



## Inside This Issue

- 1 President's Column
- 2 2012 Board of Directors and Editorial Team
- 3 From the Editor Remembering
- 4 Continue President's column
- 6 INGRoup Endowment Announcement
- 7 2012 INGRoup Conference in Review
- 8 Announcing the 2013 INGRoup Pre-Conference Workshops!
- 9 Cross-over communication: What do you think?
- 11 Call for papers, Eighth Annual Conference July 11-13, 2013, Atlanta, GA, USA
- 13 Communications



### President's Column - The "ABC's" of Interdisciplinarity: Understanding Attitudinal, Behavioral, and Cognitive Factors Involved in Interdisciplinary Research

Stephen M. Fiore  
University of Central Florida

I begin this essay with a metaphor. For metaphors often help us to understand complex phenomena in ways literal language cannot. With that being said, I have always viewed disciplines to be like spotlights. While they are bright, the very precision of their light, that is their strength, is also their weakness. This precision precludes them from illuminating much beyond the point on which they shine. Now imagine that the phenomena scholars set out to understand, whether they be scientific or societal problems, are like spheres. A discipline can only shine its light on one small part of that sphere, with the amount of illumination rapidly diminishing beyond a finely focused point. Because of this, only one small point of that phenomenon is lit; only one small part of that problem understood. I submit that more light must be used to understand phenomena; light that goes beyond that which can be provided from a single discipline. To combine metaphors, multiple disciplines are like multiple spotlights and, collectively, they are able to illuminate that sphere from multiple perspectives. *Thus, multidisciplinary research brings that phenomenon more fully into the light, and more of that problem is understood.* But for such collective illumination to more fully emerge, these disciplinary spotlights must be coordinated. Such is the purpose of interdisciplinary research; a scholarly approach which:

integrates information, data, techniques, tools, perspectives, concepts, and/or theories from two or more disciplines or bodies of specialized knowledge to advance fundamental understanding or to solve problems whose solutions are beyond the scope of a single discipline or field of research practice (National Academies of Science, "Facilitating interdisciplinary research", 2004).

Stated more succinctly, interdisciplinary research sets out to integrate a set of disciplines with the goal being the creation of a new way of understanding and to do so in such a way that it is possible for a new discipline to evolve over time. It is a coordinated effort aimed at synthesizing theory and method from respective disciplines in service of meeting a broad and more complex goal. And so it is with INGRoup. As an organization, we exist to expose our members to the bright lights within disciplines, so that, collectively, we can coordinate our fields, and evolve our own understanding of phenomena associated with groups and teams.

(continues on page 4)

**Eighth Annual  
INGRoup  
Conference  
July 11-13, 2013  
Atlanta, GA, USA**

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS****PRESIDENT AND CHAIR**

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

**VICE CHAIR AND CONFERENCE COORDINATOR**

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

**SECRETARY**

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

**TREASURER**

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

**LOCAL ARRANGEMENTS CO-CHAIR (2013)**

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

**LOCAL ARRANGEMENTS CO-CHAIR (2013)**

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

**PROGRAM CHAIR (2013)**

Stephenson Beck, PhD  
Communication  
North Dakota State University  
Stephenson.Beck@ndsu.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**

Torsten Reimer, PhD  
Organizational Communication  
Purdue University  
treimer@purdue.edu

**EX-OFFICIO STUDENT MEMBER**

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

**WEBMASTER**

Josh Introne, Research Scientist  
MIT Center for Collective Intelligence  
jintrone@mit.edu

**INGROUP NEWSLETTER****EDITOR**

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

**ASSOCIATE EDITOR**

Kyle Emich  
Organizational Behavior  
Cornell University  
kjem514@gmail.com

**ASSOCIATE EDITOR**

Ana-Maria Godeanu  
Honeywell  
agodeanu@gmail.com

**Board of Directors at 2012 Conference**

**Back Row:** Ben Herndon, Joann Keyton, Stephen Fiore, Scott Tindale  
**Front Row:** Raquel Asencio Hodge, Michael Baumann, Ernest Park, Stephenson Beck, Mark Clark

*Have something of interest to  
the INGroup community?*

*Write a column for the  
newsletter!*

*Submissions Accepted in  
December  
March  
August*

*This 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*

## From the Editor

By Deanna M. Kennedy



In this issue of the newsletter we'll review the last conference held in Chicago, IL and start to motivate towards the next conference to be held July 2013 in Atlanta, GA. Before we jump in to our conversation though, we pause to acknowledge the passing of our colleague Patrick Laughlin. Below we remember Dr. Laughlin who passed away earlier this year.

In review of the past conference Ernest Park, Program Chair, and Scott Tindale, Local Arrangements Chair, provide an overview of the conference attendance, awards, and activities. As the report shows, the conference was packed with diverse perspectives and fun activities - you won't want to miss the next conference!

In this issue, we also have information about the Joseph E. McGrath Endowment. This endowment will help to fund two of INGRoup's awards given annually at the conference. These are the INGRoup Outstanding Student Conference Paper Award and the Joseph E. McGrath Lifetime Achievement Award. Both of these awards encourage and acknowledge the outstanding scholarship in groups and teams research. To find out more about how you can contribute to the endowment fund check out page 6 or the following link: <http://tinyurl.com/INGRoup-McGrath-Endowment>

While we start thinking about the next conference we want to keep the conversations flowing. As such, we are trying something new and it requires your participation! The newsletter team randomly selected INGRoup members to get their opinion about a cross-cutting team research

The newsletter team randomly selected INGRoup members to get their opinion about a cross-cutting team research question.

On October 15<sup>th</sup> the responses will be posted to the INGRoup Facebook page where you can "like" what's written and add your own opinions, comments, and suggestions.

question. The topic this newsletter comes from reading the *Science* article "Neuroscience: Breaking Down Scientific Barriers to the Study of Brain and Mind" by Eric R. Kandel, and Larry R. Squire (2000). Specifically, participants were asked: As neuroscience technologies continue to emerge and become more accessible, what potential applications and roles do you foresee these technologies will play in the study of groups and teams? Their responses are reported in this newsletter. On October 15<sup>th</sup> the responses will be posted to the INGRoup Facebook page where you can "like" what's written and add your own opinions, comments, and suggestions. As you will see, the responses provide the interdisciplinary perspectives that we enjoy from our INGRoup community. So take a break from grading midterms and join the conversation. This participative activity will get the creative juices flowing!

Also in this issue we look forward to next year's conference. Rhett Standifer announces the pre-conference workshops for next year. If you missed the Multi-level Modeling with R workshop at the last conference, you'll have another chance in Atlanta thanks to Bertolt Meyer. Additionally, Filip Agnessens will be presenting An Introduction to Social Network Analysis. The workshops are a great way to benefit from your INGRoup membership and augment your conference experience.

Finally, we conclude the newsletter with the Call for Papers to the Eight Annual Conference to be held in Renaissance Atlanta Midtown Hotel in Atlanta, Georgia, USA on July 11-13, 2013. See you there!

Kandel, E.R., Squire, J.R. (2000) Neuroscience: Breaking Down Scientific Barriers to the Study of Brain and Mind. *Science*, 290(5494), 1113-1120.  
DOI: 10.1126/science.290.5494.1113

## Remembering...

**Patrick Laughlin** passed away August 26, 2012. He received both a bachelor's and a master's degree from St. Louis University and a Ph.D. from Northwestern University. He taught at Loyola University, Chicago, from 1965 to 1970. He was Professor of Psychology at the University of Illinois from 1970 until his retirement. His research focused on how groups solve intellectual problems of all kinds. He provided seminal work on the topic of collection induction, the cooperative search for generalizations, rules, and principles. He published more than 50 publications on this topic.



(President's Letter continued)

As recognition of the importance of interdisciplinarity continues to grow, so too increases the need to understand how to facilitate such research. I have argued that interdisciplinary research is largely a problem of coordination; coordination of individuals needing to interact as a team (Fiore, 2008). As such, it consists of a complex blend of attitudinal, behavioral, and cognitive factors that arise when people with varied disciplinary backgrounds interact to achieve some shared goal. In this brief essay I provide representative examples of the types of attitudinal, behavioral, and cognitive issues that influence interdisciplinary collaborations. These are based upon 20 years of experience working in research environments with scholars ranging from philosophers, anthropologists, and sociologists, to historians, economists, and ecologists, to psychologists, computer scientists, and neuroscientists. This experience has helped to illuminate what creates challenges during interdisciplinary interactions and what also can contribute to effective collaborations. I present these as a series of representative definitions; that is, this list of definitions is not meant to be exhaustive, merely illustrative. Each of these is modified by the prefix "disciplinary" to illustrate the complex variety of issues that must be addressed for successful *interdisciplinary* research.

#### **Attitudinal Issues in Interdisciplinary Research**

First, what follows are what can be characterized as *attitudinal* issues. Often times, the interaction is stifled when collaborators maintain some form of *disciplinary disdain*. The characteristics of disciplinary disdain include holding a lack of respect or a form of contempt for another disciplinary approach, or condescension toward another discipline. As a sample context where this may manifest itself, this can characterize the view basic researchers sometimes show for applied research. A related attitudinal problem is that of *disciplinary arrogance*. This is characterized by an overbearing pride in one's own discipline and/or a belief that one's own method/theory/approach is superior to others. Disciplinary arrogance can characterize the view those in physical sciences sometimes have for the social sciences. Finally, an attitudinal concept that is not a challenge but more of a positive characteristic is *disciplinary tolerance*. This is an openness to, or acceptance of, ideas and inputs from those in other disciplines. Disciplinary tolerance is often manifest in research cultures that have a long history with, or some prior experience in, the benefits of interdisciplinarity (e.g., research centers).

#### **Behavioral Issues in Interdisciplinary Research**

Second, I next describe what can be characterized as *behavioral* issues. It is not uncommon for potential interdisciplinary collaborations to not even be considered due to what can be referred to as *disciplinary apprehension*. This is characterized as a fear of negative consequences resulting from one's treading into a new domain or discipline or from adopting a concept from another discipline. Disciplinary apprehension can characterize the consequence of negative reinforcement tenure-review committees may sometimes give young faculty for trying to work outside their field. A more subtle behavioral issue is that of *disciplinary ignorance*. This describes a lack of willingness on the part of a researcher to improve one's understanding of some problem he/she is trying to understand by considering or assimilating knowledge from another discipline. As an example, disciplinary ignorance can characterize a rigid experimentalist who will not pursue the adoption of potentially useful or relevant methods from field research. Last, a positive behavioral concept is that of *disciplinary benevolence*. This can be used to characterize when one within a discipline shows some form of charity or kindness towards those naïve about their discipline so as to encourage pursuit of potentially innovative ideas.

#### **Cognitive Issues in Interdisciplinary Research**

Third, I next describe what can be characterized as some of the *cognitive* issues that often arise from interdisciplinary research. Sometimes discipline bound researchers suffer from *disciplinary myopia*. This occurs when a scholar has an inability to see distant disciplines as clearly as near disciplines, hence the relevance of the other discipline is not apparent, and not even in view. This can manifest itself when, for example, scientists believe something is "not possible" because they cannot even imagine what might be feasible if alternative approaches were brought to bear on a given problem. Next is the common problem of *disciplinary multilingualism*. This arises when differing disciplines use the same term to describe different concepts or use a different term to describe similar concepts. This may arise when a discipline appropriates a term from another discipline – creating a form of *negative* common ground (i.e., the misperception that they are discussing something similar). Or it can occur when the varied epistemological approaches arising in differing disciplines leads them to label the same phenomenon differently. Finally, on the more positive side is what can be called *disciplinary naivety*. This describes one who is unhampered by knowledge of, or experience in, a given domain which can result in an "out of the mouths of babes" phenomenon

where fresh and productive insights emerge. In this sense, one is not “held back” or fixated on a particular way of thinking about a problem and is free to offer innovative solutions one within a discipline may never have considered.

### **A Role for Interdisciplinarity in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**

I conclude with a brief discussion of developments in thinking about interdisciplinary research at the policy level -- developments that all point to a clear role for interdisciplinary research in the next century, and, I submit, a prominent role for INGRoup. Nearly a decade ago, Kurt Salzinger wrote about the necessity for creating interdisciplinary cultures, cogently arguing “why” scholars need to look beyond their own discipline to understand phenomena. Specifically, he stated: “The way in which our universities have divided up the sciences does not reflect the way in which nature has divided up its problems” (Salzinger, 2003, p. 3). In 2006, at a meeting of the *Federation of Associations in Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, “true interdisciplinary” research was discussed in the context of its importance to, and relevance for, understanding the complex problems facing our planet. The challenge, as noted by Robert Croyle, Director, Division of Cancer Control and Population Sciences, at the National Cancer Institute, is that some larger disciplines think they are inter-disciplinary but are really intra-disciplinary. For example, he suggested that, sometimes, behavioral scientists in general, and psychologists in particular, are not broad enough in thinking about what it means to be interdisciplinary. He states that combining a clinical, social, and cognitive psychologist is still narrow by the standards of other fields. This illustrates the distinction between intra-disciplinary (i.e., interactions within a discipline) and inter-disciplinary research (i.e., interaction across disciplines). What Croyle and many others argue is that such disciplines need to collaborate across a broader span of scholarly approaches (e.g., collaborations across psychology, medicine, sociology, and computer science) for them to be viewed as less parochial.

Within academia, movements towards a greater role for interdisciplinary continue to emerge. Michael Crow, President of Arizona State University, has argued that research universities in the United States “are at a fork in the road”, asking, “do you replicate what exists, or do you design what you actually need?” His main argument is that research universities need to break away from the department-based model and instead build up excellence at problem focused, interdisciplinary research centers (see Macilwain, 2007). What is important to recognize is that

this movement is not about “applied” versus “basic” research. Such centers conduct interdisciplinary problem-focused research, but do so grounded in fundamental science. Thus, from the standpoint of education, these centers train students across disciplines, but do so by teaching students to address real problems. This is an important complement to the discipline or “department” bound model of graduate education and represents a move to an integrative model for Ph.D. training. Indeed, we are beginning to see graduate degrees become topic or problem-focused and not just discipline focused. For example, Georgia Tech’s Ph.D. in Human-Centered Computing focuses on designing and building new computing technologies that help people live better lives. Here the emphasis is on understanding how computers affect lives in terms of human capabilities and advances in computational powers and the ubiquity of computing. This research requires a fundamental understanding across multiple disciplines – ranging from Human Factors and Ergonomics to Assistive Technologies and Industrial Design to Cognitive Science, Sociology and Public Policy. Again, it is important to note that problem-focused education is not training for applied research. Rather, it is training in an area of inquiry that, to truly understand, requires education within and across a variety of disciplines/methods. And these new interdisciplinary Ph.D. programs stand the chance of making innovative contributions to many research projects in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. At the same time, this does not mean we will witness the disappearance of the discipline-based Ph.D. The deep expertise that comes from such scholarly pursuits will always be an important foundation for the production of knowledge. Nonetheless, traditional academic programs must also be mindful, and accepting, of those who choose the interdisciplinary path (Klein, 2010). Indeed, when arguing that disciplines can be considered social constructions, Wendy Leeds-Hurwitz suggests that disciplines can sometimes be conceptualized as “temporary constructions, useful for socializing a new generation of researchers, rather than as limits placed upon mature scholars” (pp. 5-6, 2012). Therefore, those who choose to move beyond traditional academic boundaries should not be limited, but, rather, encouraged in the 21<sup>st</sup> century University. And it is our responsibility as groups and teams researchers to ensure that we contribute to the understanding and improvement of interdisciplinary inquiry.

### **Concluding Thoughts**

My goal with this brief essay was not necessarily to convince the reader of the importance of interdisciplinarity; for its importance to INGRoup is self-

evident. Rather, I chose to discuss the nature of the interactions required for interdisciplinary research, so as to facilitate an understanding of the coordination necessary for it to succeed. For, only when departments and disciplines are better able to combine and coordinate their spotlights, will we truly be able to illuminate the beauty of all of nature, and appreciate its complexity in full.

### References

- Fiore, S. M. (2008). Interdisciplinarity as teamwork: How the science of teams can inform team science. *Small Group Research*, 39(3), 251-277.
- Klein, J. T. (2010). *Creating Interdisciplinary Campus Cultures: A Model for Strength and Sustainability*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Leeds-Hurwitz, W. (2012). These fictions we call disciplines. *Electronic Journal of Communication/La Revue Electronique de Communication*, 22(3-4). Available from: <http://www.cios.org/www/ejcmmain.htm>.
- Macilwain, C. (2007). The Arizona Experiment. *Nature*, 446, 968-970.
- National Academies of Science. (2004). *Committee on Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Salzinger, K. (2003). Moving Graveyards. *Psychological Science Agenda, Summer*, 3. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

## *MemberClicks*

Want to find someone from the conference?

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, add a picture!

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

# INGRoup Endowment Announcement

The Joseph E. McGrath Endowment will both recognize the achievements of senior scholars who have followed in Joe's footsteps and, importantly, encourage and reinforce the work of outstanding younger group researchers. Specifically, the Interdisciplinary Network for Group Research (INGRoup), a professional association dedicated to the growth of group research across disciplines, seeks to generate a \$20,000 endowment to fund two activities in perpetuity.

1. *The INGRoup Outstanding Student Conference Paper Award*. This monetary award will recognize the most outstanding submission by a student to each annual INGRoup conference program.[1]
2. *The Joseph E. McGrath Lifetime Achievement Award*. This award recognizes senior scholars who have made significant contributions to small group research throughout their careers. Winners will be given lifetime INGRoup membership and have fees for conference attendance waived the year they receive their award. Previous winners of the Lifetime Achievement Award include Richard Hackman, John Levine, Richard Moreland, and Eduardo Salas.

We hope that you will join us in contributing to the endowment to support these two awards. INGRoup is a registered 501(c)(3) organization, and all contributions are tax-deductible. An online donation form can be found using the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/INGRoup-McGrath-Endowment>

If you have additional questions about INGRoup, the McGrath Award, or this fundraising effort, please contact Laurie Weingart (Past-president and committee chair) ([weingart@cmu.edu](mailto:weingart@cmu.edu)), Stephen Fiore (President) ([sfiore@ist.ucf.edu](mailto:sfiore@ist.ucf.edu)) or Joanne Keyton (Vice-chair) ([jkeyton@ncsu.edu](mailto:jkeyton@ncsu.edu)).

---

[1] This paper can be co-authored with a faculty advisor but the student must be first author. Only the student author(s) will receive the monetary portion of the award, and submissions must include certification that the student is the lead author.

## 2012 INGRoup Conference in Review

*Ernest Park, 2012 Program Chair, and Scott Tindale, 2012 Local Arrangements Chair*

On the evening of July 12th, group researchers from around the world gathered together in the Windy City to officially kick off the Seventh Annual INGRoup Conference. Situated in the Doubletree Hotel along the Magnificent Mile, the opening dinner on Thursday was followed by a welcome reception that included drinks and conversation by the hotel's outdoor pool area. Friday and Saturday were filled with conference presentations and other social events. On Saturday evening, the conference concluded at Chicago's Museum of Contemporary Art, where attendees had free reign to enjoy the museum, and were treated to music by The Caroline Davis Quartet and food catered by Wolfgang Puck.

Over the course of the weekend, conferees also took advantage of the wonderful array of restaurants that Chicago has to offer. Beforehand, conference organizers secured dinner reservations at different types of restaurants so people could sign up, form dining groups, and go out into the city together. Depending on one's taste, whether it be for Italian, tapas, or teriyaki, like-minded attendees then had the opportunity to socialize while wining and dining at the restaurant of their choice. Some also visited the food festival "Taste of Chicago" which just happened to be going on during the conference weekend. Another way conferees got to spend and enjoy time together was by visiting the Art Institute of Chicago. One of the highlights of the Institute's many exhibits was a Roy Lichtenstein retrospective, the first-ever major exhibition spanning this pop artist's 50 year career. Except for a few downpours, the weekend weather was accommodating and conferees took full advantage of the sights and sounds of the "city on the lake." A good time in Chicago was had by all.

Of course though, attendees devoted most of their time and attention to the scholarly-side of the conference program, which could not have been crafted without the help of the 108 Program Committee Members who volunteered their time to review the submissions. Ultimately, the conference program included a poster session made up of 20 poster presentations, a Keynote Address by co-presenters Richard

Moreland and John Levine, and 35 separate sessions of presentations. These presentations included 7 panel sessions, 3 symposia, and 94 competitively selected papers. Presenting authors came from Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, England, Finland, France, Germany, Israel, Japan, the Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Switzerland, and the United States.

A wide range of disciplines were also represented in the conference program. The largest percentage of authors came from I-O Psychology (32.5%),

followed by Organizational Behavior (22%), Social Psychology (17.1%), Communications (8.2%), and Cognitive Psychology (2.6%). The remaining 17.5% of authors came from other disciplines (e.g., Computer Science, Kinesiology, Sociology).

As is tradition, during one of the luncheons several scholars were recognized and received awards for the work they presented at the INGRoup conference. The 2012 Outstanding Conference Paper Award went to Nathan Pettit, and the recipients for the 2012 Best Conference Poster Award were Julia C. Seelandt, Franziska Tschan, Norbert K. Semmer, Sandra Keller, Anita Kurmann, Daniel Candinas, & Guido Beldi for Concentration Ability and Stress in the OR: Effects of Distractors and Collaboration Quality. The 2012 winner of the Joseph E. McGrath Award for the Lifetime Achievement in the Study of Groups was Eduardo Salas, an instrumental advocate for INGRoup who was received by a standing ovation from the audience.



In conclusion, we hope people departed the conference with new friends, new ideas, and fond memories. And as always, we hope people will continue presenting their work at future INGRoup conferences so the study of groups and teams remains vibrant and our knowledge about groups and teams continues to grow.



2012 Conference Attendees

## Announcing the 2013 INGRoup Pre-Conference Workshops!

By Rhetta Standifer, Workshop Organizer



Rhetta  
Standifer



Bertolt  
Meyer



Filip  
Agneessens

A new tradition continues! The workshops at the 2012 Seventh Annual INGRoup conference in Chicago, IL were a great success and so we plan to host two workshops again next year in Atlanta. These workshops will be held Thursday afternoon, July 11<sup>th</sup>, featuring topics of interest to our members. The workshops will run from 12:30-5pm. Workshop costs include materials and an afternoon snack break. Both workshops will be held at the conference hotel.

Registration for both workshops closes on June 1st 2012. The price of both workshops is \$90 for members; \$180 for nonmembers. Be sure to register early as seating is limited and we expect both to fill early!

### Workshop: Multilevel Modeling with R

We will once again host a Multilevel Modeling with R workshop, facilitated by Dr. Bertolt Meyer from the University of Zurich. In this workshop, Dr. Meyer first provides a brief introduction of R and a statistical

background on multilevel modeling. The rest of the workshop is spent getting hands-on experience with R and with multilevel modeling using examples from Dr. Meyer. In addition, attendees will learn how to import data from SPSS for performing their own analyses. Prior to the workshop, attendees will receive an extensively-commented syntax file that includes all the examples and calculations needed, including detailed download instructions for installing R on most popular operating systems. Attendees will also receive a list of reference cards with necessary commands for using R.

### Workshop: An Introduction to Social Network Analysis for Research on Teams and Organizations

Our second workshop is titled An Introduction to Social Network Analysis for Research on Teams and Organizations and will be facilitated by Filip Agneessens from the University of Groningen, Netherlands and ICS. This workshop is an introduction to main concepts in social network analysis (including measures and methods) that are important for organizational research and group research in particular. The free, open-source statistical environment R is used. The first topic focuses on measures of the position of a person in a network (including centrality and Burt's structural holes). That is followed by a discussion of measures of team structure (such as density, centralization, indices for hierarchy, homophily and transitivity/closure). Classic and recent empirical studies are used as examples.



### *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 2013 INGRoup program. You can make a donation at the "Be a Grouper" tab on our website or send your contribution payable to INGRoup to:

INGRoup  
c/o Benjamin Herndon  
INGRoup treasurer  
311 Beverly Road  
Atlanta, GA 30309

For more information, contact Benjamin Herndon at Benjamin.Herndon@mgt.gatech.edu.



## Cross-over Conversation: What do you think?

Three members of INGRoup responded to the following prompt:

----

*Neuroscience technologies provide a platform for new types of cross-disciplinary research. For example, technologies can be used to objectively determine what people notice, pay attention to, and retain from media sources. As neuroscience technologies continue to emerge and become more accessible, what potential applications and roles do you foresee these technologies will play in the study of groups and teams?*

---

These responses will be reprinted to the INGRoup Facebook page October 15th.

**We want to know what you think!**

Be sure to login to Facebook to like or comment on these submissions.



### 1.

The emergence of neuroscience technologies -- neuroimaging and electrophysiology -- presents a tremendous opportunity to deepen our understanding of interactions within teams. Using these technologies in well-designed experiments will allow us to clearly map abstract concepts, such as cognition and emotion, on to specific neural structural units of individual team members. Thus, a key role that these technologies can play is to introduce increased objectivity in our measures. First, we could more accurately determine how information is processed by team members. Take, for instance, the information encoding process. Existing measures -- such as memory tests -- can be misleading as it measures information that team members are conscious of and that they, in turn, report. But it is possible that the members might have attended to the information and encoded it at the time, they failed to store the information and, thus, were unable to retrieve it accurately when required. Second, we could more precisely identify complex relations between cognition and emotion. A measure of affective states of team members as they encode, store and retrieve information would help us to pinpoint the reciprocal influence of affect and cognitive processing on individual team members and to understand how affect could 'spread' between team members.

We could also apply these technologies to better understand social exchange and cooperation in groups. Members have certain expectations from others in their team. The brain interprets and reconstructs the information that these team members gather during their interactions, according to these prior expectations. For instance, if team members expect reciprocity in their interaction, they will

update information about reciprocal actions from one member differently than they would non-reciprocal actions. Thus, by examining how information is updated by team members we could better understand what drives cooperation in groups.

Naina Gupta  
Division of Strategy, Management and Organization  
Nanyang Business School  
Nanyang Technological University

### 2.

If we liken the human brain to a computer, neuroscientific data is like the stream of 0's and 1's that goes inside its main processing unit. However, we, group scientists and social scientists in general, are typically more interested in the algorithms that get executed and how data is represented and stored. As with computers, it is sometimes possible to reverse engineer high level constructs, like algorithms and system design from low level streams of signals. More often than not, however, this is not the best way to learn about the abstractions that we make and the ways in which we represent our knowledge. And after all, it is those abstractions and representations that enable us to operate in a complex environment. With this metaphor in mind, I am somewhat skeptical about the direct contribution that neuro-scientific data might have on group research.

Yet, despite the above objection I think that the use of neuroscientific data may provide some new opportunities, that although indirectly, may advance the field of group

research. First, it will force us to develop theories that justify “moving down a level.” Is the neural activity the right level for describing and explaining group processes? Why not moving down more levels, and explain groups as movements of basic sub-atomic particles? Such a discussion is an important extension to the micro-meso-macro discussions we have in our field, and is a prerequisite for making data at a new level useful. Second, such data may sharpen our senses in identifying new patterns, now overlooked. After all, we design measures based on existing conceptions, and we typically find things that we look for. However, looking at the stream of 0's and 1's, that make very little sense in the first place, will force us to have a fresh look at the data, identifying new patterns that may result in identifying new explanatory constructs.

Last, introducing neuroscience into the field of group research is likely to have a welcome side-effect: new researchers from different disciplines will become involved with questions and subject matter that we value. I anticipate that such involvement may generate a stream of new and creative ideas that will eventually advance our field and our understanding of teams and groups.

Amit Gal  
Management  
Tel Aviv University

### 3.

One aspect of neuroscience that I think could be of significant value in the study of group behavior is the examination of the neural foundations of attention. As Dean Hewes noted in a National Communication Association panel several years ago concerned with what

was distinctive about groups as opposed to aggregates, groups are unique in that they require dividing one's attention among multiple people, and to this I might add that groups also require quick changes in attentional focus from one group member to another. Attention is of course affected by arousal, and both arousal and attention ebb and flow during group discussion. One interesting question would be the impact of various events on arousal, attention, and, I presume, relevant neuronal activity. For example, one would think that conflict would increase neuronal activity, and I can imagine a mutual causal relationship in which such increase feeds back on conflict intensity. Would the successful completion of a task result in a corresponding decrease? Another very interesting issue is whether there is synchrony among group members in the ebbs and flows of neuronal activity over time? If so, perhaps this could tell us something theoretically interesting about group cohesiveness.

According to that font of all useful information, Wikipedia, the subfield of neuroeconomics is concerned with the relationship between brain and decision making, and the encyclopedia entry specifically points to social decision making as an area of relevant study. Much of what is described in the entry is group-relevant, such as the search for the underpinnings of cooperation. The concept of trust is mentioned in the context of the prisoner's dilemma, but I consider trust to be at the basis of all cooperative group behavior, and so its neural basis (associated by the author with the hormone oxytocin) could well be of theoretical interest.

Charles Pavitt  
Department of Communication  
University of Delaware



## INGRoup 2013 Saturday Night Social Caroline Davis Quartet at the Museum of Contemporary Art Chicago





## Interdisciplinary Network for Group Research (INGROUP)

### CALL FOR PAPERS

*Eighth Annual Conference*

July 11-13, 2013

Renaissance Atlanta Midtown Hotel

Atlanta, GA, USA

### Submission Deadline

Submissions must be received by **Thursday, January 31, 2013** (10 p.m. EST).

### 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, history, information systems, 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 8<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, 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 late-November, 2012, to January 31, 2012. All submissions must be accompanied by a 50-word abstract for inclusion in the conference program. Provide full name, position, institution, discipline, and contact information for all presenters. Submissions that include participants from a variety of disciplinary traditions are highly encouraged. Scholars can be the presenting author on no more than three submissions. Late submissions will not be accepted. 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 the INGROUP's interdisciplinary audience. Manuscripts accepted for publication cannot be submitted for presentation at the conference. We accept the types of submissions listed below.

### Papers

Submission for paper presentations can take two forms: an extended abstract or a complete paper. Note, to be considered for the conference best paper awards, complete paper submissions are necessary.

- *Papers.* A complete paper should (a) present original research or (b) develop, review, or critique group theory or group methods. Complete papers can be up to 35 pages, inclusive (tables and figures excluded from the page limit). Complete papers 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.

- *Extended abstract.* Extended abstracts should be 1,500-to 3,000-words and present original empirical research (Note: Conceptual or theoretical manuscripts that develop, review, or critique group theory or group methods must be submitted as *papers*). Extended abstracts for empirical papers should include the following: title, keywords, purpose, methodology, results (preliminary if in early stages), conclusions, and key 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 research projects that are still in process. Manuscripts must be complete by the time of the conference.

### Sessions

Submission for session presentations can take two forms: a symposium or a panel. Symposium sessions are primarily presenter-oriented, while panel sessions are highly interactive.

- *Symposium.* Symposia 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, the role and contribution of the different roles should be discussed. Submissions should be between 900 and 1,500 words and describe the focal issue, participants' qualifications and expected contributions. Each presentation within the symposium should be described by a title and abstract of up to 150 words. By submitting, at least one co-author from each paper is committed to register for, and attend, the conference upon acceptance.
- *Panel:* Panel submissions should adequately describe an overarching theme that has relevance across disciplines. Panel submissions should aim to create a forum for scholarly discussion about contemporary issues related to the advancement of group theory and/or research. 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). Submissions should be between 900 and 1500 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. By submitting, all participants are committed to register for, and attend, the conference upon acceptance.

- 

### Submission Procedures

Submissions will be reviewed by the program committee. The program chair will notify the submitter of acceptance by late March. Best Paper and Best Student Paper Awards (based on full paper submissions), and Best Poster awards will be presented at the conference. All session participants must register for and attend the conference; all accepted papers must be presented by one of the authors.

### Local Arrangements

The 2013 conference will be held at the Renaissance Atlanta Midtown Hotel, in Atlanta, GA. A block of rooms have been reserved at the conference hotel July 9 through July 14, 2013 at the conference rate of \$144.00 (single, double, triple, quad). A phone number and website for room reservations through the hotel will be provided at [www.ingroup.net](http://www.ingroup.net). The conference fee includes conference programming; a welcome dinner reception on the evening of July 11; morning and afternoon breaks and lunch on July 12 and 13; and a closing reception on July 13. For more information, please go to [www.ingroup.net](http://www.ingroup.net), or contact a member of the organizing committee:

- Stephenson J. Beck (Program Chair), North Dakota State University ([ndsuingroup@ndsu.edu](mailto:ndsuingroup@ndsu.edu))
- Leslie DeChurch/Ben Herndon (Local Arrangements Co-Chairs), Georgia Tech University ([leslie.dechurch@psych.gatech.edu](mailto:leslie.dechurch@psych.gatech.edu); [benjamin.herndon@gmail.com](mailto:benjamin.herndon@gmail.com))
- Joann Keyton (Vice-chair and Conference Coordinator), 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))

## *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)

To stay on top of INGRoup announcements, consider joining INGRoup on Facebook. The INGRoup Facebook page is designed to facilitate communication among our members, and promote discussion regarding all topics relevant to groups. The Facebook group can be found at:  
[www.facebook.com/groups/248745988486627](http://www.facebook.com/groups/248745988486627)