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## Conference Schedule at a Glance

### Thursday, July 12, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:00 – 6:00 pm</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>Henry Center Reception Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 pm</td>
<td>Opening Dinner</td>
<td>University Club Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 9:00 pm</td>
<td>INGRoup 2007 Photo</td>
<td>Atrium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 10:00 pm</td>
<td>Graduate Student Gathering</td>
<td>Four Seasons Lounge and Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 11:00 pm</td>
<td>Reception with cash bar</td>
<td>Four Seasons Lounge and Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 – 8:30 pm</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>University Club Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 10:00 pm</td>
<td>Poster session</td>
<td>University Club Dining Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Friday, July 13, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 12:00 noon</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>Henry Center Reception Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 – 11:00 am; 1:00 – 4:30 pm</td>
<td>Continuous Refreshments (Continental Breakfast; Afternoon Snacks)</td>
<td>Commons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 – 9:45 am</td>
<td><strong>Paper Sessions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 1: The Dynamics of Conflict</td>
<td>B106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 2: Groups and Teams in Context</td>
<td>B107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 3: Perceptions, Opinions, and Decision Making</td>
<td>B119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 4: Group Processes over Time</td>
<td>B120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 – 10:15 am</td>
<td>Morning Refreshment Break</td>
<td>Commons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 – 11:45 am</td>
<td><strong>Paper Sessions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 5: Symposium: What is the Role of Norms in Today’s Group Research and What Should it Be?</td>
<td>B106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 6: Technology and Communication</td>
<td>B107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 7: Decision and Indecision</td>
<td>B119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 8: Leader Behavior and Team Performance</td>
<td>B120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 am – 1:00 pm</td>
<td>Luncheon</td>
<td>Atrium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 – 3:00 pm</td>
<td><strong>Plenary Session – Doing Interdisciplinary Research: Challenges and Strategies for Success</strong></td>
<td>University Club Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 – 3:30 pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Break</td>
<td>Commons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 – 5:00 pm</td>
<td><strong>Paper Sessions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 9: Panel: Obtaining Federal Funding</td>
<td>B106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 10: Cooperation and Coordination</td>
<td>B107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 11: Theoretical Advances I</td>
<td>B119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 12: Multiple Perspectives on Learning in Teams</td>
<td>B120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15 – 6:30 pm</td>
<td>INGRoup Organizational Meeting</td>
<td>B106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 – 7:00 pm</td>
<td>Poster Setup</td>
<td>University Club Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 – 8:30 pm</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>University Club Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 10:00 pm</td>
<td>Poster session</td>
<td>University Club Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 – 11:00 am</td>
<td>Continuous Refreshments (Continental Breakfast; Afternoon Snacks)</td>
<td>Commons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 – 9:30 am</td>
<td><em>Roundtable discussions</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Conflict in Teams</td>
<td>B108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Creativity in Teams</td>
<td>B110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Emotions in Groups</td>
<td>B113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Group Diversity</td>
<td>B121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Group Member Personality</td>
<td>B122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Groups in Context: The Role of Organizational Culture</td>
<td>B124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Leadership in Teams</td>
<td>B126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Member Inclusion and Exclusion</td>
<td>B127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Motivation Gains in Groups</td>
<td>B128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Public Deliberation in Groups</td>
<td>B129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Relational Communication in Groups</td>
<td>B130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Status Dynamics in Teams</td>
<td>B131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Team Cognition</td>
<td>B132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Time and Groups</td>
<td>A135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Virtual Groups and Teams</td>
<td>A136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 10:00 am</td>
<td>Morning break</td>
<td>Commons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 11:45 am</td>
<td><em>Research Methods Mini - Workshops</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 13 Understanding Team Processes and Performance: A Multiple</td>
<td>B119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal, Multilevel Theory of Team Regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 14 Methodological and Data Analytic Models for Group Research</td>
<td>B107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimating the effects of Interdependence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 15 Team Simulations: Their Role in Research and Practice</td>
<td>B120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 16 Understanding Groups in Context: Methods of Field Research</td>
<td>B106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 17 Developing a Groups Research Data Repository</td>
<td>Quad room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(A138-A141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 am – 1:00 pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Atrium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 – 2:45 pm</td>
<td><em>Paper Sessions</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 18 Mental Model Measurement</td>
<td>B119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 19 Emotion and Affect</td>
<td>B107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 20 Team Effectiveness Across Contexts</td>
<td>B120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 21 Faultlines</td>
<td>B106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 – 3:15 pm</td>
<td>Afternoon break</td>
<td>Commons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 – 4:45 pm</td>
<td><strong>Paper Sessions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 22</td>
<td>Theoretical Advances II</td>
<td>B119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 23</td>
<td>Membership Dynamics</td>
<td>B107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 24</td>
<td>Performance Factors in Work Teams</td>
<td>B120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 25</td>
<td>Taking Time to Measure Team Temporality: Methodological and Theoretical Implications</td>
<td>B106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 – 6:00 pm</td>
<td>INGRoup Open Business Meeting</td>
<td>B106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 pm</td>
<td>Buses leave for dinner</td>
<td>Henry Center Main Entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Michigan Historical Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conference Schedule

Thursday, July 12, 2007

Registration
3:00 – 6:00 pm
Henry Center Reception Area

INGRoup’s Opening Dinner
6:30 pm
University Club Ballroom

INGRoup 2007 Photo
Henry Center Atrium
8:30 – 9:00 pm

Reception with cash bar in the
Four Seasons Lounge and Terrace
9:00 – 11:00 p.m.

Graduate Student Gathering
Four Seasons Lounge and Terrace
9:00 – 10:00 p.m.

Friday, July 13, 2007

Registration
Henry Center Reception Area
8:00 am – 12:00 noon

Exhibit Table (please bring your own flyers and books to exhibit)
Commons
8:00 am – 10:00 pm

Continuous refreshments in the Commons
7:00-11:00 a.m. (Continental Breakfast)
1:00-4:30 p.m. (Afternoon Snacks)
Friday, July 13, 2007

8:15-9:45 Session 1  
ROOM B106

The Dynamics of Conflict
Greer, L., Jehn, K., & Mannix, E.  *Conflict transformation: An exploration of the relationships between task, relationship, and process conflict and the moderating role of resolution potential.*
Holahan, P.  *Not so fast: Do decision attributes really mediate conflict and team performance?*
Menon, T., & Phillips, K.  *Getting even vs. being the odd one out: Cohesion and conflict in odd and even groups.*
Wright, K.  *Stories in groups: Using narrative theory to understand interactions in groups.*

8:15-9:45 Session 2  
ROOM B107

Groups and Teams in Context
Beersma, B., de Dreu, C., Dalenberg, S., & Vogelaar, A.  *Need for structure in teams as a double-edged sword: The interactive effect of personal need for structure in teams and task context.*
Kuipers, B., & Vallas, S.  *Management structure of the team-based organization; The power of self-managing work teams.*
Turner, M., & Pratkanis, A.  *Enhancing group effectiveness under threat.*

8:15-9:45 Session 3  
ROOM B119

Perceptions, Opinions, and Decision Making
Baumann, M., Kretz, D., & Bonner, B.  *The effect of perceptions of expertise and ulterior motives on information weighting in groups.*
Alexander, K., Levine, J., & Higgins, E. T.  *Regulatory fit and reaction to opinion deviance in small groups.*
Hinsz, V.  *The paradoxical influences of groups on commitment and opinion change.*
Wittenbaum, G., & Gockel, C.  *Influence in dyadic decision-making: Arguing for what one believes or does not believe.*

8:15-9:45 Session 4  
ROOM B120

Group Processes over Time
Behfar, K., & Swaab, R.  *Group process and shared cognition in teams: How and why the strength of shared cognition deteriorates over time.*
Gevers, J., Van Eerde, W., & Rutte, C.  *Team self-regulation and meeting deadlines in project teams: Antecedents and effects of temporal consensus.*
Weisband, S., Fadel, K., & Mattarelli, E.  *An experiment on the effects of interruptions on work trajectories and performance in critical environments.*
Friday, July 13, 2007

BREAK -- 9:45-10:15
Commons

10:15-11:45 Session 5
ROOM B106

Symposium:
What is the Role of Norms in Today’s Group Research and What Should it Be?

Vanessa Urch Druskat (University of New Hampshire)
Tine Koehler (George Mason University)
Deborah Ancona (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
Michael Berry (Turku School of Economics, Finland)
Mary J. Waller (University of Maastricht, The Netherlands)
Steve Zaccaro (George Mason University)

This symposium highlights the unique value of the study of norms for current research models in group research. Including presentations on norms research from various backgrounds, the intention is to spark renewed discussions about norms and to encourage fellow researchers to consider including norms in their own research.

10:15-11:45 Session 6
ROOM B107

Technology and Communication
Walther, J., & Bazarova, N. Validation and application of electronic propinquity theory to computer-mediated communication in groups: The effect of alternative media availability.
Burke, M., Kraut, R., Joyce, E., Kim, T. & Anand, V. Introductions and requests: Rhetorical strategies that elicit online community response.
Swaab, R., Phillips, K., Diermeier, D., & Medvec, V. Communicating in private or public? The pros and cons of dyadic interaction in group settings

10:15-11:45 Session 7
ROOM B119

Decision and Indecision
Rentsch, J., Delise, L., & Letsky, M.. Improving cognitive congruence and knowledge interoperability in decision making teams.
Tindale, S., Dykema-Engblade, A., Meisenhelder, H., Welch, E., & Krebel, A. Use of configural information in multi-cue decision making by individual and groups.
Nijstad, B., & Baas, M. Indecision in groups: Effects of distinctiveness and uncertainty.
Gastil, J.. The role of communication in disrupting democratic decision making in small groups.
**Friday, July 13, 2007**

**10:15-11:45 Session 8**

**ROOM B120**

**Leader Behavior and Team Performance**

Van Der Heide, B., & Wittenbaum, G. *Why do high self-monitors emerge as group leaders?*  
Homan, A. *Leader consideration behavior effects on the functioning of diverse teams.*

Mayfield, M., & Mayfield, J. *The role of group atmosphere and LMX relationships on worker performance and job satisfaction: Positive findings and recommendations for team enhancement.*


**LUNCHEON -- 11:45 - 1:00**

**Atrium**

**Plenary Session -- 1:15 - 3:00**

**University Club Dining Room**

**Doing Interdisciplinary Research: Challenges and Strategies for Success**

Cross-, Multi-, Inter-, and Trans-Disciplinary Research  
Stephen M. Fiore (University of Central Florida)

Cyberinfrastructure to Enable Interdisciplinary Research on Groups and Teams  
Noshir S. Contractor (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign)

Interdisciplinary Research on Groups and Teams: There's no Turning Back  
Suzanne P. Weisband (University of Arizona)

Identifying Niches and Outcomes in Interdisciplinary Group Research  
Paul S. Goodman (Carnegie Mellon University)


**BREAK – 3:00-3:30**

**Commons**
Friday, July 13, 2007

3:30-5:00 Session 9  ROOM B106

**Panel: Obtaining Federal Funding**

Jay Goodwin (Army Research Institute)
Linda Pierce (Army Research Laboratory)
Jacqueline Meszaros (National Science Foundation)
Steve Fiore (University of Central Florida)

The panel will discuss sources and strategies for obtaining federal funding for research, as well as identify some of the topic areas of interest to agencies within the federal government. Drs. Goodwin and Pierce will represent the US Army and Department of Defense, Dr. Meszaros will represent the National Science Foundation. Dr Fiore will discuss strategies for obtaining funding from an academic's perspective as well as provide some comments on the overarching principles behind federal funding for research. The session will include substantial time for questions and answers with the audience.

3:30-5:00 Session 10  ROOM B107

**Cooperation and Coordination**

Vargas-Hernández, J. *Institutional economics of co-operation and the political economy of trust.*
Coen, C. *Beyond the shadow of the future: How competitive dynamics generate cooperation.*
Boos, M., Kappeler, P. M., Kolbe, M., & Strack, M. *Coordination in primate and human groups.*

3:30-5:00 Session 11  ROOM B119

**Theoretical Advances I**

Meyers, R., Seibold, D., & Shoham, M. *Communicative influence in groups: A review and critique of theoretical perspectives and models.*
Poole, M., Cho, W. Y., & Head, K. *New directions for group theory and research: A delphi study.*
Shuffler, M. *Social cognition across the disciplines: Perspectives & propositions.*

3:30-5:00 Session 12  ROOM B120

**Multiple Perspectives on Learning in Teams**

Zellmer-Bruhn, M., Gibson, C., & Sun, K. *Cultural diversity and psychological safety: Uneven learning effects in multicultural teams?*
Bresman, H. *A multi-dimensional model of team learning and performance.*
Savelsbergh, C., van der Heijden, B., Poell, R., & Storm, P. *The good, the bad and the ugly: Which team competences mediate the relationship between team learning and performance within project teams?*
Kane, A. *Intergroup transfer of members and knowledge: Effects of superordinate social identity and demonstrability.*
Conference Schedule

Friday, July 13, 2007

5:15-6:30 Organizational Meeting
ROOM B106
(If you'd like to get involved in the planning of future INGRoup conferences, please join us!)

Poster Setup 6:30 – 7:00
University Club Dining Room

DINNER – 7:00-8:30
University Club Dining Room
Small Group Research Best Paper Award: July 2006 - June 2007
to be presented by Joann Keyton and Richard Kettner-Polley


Poster Session with dessert and coffee following dinner

1. Huang, Y., Lin, S., & Lin, Y. The effects of relation-oriented diversity and job-related diversity on team process and team performance
2. Cavarretta, F. Impacts of intrateam diversity on team performance variance: two ways to take chances on team composition.
4. O’Neill, T., & Allen, N. Broad versus narrow traits: Assessing the bandwidth-fidelity tradeoff at the team-level.
7. Sims, D., Rosen, M., Salas, E., & Fiore, S. Macrocognition: How dense are our teams?
9. Ryan, K. The role of the leader in collective efficacy beliefs and adaptive team performance.
Saturday, July 14, 2007

Continuous refreshments in the Commons
7:00-11:00 a.m. (Continental Breakfast)
1:00-4:30 p.m. (Afternoon Snacks)

Exhibit Table (please bring your own flyers and books to exhibit)
Commons
8:00 am – 10:00 pm

8:15-9:30 Roundtable Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conflict in Teams</td>
<td>B108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Creativity in Teams</td>
<td>B110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Emotions in Groups</td>
<td>B113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Group Diversity</td>
<td>B121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Group Member Personality</td>
<td>B122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Groups in Context: The Role of Organizational Culture</td>
<td>B124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Leadership in Teams</td>
<td>B126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Member Inclusion and Exclusion</td>
<td>B127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Motivation Gains in Groups</td>
<td>B128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Public Deliberation in Groups</td>
<td>B129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Relational Communication in Groups</td>
<td>B130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Status Dynamics in Teams</td>
<td>B131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Team Cognition</td>
<td>B132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Time and Groups</td>
<td>A135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Virtual Groups and Teams</td>
<td>A136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BREAK – 9:30-10:00
Commons

10:00-11:45 Research Methods Mini –Workshops

Session 13


Members of an interdependent work team have to regulate their attention and effort around multiple goals - individual and team - as they strive to accomplish their own objectives while also coordinating with teammates to accomplish team objectives. In our conceptualization, this process of team members dynamically regulating effort around multiple goals yields an emergent multilevel homology - parallel constructs and functional relations - that accounts for individual and team regulatory processes and performance outcomes. This presentation will highlight the conceptual underpinnings of our approach (i.e., multiple goal regulation and multilevel theory), describe the research paradigm, and explain the data analytics required to validate a multilevel homologous model.
Saturday, July 14, 2007

Session 14  ROOM B107


One of the most important elements inherent in group behavior is that individuals within groups influence one another. The Actor-Partner Interdependence Model provides one way of estimating the degree to which group members’ attributes (e.g., personality) impact one another’s outcomes. The One-with-many design provides a unique opportunity to study asymmetrical group relationships such as when each group has one leader or manager. New methodological and data analytic models of interdependence in groups provide a unique opportunity for advancing our understanding of group process.

Session 15  ROOM B120

Team Simulations: Their Role in Research and Practice. John R. Hollenbeck and Daniel R. Ilgen (Michigan State University)

Simulated environments are playing a greater and greater role in organizations and research. Within the area of team research and training, there is a rich history of using simulations. We shall introduce some of that work and then use our own research to describe issues of building team simulations, conducting research with them. Finally, we raise future directions for team simulations.

Session 16  ROOM B106

Understanding Groups in Context: Methods of Field Research. Lawrence R. Frey (University of Colorado and Boulder) and Joann Keyton (University of Kansas)

Capturing the complexity of group life in the field often necessitates researchers employing qualitative methods—“interpretive techniques which seek to describe, decode, translate, and otherwise come to terms with the meaning” (Van Maanen, 1983, p. 9). This mini-workshop explores some of the most salient qualitative methods employed—participant observation, in-depth interviewing, and analysis of texts and artifacts—with respect to philosophical assumptions that inform these methods, rationales for selecting them to study groups and the types of questions that can best be answered using these methods, their strengths and limitations, steps involved in the planning and designing of qualitative research, and ways of analyzing and reporting such research. Findings from extant qualitative research are reviewed to show the rich understanding of groups that can be acquired using these methods.

Session 17  QUAD ROOM (A138-A141)

Developing a Groups Research Data Repository. Renee A. Meyers (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee), Joseph Bonito (University of Arizona) and John Gastil (University of Washington)

In this session, we are interested in getting input and feedback from group researchers on development of a web-based archival and retrieval data repository system (GroupBank) for interdisciplinary group research and education. We are interested in finding out more about the research needs, practices, and uses of interdisciplinary INGGroup members as background for writing a NSF grant that will make this repository possible, and as a foundation for future construction of this system (if the grant is successful). In short, this is a listening session in order to find out more about how such a repository might support and supplement group research and education.
Conference Schedule

Saturday, July 14, 2007

LUNCH – 11:45-1:00
Atrium

1:15-2:45 Session 18
ROOM B119

Mental Model Measurement
Ellwart, T., & Konradt, U. Measuring shared mental models of expertise location in teams: Two validation studies.
Ross, S., & Allen, N. Examining the convergent validity of shared mental model measures.
Carpenter, S. Developing a measure to elicit and compare mental models of processes.
Smith-Jentsch, K., & Scielzo, S. An empirically-tested approach for measuring team-related cognition and behavior to support training and development.

1:15-2:45 Session 19
ROOM B107

Emotion and Affect
Rockett, T., & Valenti, A. When a good relationship goes bad: A theoretical examination of the impact of change in affect.
Keyton, J. & Beck, S. The influential role of socioemotional messages in group interaction.
Pescosolido, A. How do we feel about that? The development of emotional solidarity.
Gockel, C. Effects of put-down humor on cohesion in groups.

1:15-2:45 Session 20
ROOM B120

Team Effectiveness Across Contexts
de Dreu, C. Cooperative outcome interdependence, task reflexivity, and team effectiveness: A motivated information processing perspective.
Costa Jacobsohn, G., Beck, S., & Hollingshead, A. But can I trust you? Expertise, trustworthiness, and information sharing in first responder groups during emergencies.
Woolley, A., Gerbasi, M., Chabris, C., Kosslyn, S. & Hackman, J. R. What does it take to figure out what is going on? How team composition and work strategy jointly shape analytic effectiveness.

1:15-2:45 Session 21
ROOM B106

Faultlines
Homan, A., & Greer, L. Demographic faultlines and subgroup perception: The positive effects of diversity beliefs.
Cronin, M., Bezrukova, K., Weingart, L., & Tinsley, C. The assets and liabilities of active faultlines: The role of cognitive and affective processes in team performance.
Carton, A., & Cummings, J. The impact of structurally aligned subgroups on coordination and innovation in teams.
Bezrukova, K. Faultlines in diverse groups: Past developments, contradictions, and new directions.
Saturday, July 14, 2007

BREAK -- 2:45 – 3:15
Commons

3:15-4:45 Session 22 ROOM B119

Theoretical Advances II
Brodeur, C. *Kirton’s adaption-innovation theory: A critique of a group theory found in clinical psychology that could revolutionize the management of team diversity in all disciplines.*
Lei, Z. *Monkey see monkey do: The influence of work groups on frontline problem-solving.*
Shuffler, M., & Scott, C. *Collaborative sensemaking in groups: An integrated theory of shared reliability.*

3:15-4:45 Session 23 ROOM B107

Membership Dynamics
Myers, K. *Membership negotiation: Integrating interdisciplinary knowledge.*
Ryan, C. *Group socialization and perceptions of in-groups and out-groups among the new members of groups varying in entitativity.*
Cummings, J. *Membership intensity and the performance of geographically dispersed teams.*

3:15-4:45 Session 24 ROOM B120

Performance Factors in Work Teams
Yoon, K., Gupta, N., & Hollingshead, A. *Judging competence and incompetence in work groups.*
Gardner, H. *Expertise utilization in project teams: The push & pull moderating effects of group process and task characteristics.*
Kerr, N., Seok, D., & Messé, L. *Moderators of the Köhler discrepancy effect.*

3:15-4:45 Session 25 ROOM B106

Symposium:
Taking Time to Measure Team Temporality: Methodological and Theoretical Approaches

Dawna Ballard (University of Texas at Austin)
M. Scott Poole (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign)
Franziska Tshan (University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland)
Mary Waller (University of Maastricht, The Netherlands)

The symposium explores methodological approaches that allow us to capture a variety of team processes over time. Participants will describe diverse field and analytical methods useful for interrogating our theoretical assumptions about time in groups.
Saturday, July 14, 2007

5:00-6:00 pm  INGRoup Open Business Meeting  ROOM B106
*Please join us for a more detailed report on the conference and a discussion of the future of INGRoup.*

Buses leave for dinner at Museum 6:30 pm

**DINNER 7:00 – 10:00 pm**
Michigan Historical Museum

**Joseph McGrath Memorial 8:00 pm**
In front of the Territorial Capital at the Michigan Historical Museum
Speakers: Holly Arrow, Andrea Hollingshead, Franziska Tschan

Join us to celebrate the life and work of Professor Joseph McGrath who passed away on April 1, 2007. Joe spent most of his academic years as a Professor of Psychology at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and was very well known for his work on small groups.
PAPER SESSION SHORT ABSTRACTS

SESSION 1: THE DYNAMICS OF CONFLICT

Conflict Transformation: An Exploration of the Relationships between Task, Relationship, and Process Conflict and the Moderating Role of Resolution Potential

Lindred L. Greer (Leiden University)
Karen A. Jehn (Leiden University)
Elizabeth A. Mannix (Cornell University)

In this longitudinal study, we examine the relationships between task, relationship, and process conflict over time. We find that multiple forms of conflict may evolve into other forms of conflict over time, and that affective-based conflict is particularly potent, especially when teams lack the ability to effectively resolve their conflicts.

Not So Fast: Do Decision Attributes Really Mediate Conflict and Team Performance?

Patricia J. Holahan (Stevens Institute of Technology)

Using data from diverse project teams, we find affective conflict has a strong impact on whether the project team is within schedule and achieves its technical goals. Moreover, these relationships are fully mediated by two decision attributes -- decision quality and consensus. Interestingly, we find no such evidence for cognitive conflict.

Getting Even vs. Being the Odd One Out: Cohesion and Conflict in Odd and Even Groups

Tanya Menon (The University of Chicago)
Katherine W. Phillips (Kellogg School of Management)

Contrary to people’s intuitive theories, we find that small groups with odd numbers of participants are more likely to be cohesive than are even groups. We suggest that this occurs because people in odd groups often manage disagreements through the majority rule. By contrast, even groups splinter precisely because they can be balanced.

Stories in Groups: Using Narrative Theory to Understand Interactions in Groups

Kallia O. Wright (Ohio University)

Stories in Groups: Using Narrative Theory to Understand Interactions in Groups
In this paper, I explore the use of narrative theory in understanding relational communication and the formation of relational outcomes within groups. I specifically look at the use of narratives in conflict and in the group development stages. Finally, I suggest a research agenda for identifying narratives within group processes.
SESSION 2:  
GROUPS AND TEAMS IN CONTEXT 

Need for Structure in Teams as a Double-Edged Sword: 
The Interactive Effect of Personal Need for Structure in Teams and Task Context  
Bianca Beersma (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)  
Carsten K.W. De Dreu (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)  
Sander Dalenber (Department of Defense, Amsterdam, The Netherlands)  
Ad L.W. Vogelaar (Netherlands Defense Academy, Breda, The Netherlands)  

We investigated the effects of average Personal Need for Structure (PNS) in teams that engaged in an interactive task under conditions that either required or did not require adaptation. Team PNS was positively related to team performance when adaptation was not required, but negatively when team adaptation was required.

Management Structure of the Team-Based Organization: 
The Power of Self-Managing Work Teams  
Ben Kuipers (Erasmus University, The Netherlands)  
Steven Vallas (George Mason University)  

This paper explores the management structure of a team-based organization using data on 119 self-managing work teams at Volvo Trucks. Tracing the link between the distribution of organizational authority and team members’ responsiveness, we find that expanded authority does increase worker responsiveness, although in a highly uneven and selective way.

Enhancing Group Effectiveness Under Threat  
Marlene E. Turner (San Jose State University)  
Anthony R. Pratkanis (University of California, Santa Cruz)  

This study examined the role of directed-discussion strategies in improving group performance under threat. As predicted by a social identity maintenance model of groupthink, highly cohesive groups facing a collective threat produced higher quality decisions when given these strategies than did their counterparts not provided with such discussion aids.

Projects, Priorities, and Possibilities: A Multi-Level Look at Multiple Team Membership  
Mark Mortensen (MIT-Sloan)  
Michael Boyer O’Leary (Boston College)  
Anita Williams Woolley (Harvard University)  

Largely understudied, employees are increasingly asked to juggle multiple team memberships (MTM) simultaneously. In this paper, we present survey and interview data documenting MTM prevalence and its associated challenges, benefits, and enabling conditions. We discuss scholarly and managerial implications, and thereby provide an agenda for future work on this topic.
SESSION 3:
PERCEPTIONS, OPINIONS, AND DECISION MAKING

The Effect of Perceptions of Expertise and Ulterior Motives on Information Weighting in Groups

Michael R. Baumann (The University of Texas at San Antonio)
Donald Kretz (The University of Texas at San Antonio)
Bryan L. Bonner (University of Utah)

When groups discuss both common and unique information, common typically receives more weight than unique. We suggest this results in part from members weighting information by perceived accuracy while assessing accuracy via consensus. To test this, we manipulated the availability of other accuracy-relevant cues. Information weighting was affected as predicted.

Regulatory Fit and Reaction to Opinion Deviance in Small Groups

Kira M. Alexander (University of Pittsburgh)
John M. Levine (University of Pittsburgh)
E. Tory Higgins (Columbia University)

Promotion- and prevention-focus groups heard a speaker advocate a counter-attitudinal position using eager or vigilant arguments. Consistent with Regulatory Fit Theory, promotion- and prevention-focus groups responded more negatively to eager and vigilant speakers, respectively. Results clarify reaction to opinion deviance and demonstrate the applicability of RFT to small group processes.

The Paradoxical Influences of Groups on Commitment and Opinion Change

Verlin B. Hinsz (North Dakota State University)

An experiment is presented that examines how commitment processes of groups influence opinion change among group members. Opinion change for members’ post-discussion responses can be predicted by the commitment members have toward the group decision, the group decision, their initial individual opinions, and their commitment to these initial opinions.

Influence in dyadic decision-making: Arguing for what one believes or does not believe

Influence in Dyadic Decision-Making: Arguing For What One Believes or Does Not Believe

Gwen M. Wittenbaum (Michigan State University)
Christine Gockel (Michigan State University)

Can group members who advocate for a decision alternative that they do not like influence others as well as those who advocate for what they like? Data from a laboratory experiment on decision-making dyads suggest that it is easier to convince another when assigned to argue for what one believes.
SESSION 4:  
GROUP PROCESSES OVER TIME 

Group Process and Shared Cognition in Teams:  
How and Why the Strength of Shared Cognition Deteriorates Over Time  

Kristin Behfar (University of California, Irvine)  
Roderick Swaab (Northwestern University)  

This paper investigates the impact of time and team process on shared cognition. While much of the literature focuses on processes of information exchange, we argue that these processes should be considered in conjunction with socio-emotional aspects of team process that can weaken the impact of shared cognition over time.

Team Self-Regulation and Meeting Deadlines in Project Teams: 
Antecedents and Effects of Temporal Consensus  

Josette M. P. Gevers (Eindhoven University of Technology)  
Wendelien van Eerde (Eindhoven University of Technology)  
Christel G. Rutte (Eindhoven University of Technology)  

We investigated antecedents and effects of temporal consensus in project teams. Temporal consensus facilitated meeting deadlines through coordinated action. Moreover, temporal consensus was promoted by initial temporal planning and by increased temporal reminders later on, but not by temporal reflexivity. Rather, teams engaged in reflexivity because they disagreed about time.

An Experiment on the Effects of Interruptions on Work Trajectories and Performance in Critical Environments  

Suzanne Weisband (University of Arizona)  
Kelly J. Fadel (University of Arizona)  
Elisa Mattarelli (University of Modena and Reggio Emilia)  

Interruptions are central to work in critical environments. Based on theories of interruption and trajectories, a computer-based role-playing game simulating the scheduling of surgeries in an operating room unit was developed. Results indicated that the way notifications were delivered influenced work trajectories and, consequently, performance.
SESSION 6:
TECHNOLOGY AND COMMUNICATION

Validation and Application of Electronic Propinquity Theory to Computer-Mediated Communication in Groups: The Effect of Alternative Media Availability

Joseph Walther (Michigan State University)
Natalya Bazarova (Cornell University)

Korzenny’s electronic propinquity theory (1978) explains effects of media bandwidth on group members’ perceived closeness: The availability of high-bandwidth media decreases closeness of lower-bandwidth media. A previous test was unsupportive, but flawed. An original experiment involved groups using one or two media from among face-to-face, videoconferencing, audioconferencing, and text-chat.

Introductions and Requests: Rhetorical Strategies that Elicit Online Community Response

Moira Burke (Carnegie Mellon University)
Robert Kraut (Carnegie Mellon University)
Elisabeth Joyce (Edinboro University)
Tackjin Kim (Carnegie Mellon University)
Vivek Anand (Carnegie Mellon University)

Studies of online communities show that two rhetorical strategies—offering self-disclosing introductions and making requests—increase the likelihood that a newcomer will receive a reply. The research includes correlational analyses from 99 Usenet groups and three field experiments in which introductions and requests were randomly applied to posts to examine their impact on replies.

Communicating in Private or Public? The Pros and Cons of Dyadic Interaction in Group Settings

Roderick Swaab (Northwestern University)
Katherine W. Phillips (Northwestern University)
Daniel Diermeier (Northwestern University)
Vicki Medvec (Northwestern University)

Two experiments demonstrate that the impact of private conversations on groups cuts both ways depending on the requirements of the task. If the context requires agreement group members benefit from the ability to communicate in public. However, if the context requires adoption of diverse perspectives groups benefit from communicating privately.
SESSION 7: 
DECISION AND INDECISION

Improving Cognitive Congruence and Knowledge Interoperability in Decision Making Teams

Joan R. Rentsch (*The University of Tennessee*)
Lisa A. Delise (*The University of Tennessee*)
Michael P. Letsky (*Office of Naval Research*)

Teams must integrate expert knowledge to develop effective solutions. This study evaluated a theory-based intervention (C-MAP) designed to improve team outcomes by facilitating communication behaviors and the creation of knowledge objects. C-MAP teams had higher cognitive congruence, knowledge interoperability, and performance than control teams and a congruence-performance relationship was found.

Use of Configural Information in Multi-Cue Decision Making by Individuals and Groups

R. Scott Tindale (*Loyola University Chicago*)
Amanda Dykema-Engblade (*St. Xavier University*)
Helen Meisenhelder (*United States Air Force Academy*)
Elizabeth Welch (*National Opinion Research Center*)
Andrea Krebel (*Loyola University Chicago*)

Group vs. individual performance on a multi-cue decision task was compared for cue-criterion relations based on either disjunctive (highest cue gets more weight) or conjunctive (lowest cue gets more weight) configural patterns. Groups outperformed individuals, but were only slightly superior in using configural information in the conjunctive case.

Indecision in Groups: Effects of Distinctiveness and Uncertainty

Bernard A. Nijstad (*University of Amsterdam*)
Matthijs Baas (*University of Amsterdam*)

The conditions under which groups defer choice have received limited attention. We studied effects of distinctiveness (whether one alternative is clearly superior) and uncertainty (whether attributes of alternatives are known). We found that groups deferred choice when a majority of group members preferred deferral and when preferences were divided.

The Role of Communication in Disrupting Democratic Decision Making in Small Groups

John Gastil (*University of Washington*)

Groups seeking to make decisions democratically often find that task difficult. Past research suggests that five communication variables may obstruct democratic decision making in small groups. This study tested the impact of those obstacles on 57 zero-history groups that made policy recommendations on current political issues.
**SESSION 8:**
**LEADER BEHAVIOR AND TEAM PERFORMANCE**

**Why Do High Self-Monitors Emerge as Group Leaders?**

Brandon L. Van Der Heide (*Michigan State University*)
Gwen M. Wittenbaum (*Michigan State University*)

High self-monitors may emerge as group leaders because they engage in more communication congruent with the group’s goal than low self-monitors. High self-monitors felt, but were not rated by others as, more leader-like than low self-monitors. Although high and low self-monitors communicated goal-congruent messages equally, these messages helped low but not high self-monitors to become leaders.

**Leader Consideration Behavior Effects on the Functioning of Diverse Teams**

Astrid C. Homan (*Leiden University*)

In the present study, the leadership behavior *consideration* was examined as a potential moderator of the effects of diversity. As expected, results showed that leaders exhibiting considerate leadership behaviors are capable of enhancing the functioning of diverse teams compared to leaders not exhibiting considerate leadership behaviors.

**The Role of Group Atmosphere and LMX Relationships on Worker Performance and Job Satisfaction: Positive Findings and Recommendations for Team Enhancement**

Milton Mayfield (*Texas A&M International University*)
Jacqueline Mayfield (*Texas A&M International University*)

Group atmosphere perceptions were found to positively influence worker performance (path coefficient = 0.14) and job satisfaction (path coefficient = 0.41). Additionally, the leader member exchange relationship significantly effects group atmosphere perceptions (path coefficient = 0.44). The analyzed data were taken from hospital and university settings, and analyzed using partial least squares.

**Searing Sentiment or Cold Calculation? The Effects of Leader Emotional Displays on Team Performance depend on Follower Epistemic Motivation**

Gerben A. Van Kleef (*University of Amsterdam*)
Astrid C. Homan (*Leiden University*)
Bianca Beersma (*University of Amsterdam*)
Daan van Knippenberg (*Erasmus University Rotterdam*)
Barbara van Knippenberg (*Free University Amsterdam*)
Frederic Damen (*Erasmus University Rotterdam*)

How do leader emotions affect team performance? Experimental data on four-person teams showed that teams with high epistemic motivation performed better on a task when their leader displayed anger (mediated by performance appraisal), whereas teams with low epistemic motivation performed better when the leader expressed happiness (mediated by team sentiment).
SESSION 10:
COOPERATION AND COORDINATION

Institutional Economics of Co-Operation and the Political Economy of Trust
José G. Vargas-Hernández (Instituto Tecnológico de Cd. Guzmán)

The aim of this paper is to analyze the institutional economics of co-operation and the political economy of trust. It is reviewed the transactions costs, the principal – agent theory, market power, increasing-returns theory and value creation, strategic management: competitive forces, resource-based theory, organizational knowledge and learning, strategic choice theory and the collective efficiency theory. Finally, it is explained the political economy of trust.

Beyond the Shadow of the Future: How Competitive Dynamics Generate Cooperation
Corinne Coen (SUNY at Buffalo)

Organizations increasingly rely on interdependent workforce roles, increasing the value of workforce cooperation. However, the extant theoretical literature on cooperation yields conflicting predictions about individual choices over time and across levels of analysis. A formal modeling approach develops a new theory about the individual and team causes of cooperation.

Coordination in Primate and Human Groups
Margarete Boos (University of Göttingen)
Peter M. Kappeler (German Primate Center)
Michaela Kolbe (University of Göttingen)
Micha Strack (University of Göttingen)

We propose a general model of group coordination and provide an overview of the current state of behavioural and social psychological research on group coordination in human and non-human primates. Results of our own research in group decision-making and group cohesion will be presented to illustrate main theoretical aspects.
SESSION 11:  
THEORETICAL ADVANCES I  

Communicative Influence in Groups:  
A Review and Critique of Theoretical Perspectives and Models  
Renee A. Meyers (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee)  
David Seibold (University of California, Santa Barbara)  
Mirit Shoham (University of California, Santa Barbara)  

In this paper we overview and critique theoretical perspectives on group influence. We delimit our review by defining group influence as *communicatively constituted*. We briefly survey a set of interdisciplinary theories on group influence, and then focus more specifically on Communication perspectives that conceptualize group influence as a communicative practice.

New Directions for Group Theory and Research: A Delphi Study  
Marshall Scott Poole (University of Illinois-Urbana)  
Woon Young Cho (Texas A&M University)  
Katherine Head (Texas A&M University)  

This paper reports a 3-round Delphi study on new directions for small group theory and research that draws on responses of over two hundred group researchers from multiple disciplines. The study provides information on their priorities for group research. Results are broken down by discipline and experience in the field.

Social Cognition across the Disciplines: Perspectives & Propositions  
Marissa Shuffler (UNC-Charlotte)  

Social cognition can be viewed numerous ways across a variety of disciplines. The purpose of the current review is to examine the complexities and perspectives related to social cognition, and to propose ways in which researchers can collaborate across disciplines to better understand such a complicated aspect of group research.
SESSION 12:
MULTIPLE PERSPECTIVES AND LEARNING IN TEAMS

Cultural Diversity and Psychological Safety: Uneven Learning Effects in Multicultural Teams?

Mary Zellmer-Bruhn (University of Minnesota)
Cristina Gibson (University of California, Irvine)
Kangyong Sun (University of Minnesota)

Our paper examines whether status differences based on cultural diversity in a team results in within-team variance in psychological safety. We suspect that low status members may sense lower safety than high status members. Diversity in psychological safety within a team may result in uneven learning behaviors, ultimately blunting the team’s learning potential.

A Multi-Dimensional Model of Team Learning and Performance

Henrik Bresman (INSEAD)

As a means to understand learning and performance differences across teams, this study builds on recent advances in team learning research to propose a multi-dimensional model of team learning consisting of three learning strategies: experiential, vicarious, and contextual learning. Data from 43 pharmaceutical in-licensing teams are used to test the model.

“The Good, The Bad and The Ugly”: Which Team Competences Mediate the Relationship between Team Learning and Performance within Project Teams?

Ir. Chantal M.J.H. Savelsbergh (Open University of the Netherlands)
Beatrice I.J.M. van der Heijden (Open University of the Netherlands) (University of Twente)
Rob F. Poell (Tilburg University)
Peter M. Storm (Kennis & Co B.V., The Hague (Netherlands))

The focus of this study is on team learning behavior and its primary outcomes. Main question is if there are certain competencies, reflected in team behavior, that can only be learned by and from the collective and that have positive influence on team performance and satisfaction.

Intergroup Transfer of Members and Knowledge:
Effects of Superordinate Social Identity and Demonstrability

Aimée A. Kane (New York University)

I examine superordinate social identity and knowledge demonstrability to understand how and when sharing an identity promotes knowledge transfer via membership transfer. Results indicate that superordinate social identity facilitates the transfer of less, but not more, demonstrable knowledge by affecting the extent to which recipients consider knowledge from a transferee.
SESSION 18:
MENTAL MODEL MEASUREMENT

Measuring Shared Mental Models of Expertise Location in Teams: Two Validation Studies

Thomas Ellwart (Kiel University)
Udo Konradt (Kiel University)

In the context of experimental and field settings, we provide and validate a shared mental model index of expertise location in teams that (a) combines ratings of absolute knowledge and group consensus into a single index; (b) can predict team processes and output; and (c) is applicable to a variety of tasks.

Examining the Convergent Validity of Shared Mental Model Measures

Sarah Ross (University of Western Ontario)
Natalie Allen (University of Western Ontario)

Few studies in the shared mental model (SMM) literature focus on measurement. In this study, pairs’ sharedness scores were compared across concept mapping, paired ratings, and causal mapping measures. Results call into question the convergent validity of the task-based SMM measures.

Developing a Measure to Elicit and Compare Mental Models of Processes

Sandra Carpenter (The University of Alabama in Huntsville)

Participants were trained to create physical representations (“maps”) of their mental models for several processes. They then created a map, from memory, for a course-related process. To assess validity of this method, scores on a quiz measuring participants’ knowledge of the process were compared to components of their maps.

An Empirically-Tested Approach for Measuring Team-Related Cognition and Behavior to Support Training and Development

Kimberly Smith-Jentsch (University of Central Florida)
Shannon Scielzo (University of Central Florida)

This presentation will detail results from four studies designed to 1) define measurable dimensions of teamwork, 2) identify measurable teamwork mental models, 3) remediate deficiencies in teamwork mental models through training and feedback, and 4) to improve team performance through guided team self-correction structured around the predefined expert model.
SESSION 19:
EMOTION AND AFFECT

When a Good Relationship Goes Bad:
A Theoretical Examination of the Impact of Change in Affect

Tracey Rockett (University of Texas at Dallas)
M. Alix Valenti (University of Houston Clear Lake)

The work of groups is of great importance to organizations. However, there are many groups in which individuals do not get along. We suggest that in groups where individuals experience a change in relationship affect, the group is impeded from reaching its full potential and we present some of the reasons that this might happen in this paper.

The Influential Role of Socioemotional Messages in Group Interaction

Joann Keyton (The University of Kansas)
Stephenson Beck (The University of Kansas)

There are two perspectives on socioemotional talk within group interaction. One argues that relational information occurs in all messages. Another posits that messages are either socioemotional or task. This paper moves beyond a descriptive functional approach to an interaction sequence analysis demonstrating how socioemotional messages influence task interaction in a breast cancer support group.

How Do We Feel About That? The Development of Emotional Solidarity

Anthony T. Pescosolido (University of New Hampshire)

Group Emotional Solidarity is introduced as the collective awareness that all group members are experiencing the same emotion. The importance of collective emotion to group development is discussed, as well as potential antecedents and outcomes of solidarity. A case study illustrates the concept and its impact upon group dynamics, member tenure and performance.

Effects of Put-down Humor on Cohesion in Groups

Christine Gockel (Michigan State University)

Does put-down humor of outgroup members increase cohesion in a group? Results of a lab study indicate that put-down humor of outgroup members can create positive impressions of other group members without increasing one’s attraction to the group.
SESSION 20:  
TEAM EFFECTIVENESS ACROSS CONTEXTS

Cooperative Outcome Interdependence, Task Reflexivity, and Team Effectiveness:  
A Motivated Information Processing Perspective

Carsten K.W. De Dreu (University of Amsterdam)

A study with forty-six management and cross-functional teams corroborated a motivated information processing perspective: More cooperative outcome interdependence (COI) associated with better information sharing, learning and effectiveness, but only when Task Reflexivity (TR) was high. Theoretical and applied implications are discussed.

But Can I Trust You? Expertise, Trustworthiness, and Information Sharing in First Responder Groups during Emergencies

Gwendolyn Costa Jacobsohn (University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign)  
Stephenson J. Beck (University of Kansas)  
Andrea B. Hollingshead (University of Southern California)

A sample of firefighters and of emergency medical technicians (EMTs) were surveyed about their coordination, information exchange and communication with other first responders during emergencies. The results showed that both firefighters and EMTs reported many barriers to effective information exchange during emergencies: including environmental, technological, intergroup and interpersonal.

Rolling with Punches: How Control Teams Manage Critical Events

Mary J. Waller (Maastricht University)  
Robert A. Roe (Maastricht University)  
Josette M. P. Gevers (Technical University Eindhoven)  
Anneloes M. L. Raes (Maastricht University)  
Seth Kaplan (George Mason University)

This study develops and tests a model for explaining team effectiveness during critical situations. We simulated 48 critical events during nuclear power plant crew training to examine how event characteristics, team abilities, and team behaviors influence key team outcomes. Preliminary results generally support our model. Implications are discussed.

What Does It Take to Figure Out What Is Going On? How Team Composition and Work Strategy Jointly Shape Analytic Effectiveness

Anita W. Woolley (Harvard University)  
Margaret E. Gerbasi (Harvard University)  
Christopher F. Chabris (Harvard University)  
Stephen M. Kosslyn (Harvard University)  
J. Richard Hackman (Harvard University)

This study examined the effects of team composition and intervention on analytic team performance. Four-person teams used four types of evidence to solve a terrorism scenario. Surprisingly, the poorest-performing teams most closely matched actual intelligence counterterrorism teams --namely, high-ability teams working without guidance for coordinating their analytic activities.
SESSION 21:
FAULTLINES

Demographic Faultlines and Subgroup Perception: The Positive Effects of Diversity Beliefs

Astrid C. Homan (Leiden University)
Lindred Greer (Leiden University)

We find that diversity beliefs moderate the relationship between objective demographic faultline strength and perceived subgroups, such that only groups with low diversity beliefs perceive subgroups in groups divided by demographic faultlines. We examine the impact on group processes and outcomes.

The Assets and Liabilities of Active Faultlines:
The Role of Cognitive and Affective Processes in Team Performance

Matthew A. Cronin (George Mason University)
Katerina Bezrukova (Rutgers University)
Laurie R. Weingart (Carnegie Mellon University)
Catherine H. Tinsley (Georgetown University)

We tested whether cognitive and affective team integration can overcome the negative group performance and satisfaction effects of sub-group divisions brought on by active (“felt”) faultlines. Results showed that affective integration mediated the negative effect of faultlines on team satisfaction. Cognitive integration impeded the performance of groups with low faultlines.

The Impact of Structurally Aligned Subgroups on Coordination and Innovation in Teams

Andrew M. Carton (Duke University)
Jonathon Cummings (Duke University)

Researchers have recently conceptualized diversity in terms of member alignment into subgroups based on demographic characteristics. This faultline model has predicted relational outcomes, such as trust and conflict. We extend this model to structural diversity and task outcomes, arguing that structurally aligned subgroups lead to worse coordination, yet better innovation.

Faultlines in Diverse Groups: Past Developments, Contradictions, and New Directions

Katerina Bezrukova (Rutgers University)

Group faultlines form when members’ multiple characteristics (gender, race) come into alignment. Recent empirical findings in this area have been relatively inconsistent: faultlines can equally hurt group members as well as help them. My objective is to reconcile some controversies around faultlines by providing a review of multidisciplinary faultline research.
SESSION 22: 
THEORETICAL ADVANCES II

Kirton’s Adaption-Innovation Theory: A Critique of a Group Theory found in Clinical Psychology that could Revolutionize the Management of Team Diversity in All Disciplines

Cheri Winton Brodeur (University of Florida)

This theoretical review looks at the need for the inclusion of cognitive style theory in the study of team dynamics and the management of team diversity. This paper provides a better understanding of both the theory and its practical application, using Kirton’s Adaption-innovation Theory, one of the best developed cognitive style theories.

Monkey See Monkey Do: The Influence of Work Groups on Frontline Problem-Solving

Zhike Lei (George Mason University)

Engaging frontline employees in problem-solving and learning activities is often challenging. Extant research has not addressed the relational challenges to organizational learning from failure. This paper contributes to the field by focusing on the social influence of work groups to explain patterns of frontline problem-solving and learning from failure.

Collaborative Sensemaking in Groups: An Integrated Theory of Shared Reliability

Marissa Shuffler (The University of North Carolina at Charlotte)  
Clifton Scott (The University of North Carolina at Charlotte)

The purpose of the current review is to examine the impact of sensemaking upon groups in a high reliability context, and to further an integrated theory that more successfully encompasses the complexities of high reliability organizing in a dynamic environment.
SESSION 23: MEMBERSHIP DYNAMICS

Membership Negotiation: Integrating Interdisciplinary Knowledge

Karen K. Myers (University of California, Santa Barbara)

This paper argues to expand current perspectives of group membership negotiation by using a broader guiding framework to promote a more interactional understanding. This approach would draw upon research from multiple disciplines and utilize larger meta-theories to account for the recursivity and evolving nature of work group relationships.

Membership Change and Group Creativity: Impact of Newcomers and Oldtimers

Hoon-Seok Choi (Sungkyunkwan University)
Ji-Hyun Lee (Sungkyunkwan University)
Ho-Joong Kang (Sungkyunkwan University)
Young-Mi Kwon (Sungkyunkwan University)

We conducted a laboratory experiment to investigate the impact of membership change on group creativity. Using a highly involving group task, we found supportive evidence that membership change enhances group creativity. We also found that membership change has a differential effect depending on the level of group development.

Group Socialization and Perceptions of In-Groups and Out-Groups among the New Members of Groups varying in Entitativity

Carey S. Ryan (University of Nebraska at Omaha)

This research examined stereotype change among the new members of groups that varied in entitativity. Results indicate that change towards out-group homogeneity was less true of new members who perceived greater in-group entitativity. Additional analyses focus on new members’ perceptions of their socialization experiences and how these may influence stereotypes.

Membership Intensity and the Performance of Geographically Dispersed Teams

Jonathon N. Cummings (Duke University)

This paper proposes and tests a model of membership intensity (defined as the degree to which members contribute primarily to the same team) and team performance. When teams are geographically dispersed, more time spent working is related to increased performance, while membership on multiple teams is related to decreased performance.
SESSION 24:
PERFORMANCE FACTORS IN WORK TEAMS

Judging Competence and Incompetence in Work Groups

Kay Yoon (DePaul University)
Naina Gupta (Nanyang Business School)
Andrea B. Hollingshead (University of Southern California)

This study explores impression formation processes in work groups. A survey with 533 participants showed that people attend to different information when judging competence and incompetence in their coworkers. They tend to like competent coworkers but do not necessarily dislike incompetent coworkers.

Expertise Utilization in Project Teams:
The “Push & Pull” Moderating Effects of Group Process and Task Characteristics

Heidi K. Gardner (London Business School)

This paper develops and tests a contingency model of expertise recognition and utilization in project teams, using longitudinal data from 105 “Big 4” audit and consulting teams. The theoretical framework draws from status characteristics theory and small groups research to identify key barriers that prevent teams from integrating members’ expertise.

Moderators of the Köhler Discrepancy Effect

Norbert L. Kerr (Michigan State University)
Dong-Heon Seok (Michigan State University)
Lawrence A. Messé (Michigan State University)

Two experiments are presented which indicate that ideal conditions for maximizing the Köhler motivation gain a) make the less capable group member feel indispensable to the group, b) make the discrepancy between herself and her more capable partner moderate in magnitude, and c) maximize her uncertainty about her task competence.
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The Effects of Relation-oriented Diversity and Job-related Diversity on Team Process and Team Performance

Yin-Mei Huang *(Kainan University)*
Shu-Chi Lin *(National Chengchi University)*
Yeh-Yun Lin *(National Chengchi University)*

A field study of 62 work teams from 29 high-technology firms in Taiwan investigated the relationships between relation-oriented and job-related diversity, team processes (cohesiveness and external activity) and performance. Results show that different type of diversity leads to specific team outcomes. Teams higher in relation-oriented diversity lower team cohesiveness, and those higher in job-related diversity lead to higher team performance and external activity.

Impacts of Intrateam Diversity on Team Performance Variance: Two Ways to Take Chances on Team Composition

Fabrice Cavarretta *(INSEAD)*

This paper hypothesizes that intrateam diversity has a U-shaped effect on between-team variance of performance and verifies it empirically on a business simulation with 35 separate teams. Assuming performance targets exist, combining mean and variance analysis leads to improved predictions that contradict predictions based on the mean analysis only.

“Dead Times” in Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation: What Medical Teams Do During Cardiac Arrests If They Don't Resuscitate

Maria Vetterli *(University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland)*
Franziska Tschan *(University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland)*
Norbert K. Semmer *(University of Berne, Switzerland)*
Stephan U. Marsch *(University Hospital Basel)*

We studied the performance of teams composed of three MD’s (general practitioners) during simulated cardiac arrest. Performance was below expectations: the teams did not perform any of the recommended treatments in 39% of the observation time. “Dead times” were filled by passive observation of the patient or by resolving technical problems.

Broad versus Narrow Traits: Assessing the Bandwidth-Fidelity Tradeoff at the Team-level

Thomas A. O’Neill *(The University of Western Ontario)*
Natalie J. Allen *(The University of Western Ontario)*

In this empirical paper, we directly compared the predictive validity of narrow personality traits to the “Big Five” factors. At the team-level, results indicated that carefully selected narrow traits accounted for similar amounts of variance in emergent states as the Big Five. Implications for understanding team-level personality are discussed.
Unpacking Macro Level Cognitive States in Teams: Towards a Metrics Taxonomy

C. Shawn Burke (University of Central Florida)
Brandy Burke (University of Central Florida)
Elizabeth Lazzara (University of Central Florida)
Kimberly Smith-Jentsch (University of Central Florida)
Eduardo Salas (University of Central Florida)

Research suggests team effectiveness is heavily dependent on members having compatible cognitive frameworks (team cognition). This paper reports on the development of science-based metric guidelines for team cognition and corresponding taxonomy that serves to create a heuristic by which informed metric choices can be made with regard to team cognition.

The Effect of Team Building on Team Outcomes: An Update and Extension

Rebecca Lyons (University of Central Florida)
Cameron Klein (University of Central Florida)
Deborah Diaz Granados (University of Central Florida)
Eduardo Salas (University Central Florida)

The authors present the results of a meta-analytic examination of the effects of team building on team outcomes. The paper serves to update and expand upon Salas, Rozell, Mullen, and Driskell’s (1999) empirical team building review. Four outcomes of team building interventions were examined: learning/knowledge, affective, process, and performance.

Macrocognition: How Dense Are Our Teams?

Dana E. Sims (University of Central Florida)
Michael Rosen (University of Central Florida)
Eduardo Salas (University of Central Florida)
Stephen Fiore (University of Central Florida)

Macrocognition has received growing attention as a means to adapt to complex, dynamic environments. Measurement that focuses on a single-level as opposed to multi-level and ignores the relational aspects of the construct remains an obstacle towards understanding macrocognition. We discuss network theory as a means to overcome these challenges.

Team Problem Solving Tasks: A Conceptual Review and Integration

Michael A. Rosen (University of Central Florida)
Elizabeth H. Lazarr (University of Central Florida)
Stephen M. Fiore (University of Central Florida)
Eduardo Salas (University of Central Florida)

This presentation provides a review of team problem solving tasks. We present a formal description of the structure of shared and individually held information environments constituting team problem solving tasks. This structure can be used to predict the importance of processes in specific tasks and to determine generalizability between tasks.
The Role of the Leader in Collective Efficacy Beliefs and Adaptive Team Performance

Katherine M. Ryan (*George Mason University*)

The purpose of this theoretical paper is to explore the potential influence of the leader on collective efficacy in performance situations requiring adaptability. Drawing from social-cognitive and functional leadership theories, leader clarification of task-work demands and team processes are proposed enhance collective efficacy beliefs and thus team effectiveness adaptive situations.
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