**President’s Essay**

**On Identity and Interdisciplinarity**

“How has it changed you? A simple question that proved deceptively complex. A decade ago I was asking this question in Washington DC during a “Blue Ribbon” panel review for a center proposal on which I had been working. The center my colleagues and I were proposing was very large, spanning funding for a decade, included dozens of scientists from multiple disciplines, and required tens of millions of dollars. As such, the review panel was made up of, not just top scientists from varied disciplines, but also of university and foundation presidents. Over the prior year, my colleagues and I had passed multiple layers of review, and this was the final evaluation. And this was not just a smart group of reviewers, but a very experienced, and wise, group of reviewers. This one question was asked in the context of the diversity plan for our center and it was a follow-up to a description of the diversity initiatives we developed. Based upon partnerships with organizations supporting under-represented groups in science, we put together an integrated set of professional development plans coupled with research thrusts where we had wove diversity into our scientific plans. How has it changed you? The question was probing, not ‘what’ we were doing to change the demographics of science. Rather, it was asking how our interactions with diverse others had changed us, in particular, the way we understood the scientific questions. It was asking how our collaboration had altered and broadened our way of thinking; asking, how it had changed us.

I often think back on this question in the context of interdisciplinarity. Formally, interdisciplinary research is defined as an approach that integrates information, data, techniques, tools, perspectives, concepts, or theories from more than one discipline or body of specialized knowledge. The goal is to advance fundamental understanding or to solve problems whose solutions are beyond the scope of a single discipline or field of research practice. Note that this is in comparison to multidisciplinary research where complementary contributions are drawn from different disciplines. These contributions are pooled in some manner to produce a broader understanding of a given problem. But, when defining these two cross-disciplinary approaches, the question of ‘identity’ is often brought into the discussion. Some argue that, when engaged in multidisciplinary research, scholars remain firmly anchored in the concepts and methods of their respective disciplines. That is, they remain unchanged. In contrast, by juxtaposing and integrating ideas and approaches, those engaged in interdisciplinary research are said to, themselves, be changed. And it is this idea that should resonate with many of us. For we work with other disciplines, not just to inform us, not just to change our way of thinking and how we perceive the world around us, but also to change us. With interdisciplinary research, we create something that did not exist before; something not possible without bringing together disparate disciplines. But we, too, no longer exist in the same form. So creating something new applies both to the production of knowledge and to the scholars involved. Not only are interdisciplinary scholars creating new ideas, their identity is evolving along with their knowledge.

This is clearly something in which I believe. In fact, I often begin my talks about collaboration in research with a joke about “preaching the gospel of interdisciplinary research”. And this brings me to my next point; that of connecting this idea of preaching about the value of interdisciplinarity with engaging in interdisciplinary scholarship. For, in the word discipline, hidden in plain sight, is an etymological connection to the word “disciple”. Both discipline and disciple have as their etymological origin, the word, “discipulus” which comes from the Latin, “discere” which means, “to learn” or “learner”.

More interestingly, though, when considering the formal definitions for each word, we see some intriguing ideas. On the one hand, the primary definition of discipline is “the practice of training people to obey rules or a code of behavior, using punishment to correct disobedience.” On the other hand, we have the definition with which we, as scholars, are most familiar, “a branch of knowledge, typically one studied in higher education.” I call out these two somewhat distinct definitions because, when doing interdisciplinary research, we choose to move beyond our home discipline and we are, indeed, often punished for

(Continued on page 4)
**From the Editor**

As you prepare for the INGRoup conference, enjoy this latest version of the newsletter and the wonderful stories and photos from members at last year’s conference.

In this issue, Norbert Semmer, University of Bern and the Program Chair of 2014, provides a detailed look at last year’s conference. His report shows that we had 189 participants at the conference and 71 of those were first time attendants! Further, the attendees come from a number of geographic areas and academic disciplines, thus making our conference experience truly interdisciplinary.

Deanna M. Kennedy  
University of Washington Bothell

In this issue, we feature a number of our members. First, we profile Esther Sackett, a student at the Fuqua School of Business at Duke University pursuing her degree in Management and Organization. Esther is the new INGRoup student board member and she talks about her ideas for student activities and engagement.

Second, we highlight Tomi Laapotti and Leena Mikkola from the Communication Department at the University of Jyväskylä. They travelled from Finland to engage in the interdisciplinary conversation with team scholars at INGRoup. And they won an award for their poster: *Message Functions in Hospital Management Group Meetings*. If you see them at the 2015 conference be sure to ask them about Finland as INGRoup is making arrangements to hold the 2016 conference in Helsinki!

Finally, our Associate Editor, Kyle Emich, interviewed two INGRoup members that have taken on new roles at *Group and Organization Management*. M. Travis Maynard (Management) from Colorado State University, and Lucy Gilson (Management) at the University of Connecticut, are now associate editors with the journal and in their interview they discuss their perspective on the types of submissions that should target the journal. As well, Travis and Lucy talk about approaches for creating a successful submission that may be especially interesting for new scholars. Hopefully, this newsletter will inspire you as you head off to the 10th Annual INGRoup Conference this July 23-25, 2015 in Pittsburgh, PA!
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**Graduate Student Profile: Esther Sackett**

Esther is a fourth year PhD student in Management & Organizations at the Fuqua School of Business at Duke University, where she works primarily with Dr. Jonathon Cummings and Dr. Gráinne Fitzsimons. She has a BA in Anthropology from Ithaca College and a MPA in Health Policy and Management from NYU, and worked for several years in the health care industry prior to beginning her doctoral studies. Esther's interest in groups and teams research stems from her professional experience managing interdisciplinary teams and projects, and her decision to become a researcher came out of a desire to improve our understanding of collaborative processes. As a doctoral student, Esther’s research focuses on the intersection of goal systems, collaboration, and team cognition. She is interested in how members of teams navigate the multiple goals they may be pursuing at any given time, including shared team goals as well as the goals that each member is pursuing outside of the team (i.e., extra-team goals). Esther is currently conducting qualitative and experimental studies to investigate the role of team mental models (TMM) of these extra-team goals, examining how the relationships between team goals and extra-team goals influence the development of these TMMs as well their impact on goal outcomes.

As a graduate student member of the INGRoup board, Esther is interested in pursuing efforts to foster a strong community of student members as well as to involve more students in broader INGRoup activities and interactions, both during and outside of the annual conference. Plans for a doctoral consortium at the 2015 conference are currently underway. The consortium will focus on a number of professional development and research topics of interest to students, as well as being a great networking opportunity. In addition, Esther is working on developing several other ideas for student involvement. The first is an interdisciplinary mentorship program, where student members would be paired with a senior member of INGRoup. The aim of the mentorship program is to help new (and current) student members to network with faculty members who are doing research on groups and teams outside their home institution (and in other disciplines) in a more formal way. Another idea is to create a graduate student page on the INGRoup website (an effort started by the past graduate student board member, Raquel Acensio Hodge), which could draw attention to ways to get involved with the organization’s activities. In particular, there are many opportunities for students to be involved with communications activities, such as the newsletter, YouTube videos, and social media. Finally, Esther would like to develop a “how to” kit on hosting local, interdisciplinary mini-conferences on groups and teams. Local or regional mini-conferences are a great way for students to continue to foster meaningful connections and exchange ideas with students who share their interests outside of the annual conference.
2014 INGRoup Conference Summary

Conference Summary from the Program Chair

The 2014 INGRoup Conference had 189 participants, 71 of which were first-time attendants. Most of them (about 75%) came from the US, the others from 13 other countries, with Canada and the Netherlands (17 each) and Switzerland being predominant, followed by Denmark and Germany (6 each), and Portugal (5); other countries (Belgium, Finland, France, Korea, Spain, Sweden, and the UK) had between 1 and 3 participants. There were 111 contributions, of which 74 were papers, 28 were posters, 5 were panels, and 4 were symposia.

First authors came mainly from management (49%), followed by psychology (24%), organizational behavior (15%) and communication (7%). Note that these affiliations may be somewhat misleading, as they reflect the current institution where people work, and not their training. I assume that many people working in organizational behavior and management have an education in psychology and that psychology is probably the most prominent field in terms of training background.

I feel that we should try to reach more people from communication, but also from sociology and computer science. The number of participants has been subject of discussion for quite a few years. Many participants have indicated they liked the very personal atmosphere at INGRoup conferences, and this impression was communicated for the 2014 conference as well.

The Graduate Student Experience at INGRoup

Can INGRoup get any better? Sometimes, I doubt it. My second year attending the INGRoup conference was different - but just as wonderful as the first. I found that some things do not change: I was pleased to meet new colleagues with similar collaborative interests at Poster sessions, Performance 1, and Emotion in Groups. I was again tested in note taking speed during sessions that challenged and inspired further development of my own research program (Multiteam Panel, Team Adaptation). New experiences this year included an unexpected session led by the NC University graduate students in their attempt to gain insight and guidance for their own interdisciplinary project; and falling in love with process modeling as illuminated by Dr. Poole’s keynote.

As usual, support and encouragement abounded from peers and mentors alike. While I enjoy AOM and SIOP, with all the chaotic processes those huge conferences entail – they seem to be a great place to ‘visit’; whereas INGRoup feels more like ‘home’. It was a great year to be at INGRoup – and I’m renewing my efforts to convince my graduate classmates to join me in Pittsburgh!

The International INGRoup Experience

Contributed by Tomi Laapotti and Leena Mikkola, University of Jyväskylä

The INGRoup 2014 conference in Raleigh was the first INGRoup conference experience for Tomi and the second one for Leena. Attending INGRoup was an obvious choice for us because our research is mainly focused on small group communication and, despite our communication perspective, we work at the crossroads of disciplines such as management, administrative science, or organizational sciences. And of course Leena’s positive experience from INGRoup 2012 in Chicago guided our decision making. In the conference, interdisciplinarity was clearly more of added value than an impediment, which means that the interdisciplinary audience was well taken into account in all the presentations we saw. During the conference we received a lot of support as to the value and unique character of our data gathered in authentic hospital meetings. We will do our best to get the most out of it. One of our observations from the conference was that there is clearly a need for more research based on authentic
failing to obey the rules and/or follow a code of behavior. Looking at this in the context of the primary meaning of disciple, we can now see ‘why’ that punishment may emerge. For a disciple is “a follower or student of a teacher, leader, or philosopher”. When that disciple chooses to seek out another to follow, s/he is punished or even ostracized.

Reflecting upon the connection between these words is both fascinating and provocative. It shines a light on the blind devotion many have for their ‘faith’, that is, to their home discipline. To put it bluntly, we are often disciples of our discipline. Our identity is our discipline and our discipline is our identity. We hold a blind faith to that which we have been taught and we defend these beliefs furiously. The Doctorate of Philosophy is the most rigorous intellectual training through which we can put ourselves. It is obvious that it changes us from the standpoint of becoming a learned scholar. But the Ph.D. does much, much more. As with the definition of discipline, it is a process of mental training. We are inculcated with a way of thinking. We are instilled with a system of rules of conduct and a body of knowledge. We are indoctrinated into a home discipline. The process of earning a Ph.D., in a very real sense, leads us to become a disciple of that discipline.

It is from this that we can see how tension might emerge during interdisciplinary research. When confronted with the perspective of those from other disciplines, we face many possibilities. We may be faced with the prospect of, at least, recognizing that our knowledge is incomplete. Or we may have to acknowledge that our understanding is incorrect. We might even come to the realization that we are wrong about our understanding of the world. The tension, then, comes from being confronted with the very real possibility of changing our identity. For those of us who are interdisciplinary scholars, this may not seem worrisome. Indeed, for many of us, it is invigorating. But, what we must recognize is that, for others, this can be a very frightening prospect. And this is what we must always keep in mind. We need to consider this when talking with others outside our home departments. We need to ensure that this is part of our thinking when at conferences and in a dialogue with others from other disciplines. We need to be metacognitive of this when working with others on interdisciplinary teams. I’ll add, though, that we must also be compassionate. We must recognize that any conflict emerging may not be interpersonal. And it may not be intellectual. It could very well be a conflict in identity. For we must realize that, in a very real way, we may be asking those of us with whom we are interacting, to change, not just how they think, but who they are. And, then, we must be mindful to preach the gospel of interdisciplinarity.

2014 INGRoup Award Winners!!!

James E. McGrath Award for Lifetime Achievement in the Study of Groups
Norbert L. Kerr (Accepting is Richard Moreland, Upper Left)

Richard Hackman Dissertation Award Winner
Ethan S. Bernstein (Upper Right)
Does Privacy Make Groups More Productive?

Richard Hackman Dissertation Award Finalists (Not Pictured)
Ishani Aggarwal, Cognitive Style Diversity in Teams
Kenneth Goh, Interactive Processes in Creative Project Teams
Catherine Shea, Goal Pursuit and the Pursuit of Social Networks
Mengxiao Zhu, Assembly of Successful Teams

Best Conference Paper
Jesse Shore, Ethan Bernstein and David Lazer (Not Pictured)
Facts and Figuring: An Experimental Investigation of Group Network Structure and Performance in Information and Solution Spaces

Best Graduate Student Paper:
Sarah P. Doyle, Robert B. Lount, Steffanie L. Wilk, and Nathan C. Pettit (Center Right)
Status Distance as a Determinant of Co-Worker Helping in Organizational Teams

Best Conference Poster Award (Session 1)
Anna T. Mayo, Jon Wook Chang, Rosalind M. Chow, & Anita Williams Woolley (Lower Left)
Do Women Make Groups Smarter? Understanding the Effects of Gender and Competition on Collective Intelligence

Best Conference Poster Award (Session 2)
Tomi Tapani Laapotti & Leena Mikkola (Pictured on Page 7)
Message Functions in Hospital Management Group Meetings

SGR Reviewer Award
Michael Baumann (Lower Right)

Best SGR Article Winner
Nicholas P. Aramovich (Not Pictured)
The Effect of Stereotype Threat on Group Versus Individual Performance, Small Group Research, April 2014
Memories from INGRoup 2014
New Leadership at *Group and Organization Management* - An interview with associate editors Lucy Gilson and Travis Maynard by Kyle Emich

Group and Organization Management (GOM) is a bi-monthly journal that cuts across the broad range of subfields relevant to the extension of management and organization theory. Recently, they announced a new editor (Bill Gardner, Texas Tech) and team of eight associate editors including two INGRoup members, Lucy Gilson of the University of Connecticut and Travis Maynard of Colorado State University. In this INGRoup newsletter, they let us know their thoughts about the goals of the journal, how the new editorial team is acting to accomplish those goals, and give some advice to young scholars looking to publish in GOM.

The conversation began with Travis and Lucy explaining that the new editorial team was not brought in to change the direction of the journal, but to continue the momentum the past editorial team built. One of the advantages, Lucy explained, of having an eight person team of associate editors is that the journal can be responsive to authors, in terms of getting quick turn around on submissions and being able to match submissions to knowledgeable reviewers. Travis added that this change will also allow reviews to be more developmental, one of the goals of GOM.

With this in mind, both interviewees mentioned that GOM is different from other outlets for group work because as Travis put it, “groups and teams is the primary focus of GOM, but not the exclusive focus.” For example, GOM incorporates research on groups and teams with macro-level work or work on topics such as leadership or communication. As Lucy put it, “I worry that historically we’ve worked in silos, but I think now there is a big push for people in general to read other people’s work even if it’s not in your area. Traditionally, I would never think of doing work on age, but Travis and I are doing a piece together on age and virtual teams.” Moreover, Lucy mentioned that virtual teams are a great example of an interdisciplinary topic area that GOM welcomes research on, since they are studied in areas as broad as management, engineering, communications, and both micro- and macro-organizational behavior.

In fact, in addition to offering a home to work from a broad range of topic areas, GOM also makes an effort to accept submissions in an array of formats using an array of methodologies. As I learned, GOM accepts both theoretical and empirical work, as well as work using student teams, qualitative and quantitative data, and in depth case studies. This concerted effort to attract researchers utilizing different methodologies reflects GOM’s interdisciplinary focus and dedication to publishing high quality work involving groups and organizations, regardless of the topic of the work, or the methodology used to collect data. And, as Travis pointed out, the diversity and size of associate editor team helps GOM to handle such a broad set of submitted manuscripts. As he put it, “We’re open! We’re open to different methodologies and different samples. If you’re doing different work, and it’s different than other outlets are receptive to, GOM will be receptive to it.”

The special annual theoretical issue also reflects this focus. However, in addition to this staple, the new editorial board hopes to broaden the set of special issues at GOM, particularly looking to add multidisciplinary special issues. So, if you have an idea that may be plausible for a special issue Travis and Lucy request that you contact them about the process for a proposal.

In addition to planning new special issues, Lucy is spearheading the effort to update GOM’s website (http://gomi.sagepub.com) to make it more user friendly. She wants to keep their current collections, but build the website out topically. For example, users can currently access a collection of GOM conceptual issues from the past three years. However, in the future, researchers may be able to access lists of GOM articles on leadership or virtual teams.

Travis and Lucy also emphasized that the importance of having the entire associate editor group sign an editorial ethics pledge which included topics such as notpressuring authors to cite reviewers work and making the reviewing process easier for authors to navigate. Travis believes that explicitly creating this norm for the action editors is important because it explains how they want to behave as a collective. Additionally, this process should allow for more honest discourse between authors and reviewers.

Finally, since a large portion of INGRoup members are young scholars, I asked Travis and Lucy what advice they would give to young scholars interested in submitting a manuscript to GOM. When faced with this question, Travis stressed the importance of recognizing and reflecting on the practical significance of your work. He said that he sees GOM as a high quality research outlet, but with work that is translatable to managerial practice. He also mentioned that the best papers he has reviewed in the past month speak to academic audience, but also to the applicability of their investigations. Lucy added that it was important to “do your homework.” Meaning that when she reviews manuscripts, one of the things she looks for is citing representative articles within the topic area. And, although some of this work likely exists in top journals such as the Journal of Applied Psychology or the Academy of Management Journal, it is important to recognize that there are also impactful papers in journals such as Small Group Research, Group Dynamics, and GOM, and to cite them appropriately. Finally, Travis stressed that the editorial board wants GOM to be developmental, and that starts from the top. Specifically, Bill Gardner has continually stressed that GOM wants its reviews to be developmental, not just for young scholars, but for all scholars. GOM really wants people to think that, even if their paper gets rejected, the review process has helped to improve the manuscript. So, if you are looking for a multidisciplinary, multi-methodological journal that incorporates research on groups and teams, I highly recommend checking out GOM’s website and considering it as an outlet for your research.

New Board Members!
The INGRoup Board is pleased to announce that Dr. Jessica Wildman is our new Vice-President, Conference Coordinator. Jessica is a faculty member with the Department of Psychology at the Florida Institute of Technology and is a graduate of the I/O Program at the University of Central Florida. She has a number of years of experience organizing conferences and workshops while at UCF and also at FIT. We would also like to welcome Esther Sackett as the new student representative. You can read all about her on page 2 of this newsletter.
observational data from working life groups. For a graduate student (Tomi), the conference was an eye-opener in a way that even if one’s identity is more of a qualitative researcher, one still needs to develop at least some level of understanding of quantitative methods and measures to be able to participate in scientific discussions about groups in a deep, constructive way.

The poster presentation turned out to be an excellent opportunity to discuss our work and to get feedback from a wide and diverse audience. The many interesting discussions we had owe a lot to the great way the poster sessions were arranged. The open bar during those sessions was a genius idea! Anyway, for a first time presenter (Tomi, again) in an international conference, the INGRoup poster session was pretty much perfect. We got good questions to think about for the future purposes, and among other issues, we talked about methodology, implications of our results, and about the importance of matching one’s scarf or a pocket handkerchief with the poster’s graphic design.

After the INGRoup conference in Raleigh we have been busy drawing up a report of the first set of results from our research project Social Interaction Practices and Well-being at Hospital Workplace. The project (funded by the Finnish Work Environment Fund) aims to explore the functions, structures, and systems of social interaction in a hospital workplace (meetings) and understand the connections between social interaction practices and well-being. We have a large qualitative data set including video-recordings (management groups, personnel meetings, nurse leaders’ meetings) as well as interviews. Currently we are exploring formal meeting interaction on different organizational levels to understand message functions, communication networks and participants’ perceptions of interaction in management groups.

Overall, the INGRoup experience was great. The arrangements were flawless and there really were many opportunities to have a chat with the other conference participants, which meant many possibilities to get interdisciplinary views on various topics. The atmosphere in the conference was thoroughly encouraging and the enthusiasm for group research was tangible. There are not that many places or situations where it is considered quite normal to be that excited about formal meetings! We also got some ideas for potential future interdisciplinary cooperation. If we had any aims for our trip to Raleigh, they were exceeded on many levels. We are looking forward to participating in the future INGRoup conferences, and it is nice to have you in Finland in 2016!