



# Newsletter

December 2013

Volume 3, Issue 3

## President's Essay

### ***Becoming Passionate about Solving Problems***

*Pursue your passion.* Three simple words that many of us have likely heard at some point in our lives. Indeed, we may have even given this advice to others. To a large degree, this is an artifact of the modern age. Thanks to the creation of a middle-class in industrialized nations, and the prosperity of the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, for the first time ever, a generation was being raised to pursue not a way to make a living, but their passion.

But something has changed. When considering what to do with their lives, many are now looking outward instead of looking inward; looking for ways to serve the world and to help others, looking to something larger than themselves. Perhaps it is the difficult economic situation we are currently facing. Perhaps it is because we are so globally connected that more people are aware of the suffering around the world. Perhaps it is because we are, more than ever, being bombarded with information on the environmental, political, and health challenges we face. Regardless of the cause, there is a push for the pursuit of problem solving over passion. More and more, there are many among us who choose to understand and solve societal problems. As evidence that this shift in thinking is becoming more mainstream, last year, the *Harvard Business Review* published an article extolling the virtues of problem solving over passion ("To Find Happiness, Forget About Passion"):



**Stephen M. Fiore**  
University of Central Florida

"Forget about finding your passion. Instead, focus on finding big problems. Putting problems at the center of our decision-making changes everything. It's not about the self anymore. It's about what you can do and how you can be a valuable contributor. People working on the biggest problems are compensated in the biggest ways. I don't mean this in a strict financial sense, but in a deeply human sense. For one, it shifts your attention from you to others and the wider world. You stop

dwelling. You become less self-absorbed. Ironically, we become happier if we worry less about what makes us happy."

What we should recognize is that many in industry, academia, or government are stepping forward and taking on the challenges they see around them. In business, there is increasing interest in social entrepreneurship, where innovation is focused on developing products, methods, and technologies that change society for the better. In academia, many scientists are pursuing what Don Stokes (1997) described as "use-inspired science." This is a theoretically driven perspective that simultaneously considers the eventual use of the knowledge gained. Through this, scholars explore fundamental issues to further understanding, but do so within the context of complex real-world problems. In government, many federal agencies are encouraging researchers and practitioners to take on societal challenges and work with stakeholders (e.g., NGOs, community members), to more readily translate science into practice.

It does not stop here. Many fields are exploring more complex problems and developing "grand challenges" where researchers work with each other and often with stakeholders, to address significant societal issues. In fact, these grand challenges are becoming institutionalized within and across disciplines and professions. As an example, the *Institute of Medicine* put forth a set of challenges for Neuroscience in the 21<sup>st</sup> century ("From Molecules to Minds"). These included questions such as understanding the relationship between physical activity in the brain and thought, emotion, and behavior, as well as how to protect and enhance brain function as we age. Additionally, the *National Academy of Engineering* identified a set of grand challenges meant to help society deal with population growth and help to sustain the advancement of civilization while improving health and well being ("Introduction to the Grand Challenges for Engineering"). These challenges range from access to clean water, to ensuring a secure cyberspace. Likewise, the *Department of Education* has created a set of grand challenges around research that can help to better understand and improve learning ("Focus on Grand Challenge Problems"). These

(PRESIDENT > Continued on page 7)

### Have something of interest to the INGRoup community?

Write a column for the newsletter!

Submissions accepted in December, March, August and may include:

- Book Reviews
- Research Issues
- Funding Opportunities
- Teaching Approaches
- Insights about Interdisciplinary Research Collaborations

All material for publication should be submitted to the Editor as an email attachment in Microsoft Word or Word Perfect format and sent to [dkennedy@uwb.edu](mailto:dkennedy@uwb.edu)

### 2014 INGRoup Conference

The submission site is open through February 2, 2014.

[www.conftool.net/ingroup2014](http://www.conftool.net/ingroup2014)

### Inside this issue:

From the Editor	2
Conference recap	3
Perspective	4
Say yes...	5
Insights, tips & reflections	6
Call for papers	11

## From the Editor

The 2013 INGRoup conference held in Atlanta, GA on July 11-13, 2013 was an amazing conference that drew team researchers from over 15 countries and 10 disciplines. The conference program was packed with great presentations, speakers, and activities. Be sure to check out the recap section to note all of the acknowledgements and award winners.



**Deanna M. Kennedy**  
University of Washington  
Bothell

Before discussing the great contributions that INGRoup members made to this newsletter, I want to announce that our newsletter team welcomes two new Associate Editors, Michael Kaloydis, a Human Factors researcher at the Naval Education and Training Professional Development and Technology Center (NETPDTC), and Felicia Kaloydis, in Industrial/Organizational Psychology at NASA Kennedy Space

Center. At the same time, I would like to thank past Associate Editors Ana Maria Godeanu and Kyle Emich for their support and contributions to the newsletter over the last few years.

Continuing the great conversations that started at the INGRoup conference, this newsletter is packed with stories and experiences from the conference. For starters, the new Associate Editors join Dr. Eduardo Salas in discussing his 2013 McGrath lecture about translational research. If you were not able to attend the talk, the insights provided herein give you a flavor for the interesting and exciting conversations that Dr. Salas' talk provoked during the conference and continue today.

Next, we have a number of stories from conference attendees that reflect upon their INGRoup conference experience. These include insights from a first time attendee, April D. Schantz, an Industrial/Organizational Psychology doctorate student from Florida Interna-

tional University. Another student, Maggie Luciano from Management at the University of Connecticut, talks about the dissertation tips received during the inaugural doctoral consortium. And finally, Martijn Van der Kamp, a PhD Candidate at the Melbourne Business School provides a broad perspective of the conference season that showcases the niche that INGRoup fills for team researchers.

To cap off this newsletter we have a story from Maartje Schouten, a PhD student at Erasmus University in the Netherlands. She writes about taking on international opportunities to enhance your PhD experience. Her story is inspiring and shows a path that more PhD students might want to follow to make the most of their doctoral years.

Finally, we conclude the newsletter with the Call for Papers to the Ninth Annual Conference to be held at the Renaissance Raleigh North Hills Hotel in Raleigh, NC, USA on July 17-19, 2014. See you there!

## Where Can I Publish “Group” Research?

One of the reasons INGRoup was founded was that, as documented by various articles and chapters, people researching groups and teams are spread across several fields.

**Michael R. Baumann**  
University of Texas at  
San Antonio

We do not really have a “home” discipline. This makes it difficult for groups researchers to track and make good use of all the journals that might be open to publishing their work. The following list was compiled as a tool INGRoup members could use in that effort. An initial list of journals was compiled based in part on informal polling of a small number of members of each of the fields most heavily represented at INGRoup. For good or for ill, some disciplines take into account impact and influence during promotion and tenure decisions, thereby making the impact of journals in particular fields of concern for some of the membership. Therefore, the initial list was supplemented with journals identified as having article influence scores above the median in one or more of relevant fields. The “Aims &

Scope” statements, editorials, and types of articles published since the start of 2011 were then examined to determine the journal’s openness to group-related research. Finally, a keyword search based on topics presented at the 2013 meeting of INGRoup was used to evaluate the overlap between the topics published in each journal and those being researched by the membership. Several journals on the final list are ranked well in multiple disciplines represented at INGRoup and have significant overlap with the types of topics our members research. Others cover only some of those topics or are known by fewer disciplines, but still may be of interest to many of our members. A few of the journals listed have published very little groups research in the last few years in spite of aims & scopes or editorial statements explicitly mentioning an openness to research on groups and teams, suggesting that as a community we have underutilized those outlets.

(PUBLISH > Continued on page 8)

### INGRoup Newsletter

#### Editor

Deanna M. Kennedy, PhD  
Operations & Project Management  
University of Washington Bothell  
dkennedy@uw.edu

#### Associate Editor

Felicia Kaloydis  
Industrial/Organizational Psychology  
NASA Kennedy Space Center

#### Associate Editor

Michael Kaloydis  
Human Factors  
Naval Education and Training  
Professional Development and  
Technology Center (NETPDTC)

## Recap of the 2013 INGRoup Conference

### Board of Directors

#### President, Chair

Stephen M. Fiore, PhD  
Cognitive Sciences  
University of Central Florida  
sfiore@ist.ucf.edu

#### Vice President, Local Arrangements Chair 2014, Conference Coordinator

Joann Keyton, PhD  
Communication  
North Carolina State University  
jkeyton@ncsu.edu

#### Vice President, Association

Mark Clark, PhD  
Management  
American University  
mark.clark@american.edu

#### Secretary

Tuck Pescosolido, PhD  
Management  
University of New Hampshire  
tuck.pescosolido@unh.edu

#### Treasurer

Benjamin Herndon, PhD  
Organizational Behavior  
Georgia Tech  
benjamin.herndon@mgt.gatech.edu

#### Elected Board Member 2011-2014

Leslie DeChurch, PhD  
Psychology  
Georgia Tech  
lesliedechurch@gmail.com

#### Elected Board Member 2012-2015

Michael Baumann, PhD  
Psychology  
University of Texas at San Antonio  
michael.baumann@utsa.edu

#### Elected Board Member 2013-2016

Steve Zaccaro, PhD  
Psychology  
George Mason University  
szaccaro@gmu.edu

#### Student Member 2012-2014

Raquel Asencio Hodge  
Organizational Psychology  
Georgia Tech  
rasenciohodge@gmail.com

#### Conference Program Chair 2013

Stephenson Beck, PhD  
Communication  
North Dakota State University  
stephenson.beck@ndsu.edu

#### Conference Program Chair 2014

Norbert Semmer, PhD  
Psychology  
University of Bern  
norbert.semmer@psy.unibe.ch

The 2013 INGRoup conference marked the 8<sup>th</sup> annual meeting of INGRoup attendees. The meeting had 166 pre-conference registrants with 55 of these registering as first time attendees. We had attendees from over 15 countries including Australia, Belgium, Canada, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Iran, Israel, Netherlands, Norway, Singapore, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and the United States. These attendees were also diverse in the disciplines represented, including Clinical and Translational Sciences, Communication, Education, Human Factors, Industrial Engineering, Management, Organization and Strategy, Organizational Behavior, Philosophy, and Sociology. There were 106 submissions for the conference program that resulted in 101 accepted submissions. As a result, the program featured 72 paper presentations, 19 posters, 4 panels and 6 symposia. As well, the pre-conference activities including workshops and a doctoral consortium that received positive reviews.



The conference program included an inspired speech about translational research by Ed Salas, the 2012 Joseph E. McGrath

recipient. Dr. Salas offers a further conversation about his insights later in this newsletter.



The conference program also featured a Saturday night closing ceremony at the Georgia Tech's Sheller College of Business. At the event, we heard from the "Georgia Tech Little Big Band." After the jazz ensemble performance, the performers stayed for a conversation about the teamwork of the jazz band.



At the conference, Joann Keyton received the Friend of INGRoup award and Stephen Beck was acknowledged for his service to INGRoup.

(RECAP > Continued on page 9)

## A Professor's Reflection: Social Networking Analysis Workshop

I attended the social networking analysis (SNA) workshop at the 2013 INGroup conference in Atlanta. I chose this workshop as a refresher on SNA to help with my current research projects. It was an interesting and fast paced workshop that gave us the tools to engage in SNA on our own research. The important takeaways I received from this workshop were: a review of the different SNA metrics, an update on interesting SNA research at different levels of analysis (individual and group), and how useful R can be as an analysis software.



Anita Blanchard  
UNC Charlotte

I really appreciated this workshop not only for the information I learned during it, but also the networking I enjoyed with the other participants. It was a great opportunity to meet other faculty and graduate students who are interested and actively engaged in SNA. Indeed, workshops at INGroup likely function both as opportunities for learning material and interacting with like-minded others. Even at such an interactive conference like INGroup, the ability to spend half a day with other researchers interested in similar topics is a real bonus. Based on what I learned at this conference, I would look forward to attending as well as having my graduate students attend a workshop focused on how to effectively use R as an analysis tool.

## Perspective of “The impact of team science: Some reflections of a 30 year journey...”

In view of contemporary times characterized by the slow recovery from the global economic meltdown and the ensuing recession, the importance of group and team research is more critical than ever. This criticality has risen from the changing dynamics of organizations, as they strive to become leaner and stronger, as well as the need for organizations to foster environments that enable individuals to interact effectively to meet the challenges that routinely arise. Of all the issues addressed in Dr. Eduardo Salas’s talk “The impact of team sci-



Felicia Kaloydis  
NASA Kennedy  
Space Center

ence: Some reflections of a 30 year journey...” during the 2013 INGRoup conference, such as the need for us as researchers to embed ourselves in the research context, develop partnerships, and make deliverables a priority to name a few, the most salient issue that emerged was the need for researchers to embrace their roles as storytellers, and invest in the translation of team research findings.

Teams and team phenomena are inherently complex, and researchers dedicate substantial effort and resources to dissect the nuances of team dynamics. However, researchers often neglect the extra step of translating their research findings into viable prac-

tices that organizations and individuals can leverage to yield optimally functioning teams to enhance productivity, and spur creative problem-solving. Given that research grants and other avenues for research funding have declined considerably over the past several years, the translation of team research findings is arguably more important than ever. As underscored in Dr. Salas’ talk, for team science to remain innovative and continue to attract the requisite resources to thrive, there is a critical need for researchers to translate the findings of group and team research into tangible best practices that organizations of various types can implement, in order to achieve their strategic objectives.

### Translations of Team Science Findings: Do these Matter?

Yes, they do! And more than we think, give credit or value them. You see, in my opinion, by performing translations we inform many of how the findings, lessons learned, results and/or discoveries in team science impacts the world they live in – whether at work or in any collective-oriented setting. In a sense, these translations show our contributions as well as our practical, useful, relevant impact as a science. Translations are the information we take from the lab and the



Eduardo Salas  
University of Central

field to society. It is the mechanism upon we “touch” individuals, groups, collectives and networks in our society. And there is nothing more rewarding than influencing, shaping and helping collectives do better – just nothing like that....

But, what are translations? These, in my opinion, are a set of one-liners (or more) that essentially communicates either a prescription, a guideline, a truth or an evidence-based finding or compelling statement about team, group and collective phenomena. These one-liners are in outlined (hopefully) in language that is accessible and in layman terms (i.e., your

grandmother would get it and understand it). Now, I also believe that not all translations are equal. So, at least what I do is use a “consumer reports” approach. In some cases, we have meta-analysis that clearly show, for example, what works in team leadership, where translation would be presented as a “full black circle” – lots of evidence. In other cases, maybe only one or two studies – that will have a “half red circle”. In my experience, recipients of these translations appreciate and respect not only the translation itself, but how certain we are of its informational value. Now, translations

(TRANSLATIONS > Continued on page 9)

### 2013 McGrath Lecture – Dr. Eduardo Salas: “The impact of team science: Some reflections of a 30 year journey...”

Dr. Eduardo Salas, recipient of the 2012 Joseph E. McGrath Lifetime Achievement Award, delivered a vibrant McGrath Lecture at the Georgia Tech Academy of Medicine, prior to the annual INGRoup poster session and reception. The colorful address, titled “The impact of team science: Some reflections of a 30 year journey...” was a reflection by Dr.



Michael Kaloydis  
Naval Education and Training  
Professional Development  
and Technology Center

Salas of some of the key contributions of his research team, as well as lessons learned throughout his illustrious research career. During his talk, Dr. Salas noted that his research team has been effective for many reasons, of those reasons, he added that much of the success of his team resulted because they: (1) Embedded themselves in the context of their research, (2) Focused on team dynamics, (3) Were informed by theory, (4) Invested in measurement strategies, (5) Surrounded themselves with “critics”, (6) Held a sense of urgency for data collection, (7) Kept a keen eye on deliverables,

(8) Divided and conquered, (9) Developed sound methods, and (10) Learned to be “story tellers” that enabled the team to change the minds of key decision makers while conveying truths.

In addition to the keys to success noted above, Dr. Salas described eight key lessons that he and his research team have learned throughout his established research career. Those lessons included: (Lesson 1) Team work is a complex phenomenon, (Lesson 2) Team performance is comprised of

(MCGRATH > Continued on page 9)

## Say Yes to International Opportunities that Enhance Your PhD Experience!

I was asked to write the student submission for this newsletter as an international member of INGroup. This request made me wonder—what is it



**Maartje Schouten**  
Erasmus University  
Netherlands

about me that makes me an international member? Yes, I do my PhD at a European institution, so I am not American trained. However, there is actually very little about me that is international: I am Dutch—so very Dutch that I can trace my family history 500 years back to the same city where I grew up; and, I do a PhD at a Dutch university. Among the PhD students in my department, I am probably the least international—there are people from Turkey, China, Israel, Belarus, Germany, Egypt, and the UK. However, there is one aspect of my academic life that is international: I have spent quite a bit of time at various American universities. As a Master student, I spent a semester with John Hollenbeck at Michigan State. Now, in my fourth year, I am visiting Christina Shalley at Georgia Tech this fall semester and I aspire to visit one other university before I graduate. Some have called me a “jet set” PhD student. I would turn the joke around and hope

to encourage you to also plan a semester at another university.

I think greatest learning comes from situations outside of your comfort zone. My visit to Michigan was an eye-opening experience about how academia functions and what it values. Now in Georgia, I am learning about work styles and ways people interact different from the norms in the Netherlands. I would probably not have learned these lessons as efficiently or effectively in the Netherlands.

At Erasmus University it is more common than not to spend at least one semester at another university, be it in Asia, Europe or North America. So I asked six friends about their experiences. In an effort to generalize, I also asked two academics outside of my school one of which an American visiting outside of the US. This resulted in an unequivocally positive opinion about research visits. Although all of us selected the location of our visit based upon the reputation of our host or the institution, the most valuable lessons were about our personal developments as scholars, in addition to the topical knowledge of our hosts. For instance, one reported that he now feels more comfortable to contribute to the scientific community independently

and another states that he learned about the social enterprise of science, i.e. how to build strong research collaborations and sell his work to different audiences. Of course, we also face challenges: Securing funding and the visa application process are hurdles everyone struggles with. Furthermore, different interpretations of roles and responsibilities as well as different norms about setting up meetings or interacting with professors require some adaptability on our side. Yet, these challenges are worth overcoming for when it comes to answering the question of whether one would recommend this experience to others, here are the responses to my poll: “Yes”, “Yes”, “Yes”, “Yes”, “YES”, “YES”, and “YES”.

***Maartje Schouten** is a PhD Student at Erasmus University in the Netherlands. Her dissertation is on hierarchy and influence and is chaired by Lindred Greer and Daan van Knippenberg.*



### Be a Grouper

Please consider making a contribution to INGroup – show your support for the association and help us maintain financial health. Donors will be recognized in the 2014 INGroup program. You can make a donation at the “Be a Grouper” tab on our website or send your contribution payable to INGroup to the address below. For more information, contact Benjamin Herndon at [Benjamin.Herndon@mgt.gatech.edu](mailto:Benjamin.Herndon@mgt.gatech.edu).

INGroup  
c/o Benjamin Herndon  
INGroup Treasurer  
311 Beverly Road  
Atlanta, GA 30309

## INGRoup Conference Insights from a First Timer

"You should come to INGRoup," he offered, handing me an almost business card sized mini-flyer with a conference announcement.



**April D. Schantz**  
Florida International University

I was just finishing my first year of the I/O Psychology doctorate program at Florida International University and this was my first attendance at a major conference (SIOP 2013, Houston). I was a little overwhelmed – but quite excited about the people I was meeting with similar interests in teams research.

Some of my favorite research authors, like

Stephen Zaccaro, Leslie DeChurch, and Eduardo Salas would be at this INGRoup meeting – but I was not so sure about adding another trip to my crammed school schedule and limited budget. It was Steve Fiore who had handed me the card, and for the next couple months it kept reminding me of the upcoming opportunity. Partially because of the 'just off' size, it would stick out of the business cards stack – just begging for attention. Eventually, that little flyer won out – and I submitted my registration to attend.

What a surprise when I arrived to Atlanta – both in the locale and in the attendance of so many of my favorite researchers! Sessions presented amazing, targeted discussions of team measurements, relationships

and construct conceptualizations that were just starting to take off. My rapidly scribbled notes are still providing areas for me to explore!

Some atypical findings discovered at INGRoup; there are a lot of streets named Peachtree in Atlanta, rum and dancing (and their interaction) are accepted in these academic circles, National Hockey is a viable team interest, and table topics can range widely. Overall, the most important thing I learned at the INGRoup conference was that these monoliths of academia that I still idolize, are really just people with a passion and willingness to share that passion. I am looking forward to the INGRoup conference in Raleigh next year!

## Sharing Dissertation Tips from the INGRoup Conference

Among the most interesting and informative dissertation-related conversations I have had were those at the 2013 INGRoup conference – in particular those



**Maggie Luciano**  
University of Connecticut

generated during the inaugural doctoral student consortium. INGRoup truly brings together scholars, across many social scientific disciplines, who study groups and teams. Although there are clearly differences in the challenges different research projects encounter, I found it striking that across disciplines and methodologies, we often face many of the same challenges. I would like to share some of the best tips regarding common challenges that other group researchers were kind enough to share

with me.

1. Be realistic – Particularly about response rate

Not all participant pools are equally as large, responsive, or show up on time. For lab research, seek out suggestions regarding the percentage of "no shows" to help determine how many students to schedule and if there are timing issues to consider (e.g., recruitment is easiest the first and last two weeks of the semester, the "no show" rate doubles during mid-terms). More broadly, there have been several published articles (e.g., Baruch & Holtom, 2008) which can assist in managing expectations regarding response rate. Additionally, group-level research requires consideration of the percentage respondents per group needed to capture the phenomenon

of interest.

2. Be creative - There is more than one way to get sufficient power

For some research questions, studying the group-level phenomenon quickly reduces the sample size. Looking at the phenomenon over time and across tasks are a couple ways that a small number of teams can generate big data. Although sample size is perhaps the most common consideration in power analysis, be creative and consider the expected effect size in different populations and the influence of research design.

3. Be mindful – Look for ways the research can be mutually beneficial

To gain access to a population, as well as the information you want, look for ways the

(SHARING > Continued on page 10)

## A Team Researcher's Reflections on the 2013 Conference Season

This year I got myself into quite a bit of trouble, of the good kind though. I choose to submit three papers and a symposium to the conferences of the



**Martijn Van der Kamp**  
Melbourne Business School

International Association for Conflict Management (IACM), INGRoup and the Academy of Management (AoM). Having done the writing, reviewing, traveling, and attending; it is now time to reflect on and compare these conferences.

The IACM conference was completely focused on conflict, ranging from individual to societal level. It combined experts from

political sciences, psychology, organizational behavior, negotiations and other disciplines. IACM quite compares to INGRoup's multi-disciplinary focus. The difference is however that at IACM the number of sessions strictly focused on teams is relatively few, which makes it easier to explore other viewpoints and approaches. INGRoup is where I found all of the experts in the area of team faultline and multi-team systems, my areas of interest. I felt like a child in a candy store, and couldn't move away from them. Overall, the feedback and suggestions at INGRoup were amazing. Conversely, the AoM conference caters to a very broad audience, with topics ranging from accounting to strategy and from theory to methods. In accordance with the focus of each, both INGRoup and the AoM (OB

division) have excellent PhD consortia, which I would strongly recommend.

Conferences are not all about sessions, they are also about people. The IACM organizes their conferences all over the world, and has diverse global audience as a result. INGRoup is a bit more US focused in that sense. The AoM conference is as a place to see and be seen in the world of management and hence attracts a large, truly global crowd. Some people skip the AoM conference as they prefer to navigate the smaller communities of INGRoup and IACM. Also, the smaller conferences allow for more opportunities of higher quality interaction with senior researchers. I found the INGRoup crowd very industrious, fo-

(SEASON > Continued on page 10)

(PRESIDENT from page 1)

include the design and validation of individually tailored learning experiences and assessments that can optimize the acquisition of knowledge for students.

What, one might ask, does this have to do with INGRoup? I bring these developments to our attention because, as an interdisciplinary organization centered on the study of groups and teams, we are better positioned than most to steward this kind of complex problem solving. Success in these grand challenges requires researchers with an understanding of the complex dynamics that emerge when groups and teams are brought together to work on big problems. Success requires researchers who understand the kind of conflict that can emerge when a diverse group is brought together. Success requires researchers with an understanding of leadership in teams and how to motivate people to persevere in the face of adversity. In short, these problems require the intellectual capital possessed by members of INGRoup.

In sum, I hope that you think about the grand challenges to which group and team researchers can contribute, both individually and collectively. The freedom to pursue one's own area of intellectual interest is, perhaps, one of the greatest perks in academia. So I encourage you to consider what grand challenges might personally motivate you and to which you, as an expert in the study of groups and teams, can contribute. I encourage you to think about how INGRoup's intellectual capital might be leveraged to take on grand challenges as an exciting new area for research on groups and teams, or as a new environment in which to test and apply our theories. These contributions don't even need to be major; rather, they can be part of our service commitments. Here, service can be construed of as consulting to those groups or organizations that are addressing these grand challenges, helping them, for example, better understand and resolve difficulties they have with communication and information sharing. Or, it could simply be a discussion with an interested stakeholder who is in need of experience with, for example, developing cohesion within a diverse team. It could even be conversing with enthusiastic student groups that might benefit from your expertise on composition and faultlines. In any such case, I encourage you to share your knowledge, to provide important perspective, and to set them on the path that will help them better understand and solve their problem in ways that they could not have without your input. For I submit that helping to understand and improve the processes and outcomes of groups and teams working to address complex societal problems is, in fact, INGRoup's very own, and very laudable, grand challenge.

Focus on Grand Challenge Problems | U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/technology/draft-netp-2010/grand-challenge-problems>.

From Molecules to Minds - Challenges for the 21st Century: Workshop Summary. (n.d.). Retrieved from [http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=12220](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12220).

Introduction to the Grand Challenges for Engineering - Engineering Challenges. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.engineeringchallenges.org/cms/8996/9221.aspx>.

Stokes, D. E. (1997). *Pasteur's quadrant: Basic science and technological innovation*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

To Find Happiness, Forget About Passion - Oliver Segovia - Harvard Business Review. (2012). Retrieved from <http://blogs.hbr.org/2012/01/to-find-happiness-forget-about/>.

## **Proposals Due December 18 for INGRoup 2014 Workshops (July 17 in Raleigh, NC)**

Are you interested in leading a workshop related to group research methods or pedagogical approaches at a future INGRoup (Interdisciplinary Network for Group Research) conference? The INGRoup board has been soliciting workshops to be held before the start of the annual conference July 17, 2014 in Raleigh, North Carolina, USA – there is still time for your proposal by the December 18 deadline!

Workshops are offered as a service to our membership on topics related to group research, teaching, and practice, and typically are completed in one session of 3-8 hours. Those interested in leading a workshop should submit a short description including topic, facilitator bio/vita, materials, and other requirements. Expenses are typically covered through a participant fee, and workshop facilitators are given free INGRoup conference registration.

An INGRoup board committee will review workshop proposals to determine viability, priority, and potential interest.

Please submit your proposals by December 18 via email to Joann Keyton, VP & Conference Coordinator ([jkeyton@ncsu.edu](mailto:jkeyton@ncsu.edu)), and Steve Fiore, President & Chair ([sfiore@ist.ucf.edu](mailto:sfiore@ist.ucf.edu)).

Title	Fields	% on Groups	Overlap	AIS
Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes	A, M, S	10-25%	★★★★	2.59
Small Group Research	A, M, S	75-100%	★★★★	0.78
Journal of Management	A, M	5-10%	★★	4.08
Journal of Applied Psychology	A, M	10-25%	★★★★	3.70
Journal of Organizational Behavior	A, M	10-25%	★★★	2.10
Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology	A, M	5-10%	★	1.38
Leadership Quarterly	A, M	10-25%	★★★	1.35
Group & Organization Management	A, M	25-50%	★★★	1.27
European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology	A, M	10-25%	★★	1.08
Applied Psychology: An International Review	A	5-10%	★★	1.41
Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*	A	< 5%	★	1.25
Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*	A	< 5%	★	1.00
Human Performance	A	< 5%	★	0.75
Human Factors	A	< 5%	★★	0.73
Journal of Business and Psychology	A	< 5%	★★	0.71
Journal of Communication	C	< 5%	★	2.10
Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*	C	< 5%	★	2.04
Communication Research	C	5-10%	★★	1.32
Communication Monographs	C	5-10%	★	1.15
Administrative Science Quarterly	M	5-10%	★	5.62
Academy of Management Journal	M	5-10%	★★	5.59
Organization Science	M	10-25%	★★★	3.44
Journal of Management Studies	M	< 5%	★★	1.93
Organization Studies	M	< 5%	★	1.47
Human Relations*	M	5-10%	★★	1.26
Decision Sciences*	M	5-10%	★★	1.16
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology	S	< 5%	★	3.69
Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin	S	< 5%	★★	1.88
Social Psychology Quarterly	S	10-25%	★★★	1.77
Journal of Experimental Social Psychology	S	5-10%	★★★	1.57
British Journal of Social Psychology	S	5-10%	★★	1.30
Group Processes and Intergroup Relations	S	10-25%	★★★★	1.15
European Journal of Social Psychology	S	5-10%	★★	1.11
Social Psychology	S	< 5%	★★	0.84
Group Dynamics	S	50-75%	★★★★	0.79

**A** = Applied Psychology

**C** = Communication

**M** = Management

**S** = Social Psychology

**% on Groups** was computed by dividing the number of articles involving interaction between group members by total number of articles. For journals having separate sections, the denominator was the number of articles in the relevant section. Journals representing a wider range of topics (e.g., an entire field) obviously devote less of their space to groups or any other single topic.

**Overlap** was assessed as breadth and depth of coverage of topics presented at the 2013 meeting. Four stars indicate articles covering the vast majority of topics and multiple articles on most. Three stars indicates coverage of a large subset of topics, two stars coverage of a moderate subset, and so on.

**AIS** is the Article Influence Score, as reported in the 2012 Journal Citation Reports. This is similar to a 5-year impact factor, but (a) does not count citations from the journal in which the article was originally published (b) takes into account the visibility of the journals in which the articles are cited and (c) is normalized such that the average across all journals in the report equals 1.0.

\* Indicates a journal calling for papers on groups and teams but with low coverage, potentially indicating underutilization by groups researchers.

(RECAP from page 3)

Hendrik Wilhelm, Andreas Richter, and Thorsten Samrau received the Best Conference Paper Award.



Mary Zellmer-Bruhn received the Best Poster Award.

The Small Group Research Best Paper award went to Ken-



neth Goh, Paul Goodman, and Laurie Weingart.



Marshall Scott Poole received the 2013 Joseph E. McGrath



Award and will be our featured speaker at next year's conference in Raleigh, North Carolina. See you there!



(TRANSLATIONS from page 4)

are not the only answer in team science. But, they have a place, just like laboratory and field studies, just like journal articles, chapters, presentations and books. Translations are another tool in our information dissemination kit.

These translations matter in aviation, the military, the corporate world, in hospitals, at schools, in manufacturing, for emergency responders, in space and nuclear power industries, just to name a few. It matters because safety, creativity, decision-making, minimizing human error, security, saving lives is a team sport. And we have the science that helps them. Again, yes, translations matter! It matters, because it touches our lives and those around us. More are needed. These need to be reinforced, valued and embraced. We need to teach and educate the generations behind us about translations, I submit. We just need to demand them – they matter!

(MCGRATH from page 4)

cognitions, attitudes, and behaviors, (Lesson 3) Process is good for practice and outcomes are good for research, (Lesson 4) Debriefing should focus on best practices to improve team-work competencies, (Lesson 5) As a science, we know a lot about what works, (Lesson 6) Not all teams are created equal, (Lesson 7) The study of teams is multidisciplinary and no single discipline owns team science, and (Lesson 8) The 7 C's. The last lesson, the 7 C's, is not a twisted take on world geography, rather this is Dr. Salas's list of key elements to effective teams. The 7 C's of effective teams represents: Cooperation, Coordination, Communication, Cognition, Conflict, Coaching, and Conditions.

As a renowned contributor to the scientific body of groups and teams research with over 300 published journal articles and book chapters, Dr. Salas barely scratched the surface of his contributions to scientific research literature related to groups and teams. Nevertheless, Dr. Salas highlighted his contributions by reviewing select publications. Those publications included "Making Decisions Under Stress: Implications for Individual and Team Training," "Developing and Enhancing Teamwork in Organizations: Evidence-based Best Practices and Guidelines," and "TeamSTEPPS™: Team Strategies and Tools to Enhance Performance and Patient Safety." As a first time attendee of the annual INGRoup conference, it was indeed a pleasure to witness the colorful McGrath Lecture delivered by Dr. Salas, and it has been an honor, as an Associate Editor for the INGRoup Newsletter, to write a summary of the outstanding presentation of a renowned researcher, Dr. Eduardo Salas.

research project can benefit all parties involved. Adding a few items to your survey about a construct the company is interested in and generating technical reports are commonly used. Students often appreciate extra credit, or of course, monetary compensation.

4. Be efficient - Go for "two-fers"

With all the usual caveats regarding data slicing, try to design a research project where you can publish multiple papers. On one hand, this generates a safety net, on the other, you are maximizing the use of the participants' time. As an example, at INGRoup, a faculty member shared that she had been struggling to find an outlet for her focal dissertation research, whereas the backup study for additional participants was already published.

5. Be meticulous - But be prepared to be adaptable

I have yet to hear a researcher state "I designed a research project accounting for everything the reviewers desired and everything went precisely according to plan." While it is critically important to have a solid, well-vetted (ideally piloted) plan, try to build in slack as well; both in terms of time and resources.

cused, and easy going. The IACM compares, but has a somewhat bigger social/party scene. Two large dinners, a glamorous awards ceremony, and some thoroughbred party animals ensure a vibrant "group of friends" environment. The social scene at AoM, with receptions, cocktails and socials every day, is by all means a great scene to get introduced to many people, in a short time.

Taken together, AoM is a bit like Walmart, a huge one-stop shop with a something for everyone. But you have to seek to find what you're after. INGroup is like a Deli, you go there to get that one type of superb cheese or wine that you are after, and you will find many lovers of that cheese or wine there. While you're there you might scoop up something else. IACM is more like Cirque du Soleil; a specialized group, which by travelling around manages to reach quite a broad audience. Their variety in 'acts' allows for exploration of topics and methods. People go to Walmart, their Deli, or Cirque du Soleil to fulfill different needs. Different conferences fulfill different research needs. Having our research needs clear can help to determine which conferences we would like to attend, who we would like to interact with and how (i.e. paper, poster, discussion, symposium), and help us write strong budget proposals.

Good luck with your research!

**Nominations are now being solicited for open/upcoming positions**

The INGRoup Board of Directors is responsible for directing the activities of the Association and developing policies consistent with the mission of the Association. Each year, the INGRoup Board of Directors invites members to submit nominations for positions on the Executive Committee. Members who are interested in filling a non-elected board position (e.g., Local Arrangements Chair, Program Chair) should contact either Stephen M. Fiore (President) or Joann Keyton (Vice-Chair).

Open/Upcoming positions include:

- Conference coordinator (ASAP as coordinator-in-training; Joann will be done in 2014)
- Program chair-elect (ASAP; should be working with Norbert now)
- Student positions (appointed by board in spring)
- Board member cycle (Leslie's position is up in the spring), need election

For more information see <http://www.ingroup.net/about.html#board>



**Follow us on Facebook!**

[www.facebook.com/groups/248745988486627](https://www.facebook.com/groups/248745988486627)



**MemberClicks**

Don't lose that connection from the conference!

Use Memberclicks to find email addresses of other INGRoup members.

A benefit of being an INGRoup member is that you can login to the MemberClicks system and check the member directory. While you are there be sure to make sure your information is up to date. And don't forget to add a picture!

<https://ingr.memberclicks.net/>

**Interdisciplinary Network for Group Research (INGROUP)**

**CALL FOR PAPERS**

*Ninth Annual Conference*

July 17-19, 2014

Renaissance Raleigh North Hills Hotel

Raleigh, NC, USA

**Submission Deadline**

Submissions must be received by **Sunday, February 2, 2014** (11:59 p.m. EST). No extensions to the deadline will be granted.

**Overview**

Societies are dependent on the formation and utilization of groups and teams, making them relevant to countless aspects of life. Accordingly, scholars who study groups can be found across a wide array of disciplines (e.g., anthropology, communication, education, engineering, history, information systems, medicine, nursing, organizational behavior, philosophy, psychology, political science, public health, sociology). The Interdisciplinary Network for Group Research (INGROUP) was created to provide a context for scholars to:

- Promote communication about groups and teams research across fields and nations
- Advance understanding about group dynamics through research
- Advance theory and methods for understanding groups and teams
- Promote interdisciplinary research

The 9<sup>th</sup> Annual INGROUP Conference will be held so scholars across disciplines can come together, share information, and learn from one another. The conference program will include paper, poster, symposia, and panel sessions, a keynote address, and a business meeting open to all members so the future of INGROUP can be collectively planned and shaped.

**Submissions**

An online system (accessible via [www.ingroup.net](http://www.ingroup.net)) will be made available from November 1, 2013 to February 2, 2014 (23:59:59, Eastern Standard Time). All submissions must be accompanied by a 50-word abstract for inclusion in the conference program. Submitters will be required to provide full name, position, institution, discipline, and contact information for all authors. Submissions that include participants from a variety of disciplinary traditions are highly encouraged. Excluding poster submissions, scholars can be the presenting author on no more than two submissions. Submissions that involve research that has been previously presented at other professional conferences should be modified so that they are not identical to past presentations, and, most importantly, should be tailored to suit INGROUP's interdisciplinary audience. By submitting, at least one co-author from each paper within the symposium is committed to register for, and attend, the conference upon acceptance.

We accept the types of submissions listed below.

**Individual Submissions**

Submission for paper presentations and posters can take two forms: an extended abstract or a complete paper. Note, to be considered for the conference best paper awards, a "complete paper" submission is necessary.

- **Complete Paper.** A complete paper should (a) present original research or (b) develop, review, or critique group theory or group methods. In addition to the required 50 word abstract, complete papers can be up to 35 pages (tables and figures excluded from the page limit). Complete papers that are empirical should include the following: title, keywords, purpose,

methodology, results, conclusions, and references. Complete papers for theories, reviews, or critiques should include the following: title, keywords, purpose, scope of theory/critique/review, conclusions, and references. During the submission process, you will be asked to indicate your preference (not guaranteed) of presenting your paper as an oral presentation or in an interactive poster session. Only papers submitted in this category are considered for the Best Conference Paper Award and the Best Student Conference Paper Award.

- **Extended abstract.** Extended abstracts should be 1,500-to 3,000-words and may present original empirical research, theoretical development, reviews, or critiques. In addition to the required 50 word abstract, extended abstracts for empirical papers should include the following: title, keywords, purpose, methodology, results (preliminary if in early stages), conclusions, and key references. Extended abstracts for theories, reviews, or critiques should include the following: title, keywords, purpose, identify the scope of theory/critique/review, and references. During the submission process, you will be asked to indicate your preference (not guaranteed) of presenting your paper as an oral presentation or in an interactive poster session. Extended abstracts are intended for scholarship that is still in process. It is expected that a full paper will be completed and presented at the conference.
- **Poster.** Complete papers and extended abstracts can likewise be submitted for the sole purpose of participating in the interactive poster session. Poster submissions should meet the same requirements as the complete paper and extended abstract submissions described above. Posters will be evaluated by conference participants, and a Best Poster Award will be given.

### Organized Sessions

Submission for organized session presentations can take two forms: a symposium or a discussion panel. **Symposium paper sessions** involve individual presentations that are thematically related. **Panel discussions** are also thematically related but they are expected to be more interactive.

- **Symposium Paper Session.** A symposium paper session involves a submitter organized set of paper presentations developed around a common topic. Submissions should adequately describe an overarching theme that has relevance across disciplines. All else being equal, submissions that include participants from more than one discipline will be favored. A symposium can have either (a) 4 presentations or (b) 3 presentations and a discussant. Presenters should discuss research that directly relates to the overarching theme of the session. If a discussant is involved, his/her contribution should be described. In addition to a 50 word abstract describing the symposium, an overview paper for the symposium should be included and is expected to be between 900 and 1,500 words and describe the focal issue, participants' qualifications and expected contributions. A complete paper or extended abstract of each presentation must be included in this submission. Submitters should place all documents in one file. Note that a presentation within a symposium counts towards the presenting author limit of no more than two submissions.
- **Panel Discussions:** Panel submissions should aim to create a forum for scholarly discussion about issues related to the advancement of group theory and/or research. Submissions should describe an overarching theme that has relevance across disciplines. All else being equal, submissions that include participants from more than one discipline will be favored. A panel should have a moderator to facilitate discussion and can have up to 6 participants total (including the moderator). In addition to a 50 word abstract describing the panel discussion, a panel submission should be between 900 and 1,500 words and describe the focal issue, participants' qualifications, and expected contributions. Submissions should adequately describe a plan for facilitating discussion between panelists and/or the panel and audience, and should describe how such discussions could advance group theory and/or research. Submitters should place all documents in one file. Note that a presentation within a panel discussion counts towards the presenting author limit of no more than two submissions.

For each submission, you will be asked to indicate topics that characterize your submission. This information will help the program chair to identify reviewers that are experts in that area and to align your submission with other submissions that fit your areas of interest.

### Submission Procedures

Submissions will be reviewed by the program committee. The program chair will notify the submitter of acceptance by late March. Awards for Best Conference Paper, Best Graduate Student Paper, and Best Poster will be presented at the conference.

**The link for submission will be on the INGRoup website: <http://www.ingroup.net/> starting November. 1, 2013**

Registration consists of a few demographic questions and requires you to create a user name and password. Once registered, you will then be given several account options (Overview tab) as to how you can proceed.

Two of the options are very important to complete. First, “Your Submissions” will give you the option to submit a manuscript. Upon clicking this link, you will be given five different types of submission options (individual paper, individual extended abstract, poster, symposium paper session, panel discussion) and will then be able to submit your manuscript. The second account option is titled “Priority Topic Selection” and allows you to indicate topics that best represent your expertise as a reviewer. We would like to emphasize that the review process depends on submitters participating in the review process; we therefore hope that everyone registers as a reviewer by indicating priority topics.

Questions about the submission process? Contact the Program Chair, Norbert K. Semmer, at [norbert.semmer@psy.unibe.ch](mailto:norbert.semmer@psy.unibe.ch)

### Local Arrangements

The 2014 conference will be held at the Renaissance Raleigh North Hills Hotel (Raleigh, North Carolina, USA). A block of rooms have been reserved at the conference hotel July 13 through July 22, 2014 at the conference rate of \$169 (single or double). The deadline for room reservations is June 15, 2014. Reservations at the reduced room rate are on a first-come, first served basis. The reduced room rate is not guaranteed for reservations made after June 15, 2014. A phone number and website for room reservations through the hotel will be provided at [www.ingroup.net](http://www.ingroup.net).

### Questions about INGRoup or the 2014 Conference?

For more information, please go to [www.ingroup.net](http://www.ingroup.net), or contact a member of the organizing committee:

- Norbert K. Semmer (Program Chair), University of Bern (Switzerland)  
([norbert.semmer@psy.unibe.ch](mailto:norbert.semmer@psy.unibe.ch))
- Joann Keyton (Vice-chair, Conference Coordinator, and Local Arrangements Chair), North Carolina State University  
([jkeyton@ncsu.edu](mailto:jkeyton@ncsu.edu))
- Stephen M. Fiore (Chair and President), University of Central Florida ([sfiore@ist.ucf.edu](mailto:sfiore@ist.ucf.edu))

### Become a member of INGRoup!

For a nominal annual fee — \$65 regular membership (PhD, postdoc), \$20 student membership — you can support the ongoing operations of INGRoup. The money supports operating expenses like insurance and credit card processing fees, and development of new member services like upgrading and maintenance of our website. Your membership will help us to maintain stability as we continue to organize conferences showcasing research on groups and teams. In addition, members of INGRoup receive a discounted conference fee, a discount on workshop fees and can vote for Elected Board Member positions.



### INGRoup Communications

For more information on INGRoup go to [www.ingroup.net](http://www.ingroup.net).

You can also contact INGRoup at:  
INGRoup  
109 Castlefern Dr.  
Cary, NC 27513

Telephone: 919-460-5409  
Email: [ingroupscholars@gmail.com](mailto:ingroupscholars@gmail.com)  
Facebook: [www.facebook.com/groups/248745988486627](https://www.facebook.com/groups/248745988486627)