence, we ultimately risk undermining the sustainability of academia.

The movement we are seeing calls for a more balanced culture. It is not a rebellion against ambition or professionalism – on the contrary. Let us repeat that: it is not a rebellion against ambition or professionalism – on the contrary! It is a wish to create conditions where excellence, kindness, teamwork and healthy community can coexist, and where talented people

do not feel that they have to leave research in order to thrive. This need can be understood in light of several factors. Firstly, research stands on the shoulders of collective work communities and collective intelligence. Even the most high-profile publications and projects are the result of collaboration, mutual support and sharing of knowledge. Secondly, we see a generation of younger researchers who increasingly demand a sense of shared values with their workplace. They want frequent feedback, clear expectations and leaders who are measured not only on their own merits but also on their ability to create healthy environments. They want to be part of a good team – a team that collaborates excellently and where the individual players can develop. If one plays on a team where the captain is very focused on leadership rights and maintaining a clear hierarchy, it can be particularly difficult to retain the players who are motivated by collective goals and collaboration on par with individual skills.

Who are you successful with?

Research does not take place in a vacuum. Even the most independent researcher depends on others: collaborators, supervisors, students, technicians and research groups. And yet, the incentives in academia are to a large extent individual: promotions, grants and awards are typically given to individuals, not to communities – although there are thoughts and tendencies in that direction. This creates a fundamental tension between the personal and the collective – between self-interest and shared progress.

Ray Dalio (2021) in *The Changing World Order* highlights the importance of reflecting on what we actually mean by “self” in “self-interest.” Does it refer only to the individual, or also to the community we belong to? For us as researchers and leaders, this is a key question. Thinking about our own success also means thinking about who we succeed with. In academia, individual talent is not enough. We must also contribute as valuable members of our research groups – and for those who lead them, there is a special responsibility to create conditions where others can thrive and perform. This, of course, is also about power. As research leaders, we hold influence: we have the ability to set direction, allocate resources, and shape culture. That is a form of power, and with power comes a special responsibility, including the responsibility to preserve a sense of humanity.

In Shakespeare’s tragedy *Macbeth*, Lady Macbeth says of her husband: “Yet do I fear thy nature; It is too full o’ the milk of human kindness. To catch the nearest way.” She fears that her husband, Macbeth, is too kind and gentle to take the brutal path to power. But it is precisely that brutal path that leads to Macbeth’s downfall – not because he lacks will, but

because he loses connection to his moral sense. On a somewhat less literary note, but no less relevant, Astrid Lindgren's Pippi Longstocking reminds us that "*those who are very strong must also be very kind.*" Where Lady Macbeth sees goodness as a weakness, Pippi sees goodness as a responsibility that follows from strength. As research leaders, we carry both potentials within us – we have the capacity to exercise power and determination, but also the choice of how we do it. Without kindness, humanity and transparency, we risk losing the very foundation of what we aim to achieve: sustainable research with people at its center.

Adam Grant (2014) in *Give and Take* describes three approaches to working life: to take, to trade (exchanging favours 1:1), and to give. In a competitive academic culture, it can be tempting to focus narrowly on advancing one's own career by taking. But Grant shows that it is those who invest in the success of others – the *Givers* – who build the most resilient relationships and achieve the best results – especially in the long term. Not because they give up on themselves, but because they understand that the collective is part of their own self-understanding. The most successful *Givers* are those who recognize that time is a limited resource (you cannot, unfortunately, say yes to everything) and who know how to avoid being taken advantage of (for example by *Takers*).

In *The Culture Code*, Daniel Coyle (2018) points out that the most successful teams are characterized by psychological safety, vulnerability and a clear shared purpose. It is not about erasing the individual, but about understanding that strong communities are what make individual development and innovation possible. That is where collective intelligence has room to unfold, among other things because it is safe to disagree.

An insistence that excellence can only be achieved and measured by the will and ability to push others aside is therefore not only tone-deaf to our times, but also unsupported by scientific studies of what drives success. The question we must ask ourselves is therefore not whether, but rather how it is possible to influence academic culture towards greater awareness and promotion of healthy communities and kindness. Is it possible to do so without fundamentally changing the rules of the game that make up the logic of the system – but which also threaten its very sustainability? As researchers in relatively powerful positions, we can at the very least make an effort to raise the question and thereby invite debate, reflection and change from within.

We must take cultural work seriously, because we cannot take safety for granted

ELIS was born out of a realization: we cannot necessarily change the structural frameworks of academia. But we can start a conversation about how we can shape cultures that are more humanly sustainable. For many young researchers, it is not necessarily ambition that fails – but the feeling that the frameworks do not align with the life they are also meant to live alongside research.

The academic world is, on the structural side, characterized by many temporary positions and a lack of predictability – often during life stages when people are starting families, buying homes and seeking stability. This is not necessarily a problem in itself. Several are, or will be, attracted to precisely that flexibility and individual freedom that can also be entailed. But when insecure conditions based on uncertainty are combined with a culture marked by individual survival, opaque leadership and a lack of safety, it becomes difficult to retain even the most dedicated.

By comparison, industry can often offer better conditions: permanent positions and clearer career paths. Therefore, academia cannot afford to have problems on both fronts – structure and culture. If we cannot offer job security, we must at least provide security through culture, and in doing so, protect what is most valuable and unique in academia: research freedom and integrity.

We do not imagine that ELIS will change the fundamental system – with its dependence on grants, elite demands and performance logics. That is not our goal. But it is precisely these structural premises that make ELIS necessary: we must take cultural work seriously, because we cannot take safety for granted.

For us, ELIS is about focusing on how to design research environments that do not reward only one type of person but instead recognize diversity and the shared need for trust, meaning and respect. It is our way of making academia more welcoming to the generation we wish to recruit and retain – not by turning them into someone else, but by creating an environment spacious enough for them to become who they already are.

What is ELIS?

What should academia be – now and in the future – to fulfil its purpose and potential and continue to attract talent? That question forms the backdrop for ELIS (*Excellence and Kindness in Research Training*), an initiative that seeks to spark a conversation across Denmark and among academic environments.

ELIS arises from a double assumption:

- 1: Impact requires more than Excellence (if we value well-being, sustainability and humanity)
- 2: Impact requires more than Kindness (if we believe that research must be of the highest quality to make a difference)

With ELIS, we seek to encourage a union of these two assumptions. We wish to invite researchers and research leaders to adopt a focus, a shared language and practical tools for building environments where the pursuit of excellence does not exclude kindness. ELIS is neither a finished model nor a universal solution. It is a movement and a framework for action. We have developed it as a series of concrete experiments and approaches that leaders and researchers in research groups can use to strengthen well-being, transparency and collegiality – without compromising quality or ambition. Most importantly, we are trying to start a conversation across academia – a conversation that also gives a voice to newcomers and those who are considering entering.

Our mission is to give the next generation of researchers and research leaders the legitimacy, opportunity and tools to build and develop research groups that value and promote excellence and kindness in the pursuit of impact. For us, ELIS is an initiative that evolves over time – an initiative that represents our own learning platform, with its accompanying experiments, mistakes and lessons learned. This platform is open to anyone who is interested.

As part of our shared discussions, we initially had to define a set of ELIS values to stand on. These values are not static and may change over time, but for now they are as follows:

1. We strive for excellence, but not at the expense of kindness.
2. We offer guidance and support – not leadership through power.
3. We demonstrate and promote transparency in research and leadership.
4. We talk about what excellence and kindness mean for our work.
5. We make an active effort to ensure that all voices are heard and appreciated in discussions.
6. We believe that diversity and inclusion are important for well-being and success.
7. We talk about excellence and kindness in research training whenever the opportunity arises.
8. We focus more on collective than on personal success.
9. We pursue collaboration rather than unhealthy competition.

10. We consider vulnerability an expression of personal courage – not of weakness or failure.

Experiences from practice: what have we tried, and how has it worked?

It is about everyday practice. About talking openly about culture, expectations and leadership. And about daring to insist that ambitious research can go hand in hand with psychological safety, community and sustainability.

In practice, we have tried, among other things:

- Moving from individual reflections on the meaning of excellence and kindness to the joint formulation of specific values, and at regular intervals revisiting these values for possible revision. See more at the end of the article on moving from individual #ELIS4me to #ELIS4us.
- Moving from words on paper to reality by making central values or purposes visible – for example as “belonging cues” and/or as part of an evaluation framework for work processes (in the process we just had here, how did we apply value x?).
- Including a description of culture in the onboarding process for new hires (in this group, we have this value x. For you, that means that... You will be invited to...).
- Signaling the ELIS cultural code when we host events, activities or teaching sessions where we act as chair or course leader. For example, we begin with a slide that sets the tone: “This event is committed to ELIS. It should be safe to present and to ask questions. It is fine to ask difficult questions – but do it with respect.”

Starting the conversation about professionally strong and humane research environments through concrete events such as:

- ELIS as an element in PhD supervision courses and *Supervisors Talk* at the University of Copenhagen.
- *Love Thy Conflict* at Aalborg University: presentations and discussions on conflicts and how we can learn to reframe them (provided they take place in a psychologically safe environment).
- Afternoon sessions with research groups and research leaders about ELIS across Denmark.

Part 2: Reflections and perspectives from an organizational and leadership perspective

In this second part of the article, we take a closer look at how one can concretely approach the task of giving humanity good conditions for growth from a leadership and organizational perspective, with attention to the particular circumstances that characterize academia.

There is an emerging focus on strengthening relational well-being in research environments – for the benefit of the results, those who produce them, and those who benefit from them. This is clearly positive. As this focus grows stronger, it is important not to make a humane culture the responsibility of the individual. Leadership researcher Keith Grint (2024) notes that humanity in organizations often only appears as an essential theme when a system is under such pressure that employees no longer care for their relationships with one another. In other words, there is a risk of seeing kindness or compassion as an individual solution to a structural problem. Whether things are going well or the culture leaves something to be desired, we cannot reduce the cause to one single factor.

Therefore, before presenting concrete ways of working with culture, a few essential structural factors that influence the culture of research environments must be mentioned.

The movement towards a kinder academia: barriers and potentials

Research environments operate under different conditions today than they did in the past. Some 20 to 30 years ago, a wave of growth and competition-driven external funding began, and about ten years ago, growing attention was directed towards ensuring that research was not only excellent, but also expected to demonstrate societal impact. These two developments form key frameworks for the research leader's daily balancing act. Let us therefore take a closer look at some of the main barriers and potentials that characterize the situation today.

Since the beginning of the millennium, there has been an increasing political focus on ensuring that research activities contribute in clear, measurable and more demand-driven ways than before. Looking to the universities, this period has been characterized by higher production, greater efficiency, internationalization and an emphasis on measurable results. In parts of the sector, this may have led to what can be experienced as a *publication tyranny* and a certain degree of "gaming" the system, where attention is directed more towards what

ensures one's own survival and advancement within the system than towards quality (Elsom et al. 2025). Instead of turning research outward – towards those who are meant to benefit from it – it could in some ways be said to have turned research inward. The picture of the challenge is clear. In the largest study of its kind, conducted by the Wellcome Trust (2020) among more than 4,000 researchers, 63 percent said they were satisfied with their career, but only 29 percent felt they were part of a healthy work environment. As many as 53 percent had considered leaving academia because of the work environment, and 61 percent reported often or always feeling pressured by competition for funding, positions and recognition. In a Danish study, 27 percent of PhD students said they had seriously considered discontinuing their studies, and more than one third reported often or always feeling stressed or emotionally exhausted (DM & PAND 2024). More than half had experienced challenges with their mental health as a result of their work. Many also find it difficult to access support and clear guidance within their environment – for example, around 20 percent say they do not feel safe discussing personal issues such as stress or work-life balance with their advisor.

Although stress and burnout are not unique to the research world, international and Danish data show that academia is among the most affected knowledge-intensive sectors. Comparable fields such as healthcare, technology and consulting often show similar levels, but academia differs in that many young researchers experience a fundamental lack of support and supervision, while the path to permanent employment remains uncertain and long.

This is not necessarily what creates, attracts and retains the best researchers and research environments.

There are probably also places in academia where poor and harsh leadership has no consequences as long as recognized results are produced (Moss 2018). Researchers who, for example, attract large amounts of external funding are simply given more leeway when it comes to unacceptable behavior. This is, of course, a problem – but it would be short-sighted not also to consider the systemic conditions and their effects.

Compassion is not the overarching solution to these challenges, but it can serve as a way to work actively with the culture of one's research environment – as part of a broader shift towards a more sustainable and humane academia. Research shows that humane leadership increases job satisfaction, improves job performance and reduces the risk of burnout (e.g. Nielsen et al. 2025). This also aligns with expectations from, for example, funding bodies, where researchers are increasingly evaluated on their ability as PIs to lead a group and to document leadership experience.

There are many useful entry points for strengthening the culture within research environments. As an instructor on research leadership courses, I meet many emerging research leaders who are motivated to become a different kind of leader than those they have encountered themselves. Many who have done research abroad notice, when they come to Denmark, that there is greater balance between work and private life, a strong funding landscape with many opportunities, and a more informal working culture than in many other countries. These are important and promising conditions for the continued development of research environments.

How can we take a systematic approach?

What characterizes research environments that produce strong academic results while maintaining a culture of kindness? Broadly speaking, these are environments that take shared responsibility for what could be called the “second-order tasks.” As Thomas, Julie and Michael point out in the first part of this article, a skilled research leader cannot rely on being skilled alone. A key aspect of successful research leadership is the ability to create a learning environment. If you want to go far, you cannot do everything yourself – you need to invest time and energy in developing others so that progress can be shared. Second-order tasks are all the things that create the conditions for a group to succeed collectively with its first-order tasks – the core work of writing articles, analyzing data, teaching, communicating, learning at conferences and engaging with society. Central second-order tasks include building a shared culture, setting a common ambition, ensuring good collaboration within the group, maintaining clear frameworks, supporting collective competence development, and onboarding new members. All of these are tasks that the research leader cannot – and should not – handle alone, but which require shared investment. Concrete ways of making that investment, for those who wish to create more collaboration than competition and more professional and collegial support, include:

a) Work continuously to understand and develop motivation within your group

An essential leadership task is to know why and how each team member is motivated by the work you are doing together. Understanding what truly drives your colleagues and gives their work meaning is a central leadership tool. With insight into their motivation, it becomes easier to see how each person can contribute to your shared purpose and ambition. Without this understanding, you risk, as a research leader, having to give orders to make things happen – which is often demotivating, even when the person agrees with what needs to be done

(Barlebo 2014). In practice, this could mean, for example, taking a walk with each colleague every six months to talk about what drives them in their daily work, and when they feel they are truly contributing to something meaningful.

b) Next-boarding conversations

The large number of fixed-term positions in academia can create a range of dilemmas – both for individual researchers and for their leaders. For a postdoc, for example, there may be tension between spending the final part of their contract applying for their next position and creating good conditions for securing it or focusing fully on completing the current project and delivering results. In addition, early career researchers (ECRs) are often quite dependent on their research leader when it comes to their next career step. The research leader can play a decisive role by recommending them, using their network on their behalf, or including them in a future grant application. One way to address this power asymmetry is to introduce *next-boarding conversations* – discussions that begin as soon as the researcher is hired, focusing on how the position can best increase their chances of moving forward and achieving what matters most to them. These conversations should not leave the researcher feeling as if they are being “sent on” before they have even settled in but rather foster a shared curiosity about how to make their time in the current project as meaningful and relevant as possible. By quickly removing the taboo around what everyone already knows – that the position is temporary, and that the person will need to move on – senior researchers can help establish a practice of proactively supporting the career development of younger colleagues. It can also increase the chance of knowing earlier when someone plans to move on, allowing for better planning within the project – and potentially avoiding awkward conversations about whether an employee is prioritizing their next job over their current one. The senior researcher’s role is not to secure the next position, but simply having the conversation can provide valuable reflection time and an opportunity to use one’s experience or network to support the colleague.

Another important point is that it can be relevant to challenge the narrative that still exists in parts of academia – that the “natural” next step is necessarily within academia itself. The idea of a professorship as the ultimate goal can create a sense of failure in a system with few permanent positions, while it may be far more constructive to explore where one’s academic background can make a positive difference (Bøgelund & Tangkjær 2025).

c) Supporting colleagues’ own agency

For the well-intentioned research leader who is committed to creating a professionally strong and humane environment, there is a risk – a risk of taking on so much responsibility that they both exhaust themselves and become a bottleneck for the group’s work, while also unintentionally creating a culture where responsibility is placed on the leader and colleagues become less inclined to take initiative. A constructive way to counter this is to actively support colleagues’ own agency in building a positive environment. This could, for example, mean giving PhD students the mandate to establish and run a PhD forum themselves. It could also mean encouraging the group to take their own initiatives to try out new ideas that strengthen the culture – and at times pushing back, gently, on automatic expectations that the leader will do most of the work, such as always chairing meetings. The idea is to hand some of the work back to the group and help them identify and expand their own sphere of influence and initiative – and to take part in negotiating the boundaries for that influence. It can also protect the leader from becoming either a heroic figure on whom the group is dependent, or a scapegoat when not everything gets done.

d) Developing the feedback culture

One of the places where culture becomes most visible in a research environment is in feedback situations. This could be research seminars where ideas and article drafts are shared, in supervision meetings, or during presentations. In some environments, the strong focus on quality through critique, and the academic dogma that everything must be open to scientific challenge and scrutiny, can be misunderstood as meaning that being harsh is the most academically sound approach. A head of department once told me that he would really like to change the feedback culture a little, “so that PhD students wouldn’t so often leave supervision in tears.” Fortunately, that is far from the case everywhere, but there can be a widespread tendency to think that researchers should be able to “take the heat” when it comes to feedback in academia, rather than being open to reflecting on what kind of culture fosters the most learning.

In general, giving feedback is an art that requires awareness of and a curiosity about, what the other person actually wants feedback on and what they have the openness and space to work on. Sometimes, it may be necessary to hold back the urge to immediately express personal, unfiltered professional opinions. This can be done by shifting focus from the sender-oriented “who do I think needs feedback?” to the receiver-oriented “what feedback does this person want and is ready for, and when?” and by moving from focusing only on mistakes and shortcomings to also highlighting evident strengths and things that are important to continue doing.

One way to work with feedback culture is to have an open discussion about what characterizes it today and how people would like it to be in the future. It can also be a good idea to systematize feedback, so that there are regular opportunities to work with the development that takes place through it. Here, it can be useful to distinguish between different types of feedback – for example, discussing someone’s role in the group (e.g. what are the expectations of them as a group member, is that role developing) in a semi-annual or annual meeting; professional feedback (qualification of research ideas, methods, argumentation and communication, for example) in supervision and sparring contexts; and talking about personal development (what could be important for me to learn in this role – and in future roles) in a conversation at the beginning and end of an employment period.

e) Celebrating each other

It is important to achieve good results – and it is equally important to celebrate them as a research community. This is about recognizing each other’s efforts and successes and giving attention to everything that actually works. Doing so can strengthen the group’s sense of cohesion and show that people’s efforts are seen and appreciated. There are many local ways to do this: for example, a publication cake, a flag on the office door, or a “hall of fame” displaying selected milestones such as accepted grant applications or published articles. It may also be worth considering giving attention to other parameters than purely task-oriented ones such as publications and funding. This could mean simply noticing and appreciating the colleague who made an extra effort to onboard a new team member, the one who took the initiative to organize a group event, or the one who used their network to help a colleague find their next position.

f) Check yourself

As a leader, you are a role model whether you want to be or not, and you have a significant influence on the culture and the people around you. It can therefore be an advantage to know yourself and to work consciously with your own norms, expectations and reaction patterns under pressure. Research shows that people often repeat the behavior they themselves have been met with; for example, the likelihood of speaking harshly or condescendingly to colleagues increases if one’s own seniors did so (Moss 2018). When under pressure, it is common to fall into either excessive control or vague compliance. How do you typically react and what are ways you can consciously try to do something different? Can you get honest input from someone who knows you and wants the best for you? Is there feedback from your

group that you are interested in and ready to receive? It can also be valuable to show younger colleagues that your own path may not have been as linear as they imagine, or that you, too, can make mistakes.

g) Reflect and find support from other research leaders

As a research leader, you may experience expectations coming from many directions. Remember that there is much inspiration to be found among peers. Having a network of research leaders and a space to talk about the leadership aspect of your work life can be both a source of reflection and development, and an important break from competitive environments. For example, you could reach out to 5 people in your network, perhaps from other research fields and institutions, and agree to meet 3 or 4 times a year to discuss the role of being a research leader. Leadership is not just a position, it is a craft to be trained and developed.

Conclusion

As a society, we are entirely dependent on strong research environments to help solve the challenges we face. It is therefore an absolute necessity to ensure that more people – and a greater diversity of people – choose to stay in research, and that we do not lose them because of poor working conditions or doubts about whether it is possible to thrive while doing immensely important work. With this article, the hope is to inspire and make concrete how steps can be taken towards creating even stronger professional and humane research environments.

References

- Bøgelund, P. & Tangkjær, C. (2025). *Career Opportunities and Support for Postdocs in Academia: A Conceptual Framework for Career Engagement*. *European Journal of Higher Education*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2025.2515573>
- Coyle, D. (2018). *The Culture Code: The Secrets of Highly Successful Groups*. London: Bantam Press. ISBN 9781785038778
- Dalio, R. (2021). *Principles for Dealing with the Changing World Order: Why Nations Succeed and Fail*. New York: Simon & Schuster. ISBN 9781982160272
- Dansk Magisterforening & PhD Association Network of Denmark (PAND) (2024). *Arbejdsmiljø for Ph.d.-studerende* [Work Environment for PhD Students]. Available at: <https://dm.dk/media/ww1n3exo/arbejdspres.pdf>
- Elsom, S., Black, A. L., Schriever, V., Walker, A., & Grimmett, H. (2025). *Gaming the System: Choosing to Play the Infinite Game in Academia*. In *Ludic Inquiries Into Power and Pedagogy in Higher Education* (1st ed., pp. 253-266). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003450979-23>
- Grant, A. (2014). *Give and Take: Why Helping Others Drives Our Success*. London: Phoenix. ISBN 9781780224725
- Grint, K. (2024). *Care-full Leadership*. International Leadership Association. Available at: <https://ilaglobalnetwork.org/care-full-leadership/>
- Hosoda, K. K. & Estrada, M. (2024). *The Influence of Kindness on Academics' Identity, Wellbeing and Stress*. *PLOS ONE*, 19(10), e0312269. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0312269>
- Moss, S. (2018). *Research Is Set Up for Bullies to Thrive*. *Nature*. Available at: <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-018-06040-w>
- Nielsen, C. L., Lindhardt, C. L., Näslund-Koch, L., Frandsen, T. F., Clemensen, J. & Timmermann, C. (2025). *What Is the State of Organisational Compassion-Based Interventions Targeting to Improve Health Professionals' Well-Being? Results of a Systematic Review*. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 81, 2246-2276.
- Nguyen, T. L. & Lee, J. Y. (2025). *Kindness as a Public Health Action*. *Communications Medicine*, 5, 122. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43856-025-00861-3>
- Schmiedehaus, E., Cordaro, M., Perrotte, J., Stern, M., Dailey, S. & Howard, K. (2023). *The Great Resignation in Higher Education: An Occupational Health Approach to Understanding Intentions-to-Quit for Faculty in Higher Education*. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 123, 103992.
- Wellcome Trust (2020). *What Researchers Think About the Culture They Work In*. Available at: <https://wellcome.org/reports/what-researchers-think-about-research-culture>

Authors

Thomas Quaade Bandholm

Thomas Quaade Bandholm is a physiotherapist, exercise physiologist and professor at the Department of Clinical Medicine, University of Copenhagen, and at the Department of Physiotherapy and Occupational Therapy, Amager and Hvidovre Hospital. Thomas also leads the research group Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation Research - Copenhagen (PMR-C), which is part of several Clinical Academic Groups (CAGs) under Greater Copenhagen Health Science Partners.



Julie Midtgaard

Julie Midtgaard Klausen is a clinical psychologist and professor at the Department of Clinical Medicine, University of Copenhagen, and the Mental Health Services of the Capital Region of Denmark. Julie is also the founder and head of the Center for Applied Research in Mental Health Care (CARMEN).



Michael Skovdal Rathleff

Michael Skovdal Rathleff is a physiotherapist and professor at Aalborg University, Department of Medicine and Health Technology. Michael leads Aalborg University's mission Improving Health through Coherence and Individualization and the research center PRIMA: Research and Development in Primary Health Care.



Amanda Houmark-Orsøe

Amanda Houmark-Orsøe is a senior consultant working primarily with development in knowledge-intensive organizations such as universities and hospitals. Amanda worked at the University of Copenhagen from 2015 to 2022 and holds a Master's degree in Philosophy, a Master's degree in Theology, and a Master's degree in Public Governance.



How do I become part of ELIS?

Everyone can join ELIS. You do not need to apply, take a course, or agree with everything. You simply need to be curious about how you – or your research group – can contribute to an academic culture where excellence and humanity go hand in hand. As a starting point, you should probably also be able to see yourself reflected in the values above.

The first step is simple: put into words what ELIS means to you. As an individual, we call this a #ELIS4me, and as a group or institution, a #ELIS4us. You write what makes sense to you – and send it to us. It can be a sentence, a reflection, or a short text describing how you wish to live ELIS in your daily life. Something often happens when you put your values into words. It sharpens reflection – and creates a gentle sense of commitment when what you believe in (or aspire to) stands in black and white and can be compared to everyday practice. Not as a test, but as a reminder. When we share our #ELIS4me or #ELIS4us publicly, we also give others the opportunity to mirror themselves, be inspired, and – perhaps – enter into dialogue about how we enter culture together. All contributions are continuously collected in an inspiration catalogue on the ELIS website.

You are also welcome to use the ELIS logo in connection with teaching, events, courses, or other activities where you wish to signal a particular cultural code (see practical examples below). The logo can serve as a visual marker of what matters: that this is an environment where professionalism and humanity go hand in hand.

Read more at <https://www.hvidovrehospital.dk/elis>