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## Conference Schedule at a Glance

### THURSDAY July 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 5:00pm</td>
<td>Federal Funding and R Workshops <em>(Northwestern)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 – 8:00pm</td>
<td>Conference Registration <em>(Lobby, Lower Level)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30pm</td>
<td>Opening Dinner <em>(LaSalle Ballroom, Lower Level)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45 – 9:00pm</td>
<td>Reception <em>(Pool Deck, 5th Floor)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45 – 9:00pm</td>
<td>Graduate Student Meet-and-Greet <em>(Pool Deck, 5th Floor)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FRIDAY July 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00am - 5:00pm</td>
<td>Conference Registration <em>(Lobby, Lower Level)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 9:45am</td>
<td>Session 1 <em>(Superior I)</em>: Conflict: Perceptions and implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 2 <em>(Superior II)</em>: Expectations and incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 3 <em>(Superior III)</em>: Social structure and entitativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 4 <em>(Michigan)</em>: Motivating people via group dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 5 <em>(Huron)</em>: Team creativity: State of the research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 – 10:15am</td>
<td>Refreshment Break <em>(State Room, Lower Level)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 11:45am</td>
<td>Session 6 <em>(Superior I)</em>: Conflict and creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 7 <em>(Superior II)</em>: Study of groups and Team science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 8 <em>(Superior III)</em>: Group participation and discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 9 <em>(Michigan)</em>: Group performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 10 <em>(Huron)</em>: Team processes in acute care teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 1:00pm</td>
<td>Lunch <em>(LaSalle Ballroom, Lower Level)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 – 2:15pm</td>
<td>Keynote Address <em>(LaSalle Ballroom, Lower Level)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McGrath Award Recipients: John Levine and Richard Moreland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 – 3:45pm</td>
<td>Session 11 <em>(Superior I)</em>: Trust and psychological safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 12 <em>(Superior II)</em>: Strategies and tactics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 13 <em>(Superior III)</em>: Task features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 14 <em>(Michigan)</em>: Evolution and adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 15 <em>(Huron)</em>: Cohesion in complex teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 – 4:15pm</td>
<td>Refreshment Break <em>(State Room, Lower Level)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 – 5:15pm</td>
<td>Session 16 <em>(Superior I)</em>: Detecting group processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 17 <em>(Superior II)</em>: Coaching and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 18 <em>(Superior III)</em>: Development and transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 19 <em>(Michigan)</em>: Bridging boundaries toward collaborative team science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 20 <em>(Huron)</em>: Beyond methodological differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15 – 5:45pm</td>
<td>Poster Setup <em>(State Room, Lower Level)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45 – 7:00pm</td>
<td>Poster Session and Reception <em>(State Room, Lower Level)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00pm - ??:</td>
<td>Dinner in small groups on your own – see restaurant list/sign-up boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SATURDAY July 14**

8:00am – 12:00pm:   Conference Registration (*Lobby, Lower Level*)

8:30 – 9:45am:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 21</th>
<th>Session 22</th>
<th>Session 23</th>
<th>Session 24</th>
<th>Session 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Superior I</em> Status and hierarchies</td>
<td><em>Superior II</em> Aspects of affect</td>
<td><em>Superior III</em> Team composition</td>
<td><em>Michigan</em> Measuring group phenomena</td>
<td><em>Huron</em> Team interaction patterns, processes, and emergence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9:45 – 10:15am:   Refreshment Break (*State Room, Lower Level*)

10:30 – 11:45am:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 26</th>
<th>Session 27</th>
<th>Session 28</th>
<th>Session 29</th>
<th>Session 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Superior I</em> Coordination</td>
<td><em>Superior II</em> Diversity</td>
<td><em>Superior III</em> Decision Making</td>
<td><em>Michigan</em> Leadership and expertise</td>
<td><em>Huron</em> Translating team science to practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12:00 – 1:30pm:    Lunch and INGRoup Awards (*LaSalle Ballroom, Lower Level*)

1:45 – 3:00pm:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 31</th>
<th>Session 32</th>
<th>Session 33</th>
<th>Session 34</th>
<th>Session 35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Superior I</em> Importance of context and the situation</td>
<td><em>Superior II</em> Role and perceptions of individual differences</td>
<td><em>Superior III</em> Innovation and improvisation</td>
<td><em>Michigan</em> Time and activity patterns</td>
<td><em>Huron</em> Current directions in cohesion research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3:00 – 3:30pm:    Refreshment Break (*State Room, Lower Level*)

3:45 – 4:45pm:    Open Business Meeting (*Huron, Lower Level*)

4:45 – 5:45pm:    Graduate Student Business Meeting (*Huron, Lower Level*)

6:15pm:    INGRoup Photo (*Museum of Contemporary Art*)

6:30 – 9:30pm:    Evening Event (*Museum of Contemporary Art*)
CONFERENCE SCHEDULE

Thursday, July 12th 2012

12:00 – 5:00pm:
   Northwestern
   Federal Funding and R Workshops

4:00 – 8:00pm:
   Lobby, Lower Level
   Registration

6:30pm:
   LaSalle Ballroom, Lower level
   INGroup Opening Dinner

7:45 – 9:00pm:
   Pool Deck, 5th Floor*
   Graduate Student Meet-and-Greet

7:45 – 9:00pm:
   Pool Deck, 5th Floor*
   Reception

*Rain location: State Room, Lower Level
Friday, July 13th 2012

7:30 – 8:30am: Continental Breakfast
State Room, Lower Level

8:00 – 5:00pm: Registration
Lobby, Lower Level

8:30 – 9:45am: Session 1
Superior I, 2nd Floor

CONFLICT: PERCEPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

How much relationship conflict really exists? Biased perceptions of conflict in racially diverse teams
Robert B. Lount, The Ohio State University; Oliver Sheldon, Rutgers University; Floor Rink, University of Groningen; Katherine Phillips, Columbia University

We examine whether racial diversity can bias observers’ evaluations of relationship conflict in work teams. Across several studies, the findings illustrate that observers perceived more relationship conflict when teams were described as racially diverse rather than racially homogeneous, even though the objective content of the team discussion was held constant.

Perceptions of intra-group conflict: The effect of coping strategies on conflict transformation and escalation
Helen Pluut & Petru Curseu, Tilburg University

Focusing on whether task conflict evolves into relationship conflict (conflict transformation) and on whether relationship conflict perpetuates over time (conflict escalation), this multilevel study finds that coping influences these processes in different ways, depending on the (mis)fit between coping strategy (problem-focused or emotion-focused) and conflict type (task or relationship conflict).

Exploring homophily-heterophily effects of motivational states on cooperation and conflict in teams
Toshio Murase, Northwestern University; Daniel Doty, Georgia Institute of Technology; Christian Resick & Ho Kwong Kwan, Drexel University; Ping Shao, California State University, Sacramento

The motivational states of team members are important for accomplishing complex, collective goals. However, the internal motivational states of members may also detract from team interactions and effectiveness if members are highly competitive. This study explores the relationships between goal strivings, cooperation, and conflict at the individual and team levels.

Knowledge variety, knowledge sharing, and team conflict: Implications for team transactive memory systems and performance
Ravi Gajendran, University of Illinois; David Harrison, University of Texas at Austin

This paper develops and tests a theory about the effects of knowledge variety, knowledge sharing, and team conflict on transactive memory systems (TMS) and team performance. Findings suggest that knowledge sharing enhances TMS and team performance while task conflict hurts both these outcomes. Relationship conflict weakens the TMS-team performance relationship.

-----------

8:30 – 9:45am: Session 2
Superior II, 2nd Floor

IMPACT OF EXPECTATIONS AND INCENTIVES

The lion’s share: The impact of credit expectations and credit allocations on commitment to leaders
Stephen Sauer, Clarkson University; Chad Proell, Texas Christian University; Matthew Rodgers, The Ohio State University

We examine how the relationship between leaders’ credit allocation behavior and subordinates’ commitment is influenced by the fulfillment of credit expectations. We found that commitment decreased when leaders took credit for their subordinates’ work. These effects were mitigated when expectations were fulfilled and were exacerbated when expectations were unmet.

(continues on next page)
Expecting less from groups: A new perspective on shortcomings in idea generation groups
Eric Jones & John Lambertus, Southern Illinois University – Carbondale

This research investigated the role of group members’ expectations as an explanation for groups underperforming on brainstorming tasks. In Study 1, participants expected fewer ideas per individual as the number of people working together increased. A second study demonstrated that these performance expectations accounted for idea output by actual groups.

Cognitive factors predict affective outcomes in project teams: Team mental models as group psychological contracts
Claudia Bauer-Emmel, University of Trier; Michael J. Burscher, University of Zurich; Conny H. Antoni, University of Trier

Research on Team Mental Models (TMM) has neglected affective team outcomes. By drawing from research on psychological contracts, we aim to fill this gap; we introduce a new type of TMM content – beliefs regarding mutual obligations. We show the concept’s usefulness by relating similarity of mutual obligations to team cohesion.

The effect of team-based rewards on performance: A meta-analysis
Yvonne Garbers & Udo Konradt, University of Kiel

We meta-analyze existing literature on team-based rewards on peoples’ performance published in key work and organizational psychology journals. Results indicate positive effects for team-based rewards, with equitably distributed rewards result in higher performance than equally distributed rewards. Practical and theoretical implications for team composition and motivation will be discussed.

8:30 – 9:45am: Session 3
Superior III, 2nd Floor

SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND EMERGING ENTITATIVITY

Entitativity in online groups: Theory development
Anita Blanchard & Lisa Walker, UNC Charlotte

In this paper, we develop a theoretical approach to the experience of entitativity (i.e., feelings of groupyness) in online groups. Using research from face-to-face entitativity and social presence theory, we examine how the social processes and technological features of online groups affect the antecedents of online entitativity.

Group research and terrorism: The interaction of network structure and disagreement in online political discussion groups
Justin Reedy, University of Washington; John Gastil, Pennsylvania State University; Michael Gabbay, University of Washington

Terrorism scholarship remains only weakly coupled with group research, and our study uses an experimental method to forge a stronger link. We examine varying patterns of choice shifts on tactical choices in online groups while varying key features of terror cells, including communication network structure and levels of disagreement.

Working through differences: Value convergence and emergent work group identities
Loes Meeussen, Ellen Delvaux, & Karen Phalet, KU Leuven

We examine group identity formation over time within real-life interactive work groups. Our findings show that work group members affect each other’s achievement values over time and that this value convergence provides a shared sense of what is important within the group, underlying emergent work group identities and group performance.

Groups and publics: Building on action
Gary Fine, Northwestern University

Social structures depend on groups with shared pasts and futures, that are spatially situated, and that depend on common references. Building on theories of action, group dynamics, and microcultures, I argue that groups are a stage on which social order is produced and a lens for understanding how social order is selected.
8:30 – 9:45am: Session 4  
Michigan, 2nd Floor  

**SYMPOSIUM:** Motivating people to exercise harder via group dynamics

Norbert Kerr, Deborah Feltz, Kaitlynn Osborn, & Samuel Forlenza, Michigan State University

Recent findings from an interdisciplinary inquiry into motivation to exercise are reported. Several studies show a robust Köhler motivation gain effect, and identify some task and group factors that both do and do not moderate this effect. The role of group dynamics for encouraging greater physical fitness will be discussed.

----------

8:30 – 9:45am: Session 5  
Huron, Lower Level  

**PANEL:** Team creativity: State of the research

Roni Reiter-Palmon, University of Nebraska Omaha; Michael Beyerlein, Purdue University; Susannah Paletz, University of Pittsburgh; Paul Paulus, University of Texas at Arlington

Interest in team creativity has increased recently as a result of increased globalization and rapid technological changes. We have assembled a panel of noted researchers in the area of team creativity to share their unique perspectives and their research on the topic.

9:45 – 10:15am: 
State Room, Lower Level  

**Refreshment Break**

10:30 – 11:45am: Session 6  
Superior I, 2nd Floor  

**CONFLICT AND CREATIVITY**

A dynamic constructivist model of the effects of conflict on individuals’ cognition in multicultural environments

Susannah Paletz, University of Pittsburgh; Ella Miron-Spektor, Technion University; Chun-Chi Lin, University of Tokyo

This paper presents a dynamic constructivist model that illustrates the effects of conflict on individuals’ creativity and analytical thinking in multicultural environments. This model contributes to the literature by highlighting ways in which cultural meanings, as types of shared mental models, may act as a moderator at several points.

Are you thinking what I’m thinking? Creativity and conflict asymmetry in interdisciplinary teams

Kevyn Yong, HEC Paris; Stephen Sauer, Clarkson University; Elizabeth Mannix, Cornell University

We examine the effects of conflict and conflict asymmetry on creativity in interdisciplinary nanobiotechnology teams. We found that task conflict positively affected creativity, and explained the usefulness component. By contrast, relationship conflict negatively affected creativity. We also found that relationship conflict asymmetry positively affected creativity, and explained the novelty component.

Does conflict enhance or inhibit creativity in innovation teams? The tension between team cognition and emotion

Gergana Todorova, University of Miami

The study examines mechanisms of the relationship between conflict and creativity and uncovers a tension between team cognition and emotions in diverse innovation teams. Findings suggest that while fear engendered by task conflict interferes with creativity, task conflict spurs creativity through its effects on deep level diversity and transactive memory.

Group creativity: The positives of being negative

Nicole Iannone & Janice Kelly, Purdue University

Three-person groups were put into negative, neutral, or positive moods and worked together on a creativity task. Negative mood groups reported more positive group processes and generated more unique and better ideas in the last half of their interaction compared to positive and neutral mood groups.

----------
Social interaction in administrative groups: A review
Eveliina Pennanen & Leena Mikkola, University of Jyväskylä

This paper takes a critical look at interdisciplinary research into social interaction in administrative groups. Reviewing research reports published in 2000–2010, the paper describes the focus of research into administrative groups. The results suggest that previous research focused on management and organizational performance. Practical implications will be discussed.

Social mechanisms of team science: A descriptive case study using as a systems perspective employing reciprocating structuration theory
Gaetano Lotrecchiano, George Washington University

Social constructivist multilevel research is employed to study a federally funded national network team to determine the social mechanisms and dynamics that drive transdisciplinary teams. Results emphasize the identification of mechanisms as well as the relationship between role and disciplinary differences and overlap.

Complex interdisciplinary collaboration to assess collaborative problem solving skills across the globe
Stephen M. Fiore, University of Central Florida; John De Jong, Global Strategy & Business Development, Pearson Plc; Pierre Dillenbourg, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology; Peter Foltz, Pearson Knowledge Technologies; Art Graesser, University of Memphis; Yigal Rosen, University of Haifa

This paper discusses a framework for assessing collaborative problem solving in the context of the Programme for International Student Assessment, an internationally standardized assessment developed by participating countries around the world. Our goal is the development of reliable indicators of collaboration that are theoretically sound and scalable for large-scale administrations.

Evaluating collaboration and team science in the National Cancer Institute’s Physical Sciences – Oncology Consortium
Unni S. Jensen, Jodi Basner, & Laure Haak, Discovery Logic, a Thomson Reuters Business; Nicole M. Moore, Larry A. Nagahara, & Jerry S. H. Lee, National Cancer Institute

This study developed and tested methods and tools to measure the outcomes and success of the National Cancer Institute’s Physical Sciences - Oncology Centers program in stimulating collaboration between physical scientists and cancer researchers, converging diverse research fields, and producing novel research findings related to cancer biology and therapeutics.

Who contributes to a discussion? Relational confidence as a predictor of participation in decision-making groups
Torsten Reimer, Purdue University; Isabel Botero, Aarhus University

We report an empirical study with three-member groups, in which we explored the role of group members’ confidence ratings as a predictor of group participation. The solitary-confidence hypothesis assumes that highly confident members participate more frequently in group discussions than lowly confident members. Conversely, the relational-confidence hypothesis predicts that working with members who have a low rather than high confidence level increases participation rates. The study supported the relational-confidence hypothesis.

Participation across multiple small group discussion sessions: Egocentric and group-centric influences
Joseph Bonito & Jennifer Ervin, University of Arizona; John Gastil, The Pennsylvania State University; Renee Meyers, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Examines participation across multiple group discussion sessions. Multilevel analysis is used to identify consistency in participation across sessions and across groups. The two data analyzed differ in structure, allowing for multiple, complementary assessments of participation (continues on next page)
Participation analysis: Assessing individuals’ direct and indirect contribution to team outcomes
Amit Gal, Tel-Aviv University

This paper presents a method for assessing individual contributions to team outcomes. The method is applicable to settings in which work is repeatedly performed by constantly-changing team compositions. The methods also enables differentiating between direct and indirect contribution of members to team outcomes. Implications to the study of teams are discussed.

Towards supporting social deliberative skills in online group dialogues
Tom Murray, Beverly Park Woolf, & Leah Wing, University of Massachusetts

We tested features of software meant to scaffold “social deliberative skills” in group dialogue and present a theoretical framework and initial results from a study of online dialogue in a college classroom. In addition to hand-coding we are exploring the use of automated text analysis tools to characterize group attributes.

10:30 – 11:45am: Session 9
Michigan, 2nd Floor
SYMPOSIUM: Understanding group performance: A tribute to James H. Davis
R. Scott Tindale & Katharina Kluwe, Loyola University Chicago; Christine M. Smith, Grand Valley State University; Amanda Dykema-Engblade, Northeastern Illinois University; Verlin B. Hinsz, North Dakota State University; Bryan Bonner, University of Utah; Sheli Sillito, Brigham Young University; Ernest Park, Grand Valley State University

Jim Davis was one of the prominent members of the “Illinois School” of groups research, and produced a vast body of both empirical and theoretical work on group decision making and performance. The papers in this session are not meant to mimic or revisit Jim’s work, but rather to highlight some current themes in group performance research that were at least partially inspired by Jim and his approach. Rather than looking backward, the research discussed here attempts to continue to move the field forward by addressing new questions and presenting new data and ideas.

10:30 – 11:45am: Session 10
Huron, Lower Level
PANEL: Team processes in acute care teams
Michaela Kolbe, ETH Zurich; Margarete Boos, University of Göttingen; Mary J. Waller, York University; Norbert Semmer, University of Bern; Franziska Tschan, Université de Neuchâtel; Eduardo Salas, University of Central Florida; Stephan Marsch, University Hospital Basel

In this international panel, researchers from I/O and Social Psychology and Acute Care Medicine will highlight aspects of team processes considered critical for effective acute care teamwork. Among these are team interaction pattern in pediatric trauma simulations, experienced stress during cardiac arrest treatment, team debriefings, CRM training, and teamwork sustainability.

12:00 – 1:00pm: Lunch
LaSalle Ballroom, Lower Level

1:15 – 2:15pm: MCGRATH ADDRESS: OVER 30 AND LOVING IT
John M. Levine and Richard L. Moreland

LaSalle Ballroom, Lower Level
John M. Levine and Richard L. Moreland

2011 Joseph E. McGrath Lifetime Achievement Award Recipients

**John M. Levine** did his undergraduate work at Northwestern University and received his PhD in Psychology from the University of Wisconsin. He is Professor of Psychology and Senior Scientist at the Learning Research and Development Center at the University of Pittsburgh. Dr. Levine has served as Associate Editor of the Journal of Research in Personality, both Associate Editor and Editor of the Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, and Executive Committee Chair of the Society of Experimental Social Psychology. He is a Fellow of several professional societies, including the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, the Society of Experimental Social Psychology, and the Association for Psychological Science. Dr. Levine has edited several books on group processes and published extensively on such topics as majority and minority influence, reaction to deviance and disloyalty, group socialization, and innovation in work teams. He is an Honorary Professor of Psychology at the University of Kent, UK.

**Richard L. Moreland** did his undergraduate work at the University of Colorado and received his PhD in Psychology from the University of Michigan. After leaving Michigan, Dr. Moreland came to the University of Pittsburgh, where he is a Professor in the Department of Psychology and at the Joseph Katz Graduate School of Business. Dr. Moreland has served as Associate Editor for several journals, including (at present) Small Group Research and Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes. He is a Fellow of Divisions 8, 9, and 49 of the American Psychological Association, and of the Society of Experimental Social Psychology. Dr. Moreland has published papers on many aspects of small groups, focusing on such phenomena as group socialization, group composition, transactive memory, and (recently) the relationship between reflexivity and group performance.
**TRUST AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY**

**Trust in temporary work groups**
Tine Koehler, The University of Melbourne; Jose M. Cortina, George Mason University; Eduardo Salas, University of Central Florida; Alice J. Garven, U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

Temporary work teams are a relatively new form of teamwork in organizations with many challenges for the development of trust. Nevertheless, trust is crucial for these teams. This paper develops a model of trust in TWGs, offering a roadmap of challenges to trust development and alternative bases for trust.

**A contingency view of the effects of cognitive diversity on team performance: The moderating roles of team psychological safety and relationship conflict**
Luis Martins, University of Texas at Austin; Marieke Schilpzand, Georgia Gwinnett College; Bradley Kirkman, Texas A&M University; Silvester Ivanaj, ICN Business School; Vera Ivanaj, Chemical Engineering School, ENSIC

We examined how psychological safety and relationship conflict moderated the effects of expertise and expertness diversity on team performance. We found that under low psychological safety, expertise diversity was negatively related but expertness diversity was positively related to performance. Under low relationship conflict, expertness diversity was positively related to performance.

**The impact of religious diversity on the development of trust in STATs**
Jessica Wildman, Stephanie Miloslavic, & Alicia Paul, Florida Institute of Technology

This presentation theorizes about a critical understudied cultural variable – religious affiliation – that is likely to have an impact on trust in swift starting action teams. We utilize social categorization theory to suggest that prejudice toward non-religious team members will reduce trust in the team as a whole.

**From self-to other-centric: The impact of team (dis)satisfaction and psychological safety on performance evaluation biases**
Kristin Behfar, University of Virginia; Ray Friedman & David Oh, Vanderbilt University

Research on self-serving bias in teams has focused on bias after team feedback. Many teams, however, work for extended periods of time before receiving feedback. This paper proposes and finds that team members exhibit biases prior to receiving feedback, depending on the level of team satisfaction.

**STRATEGIES AND TACTICS**

“*I apologize, but not for your sake*”: Working through disclosures to create group cohesion
Mai Trinh & Andrew Schnackenberg, Case Western Reserve University

This paper looks at the process by which group cohesion emerges: how it comes into existence, and how it changes. Conceptualized as an emergent state that is constantly enhanced or diminished by group dynamics, cohesion is shaped by repertoires of disclosures, responses, and varies by perspectives.

**Compensatory identity shift in demographically diverse and similar groups**
Kawon Kim & Margaret Ormiston, London Business School; Matt Easterbrook & Vivian Vignoles, University of Sussex

We examined whether a group’s demographic composition activates members’ strivings for belonging and distinctiveness, thus leading to a compensatory identity shift. Through multilevel regression analyses, we find that members of diverse groups emphasize aspects of their identity that satisfy belonging needs, suggesting important implications for the management of diverse groups.

(continues on next page)
Newcomers as innovation agents: Group receptivity to integrating versus differentiating identity strategies
Aimee Kane, Duquesne University; Floor Rink, University of Groningen

Three experiments examined whether newcomers can increase group receptivity through language-based identity strategies that differentially signal group concern. Newcomers using an integrating strategy emphasizing group identity (We) elicited greater knowledge consideration, knowledge adoption, performance, and expertise recognition than those using a differentiating strategy emphasizing personal identity (I vs. you).

Collective implementation intentions improve physical persistence in interdependent small groups
J. Lukas Thürmer, FrankWieber, & Peter M. Gollwitzer, University of Konstanz

Groups often strive for their goals suboptimally and thus underperform. Extending implementation intention theory (Gollwitzer, 1999), we suggest collective implementation intentions a group-tailored goal striving strategy to facilitate goal attainment. We report data showing that collective implementation intentions improve triads’ interactions and performance in an interdependent persistence task (Bray, 2004).

2:30 – 3:45pm: Session 13
Superior III, 2nd Floor

TASK FEATURES

Simple heuristics and information sharing in groups
Torsten Reimer, Purdue University; Ulrich Hoffrage, University of Lausanne

Previous research on hidden profiles indicated that groups have difficulties mastering the challenge of communicating and integrating unique information held by single group members. We summarize the results of a set of simulation studies and of two experiments, in which we identified conditions that enable groups to detect hidden profiles.

Task features, reward sensitivity, and coordination: Beyond transactive memory
Michael Baumann, University of Texas at San Antonio; Bryan Bonner, University of Utah

Although transactive memory has been heavily researched, how task features and individual differences may modify TM structures has been largely overlooked. The current study examines how differences in task component difficulty, task component value, and member reward sensitivity affects these structures.

2:30 – 3:45pm: Session 14
Michigan, 2nd Floor

EVOLUTION AND ADAPTATION

The evolution of TMM similarity and accuracy over time: A latent growth modeling approach
Catarina Santos & Ana Passos, Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL)

This study aims to analyze how team mental models (TMM) evolves over time (based on similarity and accuracy measures); and which team composition variables explain TMM evolution. Teams enrolled in a competition for a 5-week period participated in this study. Hypotheses were tested with Latent Growth Modeling.

Mental model updating and team adaptation
Sjir Uitdewilligen, Maastricht University; Mary Waller, York University; Adrian Pitariu, University of Regina

In the present study we tested the relations between initial mental model similarity and accuracy, team mental model updating—the extent to which team members update their mental models in reaction to a change in the task situation—the development of novel interaction patterns, and team adaptive performance.

(continues on next page)
Adaptive team performance: The role of learning
Wendy Bedwell, University of Central Florida

This effort seeks to further the study of team adaptation by articulating propositions derived from a scientifically-based model addressing the role of learning in adaptive performance. Specifically, this effort explores mechanisms for developing shared mental models and their influence on the relationship between membership change and adaptive team performance.

Team adaptation to nonroutine events: A social identity perspective
Golchehreh Sohrab & Mary J. Waller, York University

We investigate the role of team identity as a potential determinant of team adaptation and responsiveness to nonroutine events. Using survey and video data, we analyze team interactions during stable and routine conditions and contrast it with team interactions as individuals worked during a stressful, complex task replete with unexpected events.

2:30 – 3:45pm: Session 15
Huron, Lower Level

PANEL: Beyond the small group: Cohesion in complex teams

Arwen DeCostanza, Jay Goodwin & Armando X. Estrada, U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences; Amanda Thayer & Eduardo Salas, University of Central Florida; Leslie DeChurch, Georgia Institute of Technology; Noshir Contractor, Northwestern University; Steve Kozlowski, Michigan State University; Paul Tesluk, University of Buffalo

Existing cohesion research focuses primarily on the small group, while teams are operating in more complex environments requiring larger, diverse, adaptive, and dispersed entities. To enhance applicability of research, a panel of experts with diverse perspectives will discuss the theoretical, measurement, and practical issues related to cohesion in complex teams.

3:45 – 4:15pm:
State Room, Lower Level

Refreshment Break

4:15 – 5:15pm: Session 16
Superior I, 2nd Floor

DETECTING GROUP PROCESSES AND BEHAVIORS

Beyond content analysis: Modeling interaction sequences with statistical discourse analysis
Nale Lehmann-Willenbrock, TU Braunschweig; Ming Ming Chiu, SUNY Buffalo

This paper showcases Statistical Discourse Analysis (SDA). We describe the typical approach to interaction data (coding, content analysis and possible conclusions) and illustrate how SDA addresses many more research questions. We compare content analysis and SDA in a sample of 43,139 utterances by 237 employees during 43 regular team meetings.

Fixation effects in brainstorming: A reanalysis using recurrence quantification methods
Jamie Kohn, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio; Nicholas Kohn, Air Force Research Laboratory

This study examined clustering and fixation in brainstorming by using data from an earlier data set. Recurrence quantification analysis showed that interactive groups exhibit more clustering, more “trains of thought,” and longer “trains of thought” than nominal groups. These data suggest that fixation is more prevalent in interactive groups.

(continues on next page)
Understanding team decision making through signal detection theory (SDT) in an intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) “Red/Blue” Exercise
James Won & Daniel Hannon, Tufts University

In the ISR “Red/Blue” game, self-organized teams work together to uncover clandestine networks. Modeled as a two-stage decision process, Signal Detection Theory (SDT) is used to describe teamwork and performance. Varying team size shows increasing resources does not improve performance or teamwork, but performance is more dependent on balanced interactions amongst teammates.

4:15 – 5:15pm: Session 17
Superior II, 2nd Floor

COACHING AND FEEDBACK

What influences “when”? The antecedents of the timing and form of team coaching interventions
Colin Fisher, Boston University

This study investigates how team coaches’ observational processes influence the timing and type of their coaching interventions. Using responses to a video case, it shows that participants with more team coaching experience intervened later and were more likely to use a participative style than those with less experience.

Team reflection: A mediator or a moderator in the relationship between team coaching and team performance
Martina Buljac, Erasmus University; Marianne van Woerkom, University of Tilburg

The relationship between coaching leadership and team performance may be mediated or moderated by team reflection. This study shows that team reflection is a moderator and not a mediator in this relationship. Coaching leadership may not foster team reflection, but rather take over the reflective function if teams do not reflect on their own initiative.

The role of feedback for intercultural team identity development
Jessica Wildman & Thomas Skiba, Florida Institute of Technology

In this paper, we introduce a theoretical framework for understanding the development of intercultural team identities through different team processes. Specifically, we propose integrating feedback and transactive memory systems as mechanisms by which teams develop adaptive cultures and perform.

4:15 – 5:15pm: Session 18
Superior III, 2nd Floor

DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSITIONS

Creating and sustaining effective teams: Towards a temporally based framework of team development interventions
Marissa Shuffler, University of Central Florida; Deborah Diaz Granados, Virginia Commonwealth University; Eduardo Salas, University of Central Florida

While research on teams and team development is prolific, less is known about when team development interventions (i.e., training, coaching, etc.) are best implemented. We propose a temporally based framework that advances an understanding of when, throughout the team performance lifecycle, these interventions should be introduced to best impact performance.

The dynamics of team embeddedness: The role of network development for project performance
Josette Gevers & Boudewijn Driedonks, Eindhoven University of Technology; Mariann Jelinek, William & Mary; Arjan van Weele, Eindhoven University of Technology

Based on six in-depth case study analyses, we developed the Dynamic Embeddedness Model, which exhibits how a team’s project performance is affected by the development of upstream and downstream network links. The case studies pointed at a disproportionate impact of teams’ early external connections on project performance.

(continues on next page)
We’re halfway there? A closer look at why and how task groups transition
Sujin Jang & Richard Hackman, Harvard University

Advancing current understanding of Gersick’s (1988) punctuated equilibrium model, we examined why and how small task groups experience transitions. We found that midpoint transitions are characterized by a shift in activity and perspective, rather than an increase in any single activity. We also found that transitions were driven by internal, rather than external, pacing mechanisms.

--------

4:15 – 5:15pm: Session 19
Michigan, 2nd Floor

PANEL: Bridging boundaries towards collaborative team science

Leslie DeChurch, Dorothy Carter, & Raquel Asencio-Hodge, Georgia Institute of Technology; Stephen M. Fiore, University of Central Florida; Noshir Contractor, Northwestern University; Stephen Zaccaro, George Mason University

This panel will discuss 1) how multiteam system research can be used to understand and improve team science, and 2) the need for an interdisciplinary approach for studying scientific collaboration. We discuss how perspectives from psychological, organizational, and cognitive sciences are brought to bear to examine collaboration in science teams.

--------

4:15 – 5:15pm: Session 20
Huron, Lower Level

PANEL: Moving beyond methodological differences

Stephenson Beck, North Dakota State University; Joann Keyton, North Carolina State University; Mary Waller, York University; Bertolt Meyer, University of Zurich

The panel we propose explores the role (and potential usefulness) of methodological critiques. Panelists will respond to the following two questions: How can scholars use comments outside their discipline to enhance their discipline-specific research? How can scholars from different disciplines integrate methodological differences to enhance group research?

--------

5:15 – 5:45pm:
State Room, Lower Level

Poster Setup

5:45 – 7:00pm:
State Room, Lower Level

Poster Session and Reception
1) Measuring shared mental models without prior knowledge of the task: Metrics for mental model convergence and distinctiveness  
Sandra Carpenter, Harry Delugach, Dawn Utley, Letha Etzkorn, & Julie Fortune, University of Alabama, Huntsville

2) Meetings that suck! The ultimate price of collaboration process bias  
Yekaterina Bezrukova, Santa Clara University; Chester Spell, Rutgers University; Terri Griffith, Santa Clara University

3) Who's late this time?: The effects of lateness to meetings on meeting satisfaction and effectiveness  
Nicole Landowski, Joseph Allen, Max Porter, Holly Hinkel, & Christian Ebers, Creighton University

4) Reinforcing cooperation: Decision processes in the intergroup vs. single group prisoner’s dilemma  
Corinne Coen, Case Western Reserve University

5) Effects of goal instructions and response format on group brainstorming performance  
Olga Goldenberg, University of Illinois at Chicago; James R. Larson, Jr., Loyola University Chicago; Jennifer Wiley, University of Illinois at Chicago

6) What did you say? Repetition during discussion and group decision making  
Ryan Leach & Jennifer Wiley, University of Illinois at Chicago; James Larson, Loyola University

7) The case for a group dynamics curriculum for K-12  
Joann Keyton, North Carolina State University; Michael Beyerlein, Purdue University; Renee Meyers, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee; Scott Schaffer, Purdue University

8) The adaptive use of recognition in group decision making  
Juliane Kämmer & Wolfgang Gaissmaier, Max Planck Institute for Human Development; Torsten Reimer, Purdue University; Carsten Schermuly, SRH Hochschule Berlin

9) Group potency and team performance: The moderating role of cohesion  
Hayden Woodley, Western University; Tom O’Neill, University of Calgary; Sheerin Thussu, Deloitte; Erin Marcotte, Self Management Group; Natalie Allen, Western University

10) Threats for concentration in the operating room: Different types of distractors affect concentration ability and stress in a multidisciplinary team in accordance with task requirements  
Julia C. Seelandt & Franziska Tschan, University of Neuchatel; Norbert K. Semmer & Sandra Keller, University of Bern; Daniel Candinas & Guido Beldi, University Hospital of Bern

11) Self-stereotyping, collaboration, and task performance in multi-cultural teams  
Kay Yoon, DePaul University

12) Enhancing teamwork via high-fidelity simulation  
Glenn Littlepage, Michael Hein, Paul Craig, Richard Moffett, Andrea Georgiou, & Durant Bridges, Middle Tennessee State University

(continues on next page)
13) Where’s the boss? The influence of geographic distribution, virtual tools, and team composition on team leadership emergence
Marissa Shuffler, C. Shawn Burke, Stephen M. Fiore, & Eduardo Salas, University of Central Florida

14) The interaction of peer justice and relationship conflict on team performance
Louis Lipani, Mary (Molly) Kern, & Zeynep Aytug, Baruch College

15) A multilevel analysis of what’s missing from team training transfer theory and research
Mary Jane Sierra & Kimberly Smith-Jentsch, University of Central Florida

16) Trust and distrust in teams: Empirical evidence for a new research paradigm
Jessica Wildman, Florida Institute of Technology; Amanda Thayer & Elizabeth Lazzara, University of Central Florida; Maritza Salazar, Claremont Graduate University; Eduardo Salas, University of Central Florida

17) I don’t understand what you mean: The moderating role of shared mental models on information sharing effectiveness
Christopher Wiese & Kimberly Smith-Jentsch, University of Central Florida; Mike Rosen, Johns Hopkins Medical Institution

18) Prior working experiences in teams: An examination in financial audit teams
M. Travis Maynard, Colorado State University; Matthew D. Dean, University of Southern Maine

19) The analogical mind of teams: Leading functional diverse teams towards performance
Nicoleta Meslec, Tilburg University; Daniel Graff, Aalto University School of Economics; Petru L. Curseu & Marius T. H. Meeus, Tilburg University

20) Increasing the performance of virtual teams: The context role of trust climate
Florian Kunze & Taiga Brahm, University of St. Gallen
Saturday, July 14th 2012

7:30 – 8:30am:
State Room, Lower Level

8:00am – 12:00pm:
Lobby, Lower Level

8:30 – 9:45am:  Session 21
Superior I, 2nd Floor

STATUS AND HIERARCHIES

Reconsidering the diversity-performance relationship: An examination of the role of stereotypes and status configuration accuracy in diverse work groups
Hans van Dijk, Tilburg University; Bertolt Meyer, University of Zurich; Marloes van Engen, Tilburg University

We advance a status perspective on work group diversity and show how stereotyping and status-related processes impact the performance of diverse groups. Our findings challenge some of the conventional wisdom in diversity research and call for a reconsideration of the social categorization and the information/decision-making perspective.

The dysfunctional side of status: Status distance and change as determinants of damaging intragroup behavior
Nathan Pettit, New York University

This research goes beyond the historically predominant static, ordinal, ranked-based view of status differences by incorporating two important concepts—status distance and status distance change—and demonstrates that variance along these dimensions predicts damaging intragroup behavior (i.e., social undermining, information withholding) even while rank-based differences are held constant.

Your face determines your place: The effects of facial structure on group hierarchy, conflict and performance
Margaret Ormiston, London Business School; Elaine Wong & Michael Haselhuhn, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

We propose that social hierarchies emerge in groups based on group members’ observable characteristics, specifically their facial width (relative to height) and that these hierarchies benefit group outcomes. We studied MBA teams and found that hierarchies based on facial structure negatively relate to conflict and positively relate to group performance.

Minority influence and communication of shared information in group discussions of controversial issues
Lyn Van Swol, Michael Braun, Emily Acosta, & Carlson Cassandra, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Dimperio Giovanna, Shine Advertising

Participants received information about whether “under God” should be in the pledge of allegiance and discussed the issue in groups. Deviant group members who mentioned more shared information were more influential in the group, but the relationship between mentioning shared information and influence was not significant for other group members.

-----------

8:30 – 9:45am:  Session 22
Superior II, 2nd Floor

ASPECTS OF AFFECT

Emotional experience in groups
Janice Kelly, Megan McCarty, & Nicole Iannone, Purdue University

We present the results of an internet based survey designed to provide descriptive information on emotion expression across a wide variety of groups. Greater expression of positive emotions and less expression of negative emotions characterized the most highly entitative groups. High arousal positive emotions were associated with positive group processes.

(continues on next page)
Who’s bringing the donuts? The role of positive affect in group decision making
Kyle Emich, Cornell University

The current study explores the role of positive affect in group information exchange and decision making. The results of two studies show that when group members are in positive affect they are more likely to share unique information and disagree when appropriate. Additionally, these behaviors act as cognitive cues so that neutral affect group members display similar behavior when teamed with people in positive affect.

The signal provision of emotion: Using emotions to enhance reliability via sensemaking
Joseph Allen, Creighton University; Cliff Scott, University of North Carolina at Charlotte; John Crowe, Creighton University; Sarah Tracy, Arizona State University

Limited research in high reliability organizations considers how normative demands on emotion help to explain why some anomalous events are heedfully enacted and others not. We present a theoretical model explaining how the signal provision of emotion contributes to the heedful enactment of anomalous events in high reliability organizations.

‘Would you like to talk about that?’ An exploration of the impact of group emotional awareness in gender diverse teams
Smaranda Boros, Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School; Petru Curseu, Tilburg University

Group emotional awareness generally impacts positively team effectiveness. At the same time, in gender diverse teams it elicits categorization on a differentiating topic (emotions), with possible negative effects. In two studies (a cross-sectional survey and an experiment), we seek to specify conditions when gender diverse teams benefit from group emotional awareness.

---

8:30 – 9:45am: Session 23
Superior III, 2nd Floor

TEAM COMPOSITION

Composing the ideal team: An algorithmic study of personality characteristics and team performance
Deanna Kennedy, University of Washington Bothell; Sara McComb, Purdue University

Team member characteristics influence team performance but what values matter? We examine average, diversity (variance), maximum or minimum characteristic values using an algorithmic approach. Our results suggest what the best model is for relating personality characteristics to team performance under different working conditions. Implications for composing teams are discussed.

How to create a team: The role of expertise distribution in designing effective software development teams
Sri Kudaravalli, HEC Paris; Samer Faraj, McGill University

We study the effect of expertise distribution on software team performance. Research suggests that broadly distributed expertise leads to better group performance. However, we find that, while distribution of design expertise is associated with improved group performance, the distribution of technical expertise is negatively associated with group performance.

Linking team composition to team performance in virtual organizations: An application to post-disaster debris removal operations
David Mendonca, James Brooks, & Martha Grabowski, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

This paper examines differential effects of team composition on team performance in a multi-team system. Results suggest that prior equivocal results on this relationship may be due to task-related factors and to the role of fluidity in the tradeoff between effectiveness and equality.

(continues on next page)
Teamwork and talent: Implications for team performance
Bret Bradley & John Baur, University of Oklahoma

Teamwork and talent represent two critical factors in a team’s success. Research shows that both are associated with team performance. Yet, we know little about how teamwork and talent interact. We aim to explore the interaction between teamwork and talent in this paper using data from professional hockey teams.

8:30 – 9:45am: Session 24
Michigan, 2nd Floor

NEW WAYS TO THINK ABOUT AND MEASURE GROUP PHENOMENA

The Team Descriptive Index (TDI): Operationalizing the multidimensional scaling approach to team description
John Hollenbeck, Stephanie Lee, Klodiana Lanaj, & Joel Koopman, Michigan State University

The literature on teams is replete alternative team type taxonomies, but little consensus on how to differentiate teams. In this presentation, we report the results of a series of studies designed to develop a set of standardized measures for the three continuous constructs that underlie most categorical team type systems.

Assessing collaborative expertise in student design and innovation teams
Xaver Neumeyer & Michael Marasco, Northwestern University; Ann McKenna, Arizona State University

Our work is investigating the role of collaboration expertise in the context of student design and innovation project work. Specifically, we are interested in how students perceive different aspects of collaboration expertise such as team conflict or design uncertainty. We are using a mixed-method approach to data collection through student interviews, team observations, reflective memos, and surveys.

Beyond the individual: A theory of team-level stress
Mary Jane Sierra & Kimberly Smith-Jentsch, University of Central Florida

We propose a comprehensive theory of team-level stress based on the principles of multilevel theory and aim to clearly differentiate it from individual-level stress theory. Further, we delineate our theory's implications for both measuring and limiting team stress, and provide practical recommendations for doing so.

Diversity faultlines for multiple subgroups: A cluster-analytic approach
Bertolt Meyer & Andreas Glenz, University of Zurich

Several measures for quantifying diversity faultlines - hypothetical dividing lines splitting a team into homogeneous subgroups - exist. Their examination with simulated data reveals that no measure is applicable if teams consist of more than two subgroups. We thus propose a new measure and demonstrate its applicability to multi-subgroup situations.

8:30 – 9:45am: Session 25
Huron, Lower Level

PANEL: Connecting the dots: Team interaction patterns, team processes, and team emergence

Zhike Lei & Jan Hagen, European School of Management and Technology; Simone Kauffeld, Technische Universität Braunschweig; Michaela Kolbe & Mona Weiss, ETH Zurich; Nale Lehmann-Willenbrock, Technical University – Braunschweig; Stephan U. Marsch, University Hospital of Basel; Norbert Semmer, University of Berne; Franziska Tschan, University of Neuchâtel; Mary Waller, York University

While much has been written about how team interaction patterns affect team processes, we know little about whether and how interaction patterns influence team emergence. This interdisciplinary panel (Industrial-Organizational Psychology, Organizational Behavior, Healthcare, Aviation) reports four empirical investigations examining the relationships between interaction patterns, team processes, and team emergence.
9:45 – 10:15am:  
State Room, Lower Level  
Refreshment Break

10:30 – 11:45am: Session 26  
Superior I, 2nd Floor

**COORDINATION**

**Team coordination during cardiopulmonary resuscitation: A systematic review of the literature**  
Ezequiel Fernandez Castelao, Georg-August University; Sebastian G. Russo, University Medical Centre Göttingen; Martin Riethmüller & Margarete Boos, Georg-August University

The purpose of this review is to identify and evaluate to what extent the literature on team coordinating during cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) empirically confirms its positive effect on CPR performance. An integrative model was developed to explain linkages between three main coordination mechanisms: Planning, leadership, and communication.

**Dynamics of team coordination from a team learning perspective**  
Catherine Gabelica, Piet van den Bossche, Mien Segers, & Wim Gijshelders, Maastricht University

In a multiple-measures experiment 33 teams with no prior experience in flight games were assigned to newly formed dyads to complete a flight simulation task. The study showed how team learning processes, driven by team interpersonal context, supported coordination development, which in turn predicted subsequent team performance.

**Team performance in police special forces: Testing the conditional indirect effect of transactive memory systems on team coordination and team adaptive performance**  
Pedro Marques-Quinteiro, Instituto Universitário de Lisboa; Luís Curral, Lisbon University; Ana Margarida Passos, Instituto Universitário de Lisboa

This study suggests that both forms of team coordination (i.e. implicit and explicit) positively predict subsequent team adaptive performance, and that this in turn predicts team performance. This study also suggests that team transactive memory systems positively influence the strength of this relationship.

**Safer surgery through team interventions**  
Connie Dekker-Van Doorn, Erasmus University; Linda Wauben, Delft University of Technology; Jeroen van Wijngaarden, Johan Lange, & Robbert Huisman, Erasmus University

In 12 Dutch hospitals a team-based Time Out Procedure and Debriefing were introduced in the Operating Room using Design theories and theories on Organizational Learning. To explore the effect of the design and implementation process case studies were carried out in 6 hospitals. Analysis includes 56 interviews.

-----------

10:30 – 11:45am: Session 27  
Superior II, 2nd Floor

**DIVERSITY**

**The dynamic relationships between team composition and team performance: An investigation with latent growth models**  
Jia Li, University of Göttingen; Bertolt Meyer, University of Zurich; Meir Shemla & Jürgen Wegge, Technology University of Dresden

In a study of 279 consultant teams over five years, we, using latent growth modeling, found that 1) team gender and age diversity and team performance develops linearly over time but 2) temporal change in team gender and age diversity has no concurrent impact on temporal change in team performance.

(continues on next page)
Team diversity, team processes, and team performance: The moderating role of leader mood  
Meir Shemla & Jürgen Wegge, Technical University Dresden; Eric Kearney, GISMA Business School; Sebastian Stegmann, Frankfurt University

In a study of 59 teams we found that team diversity was related to team identification and elaboration in contrasting links. Such incongruence between identification and information-elaboration poses an intriguing challenge with respect to previous research. Also in contrast to previous research, elaboration was conducive to team performance only when team identification was high.

Cognitive style diversity and team creativity  
Ishani Aggarwal & Anita Woolley, Carnegie Mellon University

Cognitive diversity is a source of both beneficial resources and detrimental processes in teams. Past research has demonstrated that it is related to suboptimal performance in tasks that require execution and coordination. In the current work, we explore its effects on team processes and performance on a creative task.

The cognitive benefits of advocating group diversity  
Sun Young (Sunny) Kim, Northwestern University; Katherine Phillips, Columbia University

This research examines the influence that group diversity (versus group similarity) has on individual levels of cognition. The results of this study show that individuals who endorse a diversity mindset rather than a similarity mindset engage in more diversity of thought and perform better on a cognitive reflection task.

Group decision making the fast and frugal way  
Nicholas Aramovich & J. Richard Hackman, Harvard University

This paper addresses whether groups have a set of specific heuristics in their toolbox that allow them to render good decisions fast and frugally. We offer our conceptualization of a group heuristic, review literature on group information processing, and specify conditions in which specific heuristics are likely to be adaptive.

Thinking together vs. thinking alone: The costs and benefits of collaborative judgment  
Julia Minson & Jennifer Mueller, University of Pennsylvania

We compare judgments of individuals working alone versus with a partner. We find that dyads’ judgments are no more accurate than individual ones, unless the task is one allowing for extreme errors. However, because dyad members are more confident, they take less outside input, which also impedes accuracy.

Groups outperform individuals in tacit coordination by using consensual and disjunctive salience  
Christopher Chartier & Susanne Abele, Miami University

We tested the tacit coordination of groups and individuals. Groups performed far better than individuals. This advantage is driven by groups frequently having an initial majority supporting the focal point (consensual salience) as well as being able to recognize the focal point if one member supports it (disjunctive salience).

The effects of cheating on deception detection during a social dilemma  
Kristina Swanenburg & Richard Moreland, University of Pittsburgh

The literature on deception detection suggests people should be poor at detecting cheating exchange partners, whereas the literature on cheating suggests people are good at detecting such partners. Activation of the cheating detection module may explain this discrepancy. Results suggest individuals susceptible to cheating sometimes have increased deception detection accuracy.
LEADERSHIP AND EXPERTISE

Expertise dissensus: A multi-level model of teams’ differing perceptions about member expertise
Heidi Gardner & Lisa Kwan, Harvard University

We introduce the concept of expertise dissensus, which reflects the variance in team members’ perceptions of one another’s expertise levels. We argue that it matters how team members perceive all others’ expertise—not just the most expert—and develop and test a multi-level model to explain how expertise dissensus affects team processes and outcomes.

“Help them stop complaining”: Effects of transformational leadership on dysfunctional communication in team meetings
Annika Meinecke, Nale Lehmann-Willenbrock, & Simone Kauffeld, TU Braunschweig

This study examines the link between transformational leadership and team meeting communication. 32 teams were videotaped during regular meetings at two points in time. We found a link between transformational leadership and communicative leader behaviors. Moreover, multilevel modeling revealed that transformational leadership functions as a buffer against dysfunctional communication.

On the same side of the divide: How diversity faultlines can bring benefits to team members if they are similar to their leader
Bertolt Meyer, University of Zurich; Meir Shemla & Jürgen Wegge, Technology University of Dresden

Diversity faultlines—hypothetical dividing lines splitting a group into homogeneous subgroups—are assumed to be detrimental for group-level outcomes. However, based on a large field sample of financial consultants, we show that faultlines can be beneficial for those team members who are in the same homogeneous subgroup as their leader.

PANEL: Translating team science to practice: What works and what doesn’t?
Wendy Bedwell & Kimberly Smith-Jentsch, University of Central Florida; Mark Clark, American University; Joann Keyton, North Carolina State University; Jay Goodwin, U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

If existing theories are adequate for complex, dynamic real world environments, then how do we transition those theories to practice? Experts in translational research—bridging science and practice—will engage with one another and the audience in a discussion addressing the successes and failures of translating team science to practice.

IMPORTANCE OF CONTEXT AND THE SITUATION

Inter-team knowledge sharing: The effects of context and when lobbying can help
Henrik Bresman, INSEAD

This paper develops a model relating knowledge sharing across teams to their context. Findings from R&D teams suggest that the effectiveness of teams’ efforts to induce other teams to share knowledge by lobbying management is contingent on the configuration of their context and the kind of knowledge that is shared.

(continues on next page)
The prevention and regulatory functions of group emotional intelligence: Evidence for a cascading model
Smaranda Boros, Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School; Petru Curseu, Tilburg University; Delia Virga, Universitatea de Vest Timisoara

Starting from cascading model of emotional intelligence (i.e., emotional awareness is a precondition for emotion regulation-Joseph & Newman, 2010), we propose mechanisms and contingency factors which explain the development of group emotional intelligence at the cross-roads between individual capacities and situations groups face.

To live and let die: Regulatory climate and climate strength in World of Warcraft teams
Eric Rietzschel & Daniël Meijer, University of Groningen

This survey study looks at regulatory focus and regulatory climate in World of Warcraft raid teams. We hypothesize that the relative importance of these constructs in predicting team innovation depends on the degree of within-team agreement of climate perceptions, also called climate strength.

Regulatory focus affects group decision-making: The role of information elaboration and intra-group conflict
Michael Josef Burtscher & Bertolt Meyer, University of Zurich

Applying regulatory focus theory to decision-making groups, we found that groups in the promotion focus condition solved on average more tasks correctly than groups in the prevention focus condition. Further analyzing the underlying mechanism of this effect, we investigated the role information elaboration and intra-group conflict.

1:45 – 3:00pm: Session 32
Superior II, 2nd Floor

ROLE AND PERCEPTIONS OF INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

Social ostracism in task groups: The role of member agreeableness
Gwen Wittenbaum, Michigan State University

In three-person task groups, the member who was out of the loop (i.e., missing task-relevant information) reported negative psychological consequences after being ostracized by the other two members. These negative consequences (for felt belonging to the group and mood) were mitigated in groups composed of members high in agreeableness.

Own and others’ personality characteristics influence the emergence of leadership behavior in teams
Christine Gockel, University of Fribourg; Rebecca Schmidt, Chemnitz University of Technology

In a sample of 27 student research teams, we examined the effects of own and fellow team members’ personality characteristics on individual leadership behaviors. For constructive leadership behaviors, we found own extraversion, others’ extraversion, and others’ agreeableness to be predictive. For destructive leadership behaviors, only own agreeableness was predictive.

When expertise trumps extraversion: The role of functional diagnosticity
Susanne Abele, Gary Stasser, & Matt Groebe, Miami University

There is conflicting evidence whether competence or extraversion prevails in group problem solving. Two studies were conducted to test the prediction that groups recognize expertise and grant speaking opportunities accordingly only under conditions providing functional diagnosticity. Competence trumped extraversion only when problems were hard, but not when problems were moderately easy.

Social aspects in task groups: Examining mutual enhancement and perceptions of affiliation, dominance, and sexuality in the context of decision-making groups
David Henningsen & Mary Lynn Miller Henningsen, Northern Illinois University; Amanda Irtions, University of Maryland; Gregory Russell & Lisa Roth, Northern Illinois University

The current study explores the formation of social impressions among group members during a decision-making task. The influence of information distribution within groups on perceptions of affiliation, dominance, and sexuality are considered along with mutual enhancement. Mutual enhancement emerges for women but not men.
INNOVATION AND IMPROVISATION

1:45 – 3:00pm: Session 33
Superior III, 2nd Floor

Task and relational engagement: Conceptualizing multiple paths to team creativity
Amy Verbos, University of South Dakota; Amy Sommer, HEC Paris

Drawing on prior research on engagement through a positive relationship lens, we propose a new conceptualization of engagement: relational engagement with the team, and task engagement to work performed by the team. We explore the antecedents and consequences of engagement, with special attention to performance and creativity.

Selecting for innovation: The application of the motivated information processing in groups model on idea selection
Michaël van Damme & Frederik Anseel, Ghent University

Research showed that groups perform surprisingly poor on idea selection after a brainstorm task. The Motivated Information Processing in Groups (MIP G) model proposes that group decision-making is a direct function of motivated information processing. This research studied whether groups select better ideas when they are epistemically and prosocially motivated.

The role of mood similarity and emotional contagion in dyadic performance
Megan McCarty & Nicole Iannone, Purdue University; James Wirth, University of North Florida; Janice Kelly, Purdue University

We explored the impact of mood similarity and emotional contagion susceptibility on dyadic creative performance. Mood similarity interacted with emotional contagion susceptibility such that groups with greater emotional contagion susceptibility came up with more and better quality ideas when both group members were in negative as opposed to dissimilar moods.

Juggling on a treadmill: A social performance view of globally distributed improvisation
Bhuvana Narayananamurthy, Northwestern University

Building on a metaphorical view of improvisation, this paper builds a propositional view of globally distributed improvisation using grounded theory. Drawing on data from four multinational consulting firms, the paper establishes the centrality of conversations in enabling improvisations in globally distributed settings.

TIME AND ACTIVITY PATTERNS

1:45 – 3:00pm: Session 34
Michigan, 2nd Floor

Isn’t it about time we start taking events in teams seriously?
Sjir Uitdewilligen, Maastricht University; Bart de Jong, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

Whereas, most team studies take a static perspective on team performance, the present paper introduces events to provide a temporal account of the dynamic trajectories of team performance. We propose a comprehensive model of event characteristics, event dispersion characteristics, event reaction characteristics, and intermediate mechanisms to explain team performance dynamics.

Teams in ambiguous contexts: A temporal model of activity cycles in creative project teams
Kenneth Goh, Carnegie Mellon University

This study investigates temporal processes in teams engaged in creative projects. Drawing on longitudinal case studies of two interactive media development teams, properties of plan-enact-review cycles are examined, including the occurrence of cycles over the project lifespan and the temporal mapping of activities within different cycles.

Designing a temporal context for a multiteam system
Rhetta Standifer, University of Wisconsin Eau Claire; Mark Clark, American University

In this article, we describe the way in which a temporal context may be developed within a multiteam system through the effective adaptation of temporal elements to MTS episodic activity. To illustrate this concept, we use America’s Cup sailing teams’ efforts during the Cup’s multiyear tournament cycle.

(continues on next page)
The value of a transparent workflow in Mechanical Turk
Peter Kinnaird, Laura Dabbish, & Sara Kiesler, Carnegie Mellon University

Work involving interdependent tasks in Mechanical Turk (MTurk) can be managed efficiently by designing a workflow. In this paper we describe two experiments we conducted in MTurk to determine whether information about the workflow and the worker’s role in it would increase workers’ motivation. Results were mixed.

1:45 – 3:00pm: Session 35
Huron, Lower Level

SYMPOSIUM: Current directions in cohesion research

Amanda L. Thayer, Rebecca Grossman, C. Shawn Burke, Eduardo Salas, University of Central Florida; Mark Clark, American University; Samantha Baard, Subir Biswas, Dong Bo, Michael Braun, Richard P. DeShon, Steve Kozlowski, Marina Pearce, Yogesh Piolet, Tara A. Rench, Michigan State University

This symposium will provide a broad picture of current directions in cohesion research, presenting theoretical advancements, insights from applied settings, findings from extreme environments, and developments in research methods and measurement techniques. We present a sampling of cohesion research and bring to the forefront current directions in the field.

3:00 – 3:30pm:
State Room, Lower Level

Refreshment Break

3:45 – 4:45pm:
Huron, Lower Level

Open Business Meeting

4:45 – 5:45pm:
Huron, Lower Level

Graduate Student Business Meeting

6:15pm:
Museum of Contemporary Art Chicago

INGroup Photo

6:30 – 9:30pm:
Museum of Contemporary Art Chicago

Evening Event

The Caroline Davis Quartet will be performing at our closing event. This year’s event will expose INGRowp to collaboration in free jazz improvisation. Dr. Caroline Davis is an award winning performer with degrees in Jazz and Psychology, and a PhD in Music Cognition. Please join us for an intellectually and evocatively stimulating performance as we enjoy and learn about complex adaptive collaboration in jazz.
Doubletree Magnificent Mile Room Locations

2nd Floor

SUPERIOR III | SUPERIOR II | SUPERIOR I

MICHIGAN

Lower Lobby

Huron

LaSalle

Ballroom

Stairs to lobby

Restrooms

State Room
Directions to Museum of Contemporary Art Chicago

Buses will be available to the museum starting at 5:30 pm

- Buses will run every 10 minutes.
- Buses will load on the east side of the hotel on N. Fairbanks street (the Einstein Bagel entrance).
- Buses will also return from the Museum to the hotel starting at 9:00 pm.
- Drop off will be on Chicago Avenue

If you choose to walk –

- From the hotel, walk north on Fairbanks; this street will end at Chicago.
- Turn left for ½ block and cross Chicago Avenue at the crosswalk.
- After crossing the street, turn right (east) to get to the walkway.

We are entering through the courtyard entrance in the back of the museum (or the east side of the museum). The front or public entrance (up the steps) will not be open. Our entrance is directly east of the museum - there is a walkway between the terrace of the museum and the park just east of it (Lake Shore Park).
Are you a member of INGRoup?

*If not* –

For a nominal fee ($40 for faculty and professionals; $20 for students), you can support the ongoing operations of INGRoup. The money supports operating expenses like insurance and credit card processing fees, and development of new member services, like upgrading and maintenance of our website. Your membership will help maintain stability as we continue to organize conferences showcasing research on groups and teams. In addition, member of INGRoup receive a discounted conference fee and can vote for Elected Board Member positions. You can become a member at the INGRoup website (www.ingroup.net).

*If yes* –

Our new membership system allows you to update your membership information any time--just log in with your email address. All of INGRoup’s communication with you comes through this membership system. When you’re logged in, you can check the expiration date of your membership, and peruse the member directory. We’ll be rolling new features of our membership system throughout the year.

*Being an INGRoup Member Helps Support the Scholarly Study of Groups and Teams*
Be a Grouper

The following INGRoup members have made a contribution to the 2011-2012 Be a Grouper fundraising drive. Be a Grouper donations help build the organization’s operational funds so that INGRoup can remain fiscally viable and continue to provide services to the group and team scholarly community.

Michael Baumann
Joe Bonito
Michael Josef Burtscher
Stephen M. Fiore
John Gastil
Hannes Guenter
Richard J. Hackman
Benjamin Herndon
Deanna Kennedy
Joann Keyton
John Levine
Poppy McLeod
Renee Meyers
Michael O’Leary
Ernest Park
Randall Peterson
Nathan Petit
Norbert Semmer
Rhetta Standifer
Franziska Tschan
Lisa Slattery Walker
Laurie Weingart
Gwen Wittenbaum
Y. Connie Yuan

List compiled as of June 23, 2012
The 2013 INGRoup conference will take place in modern midtown Atlanta at the Renaissance Atlanta Midtown Hotel. Co-sponsored by the Georgia Institute of Technology College of Science and Scheller College of Business, conference events will also take you to several of Midtown’s unique locations, including the historic Academy of Medicine and Georgia Tech’s Scheller College of Business.

The Academy of Medicine is one of Atlanta's premier historic buildings newly restored to be one of the most elegant settings in the heart of Atlanta. INGRoup's poster session and the McGrath Lecture will be held at this location on Friday evening. The Scheller College of Management is a model for open-light buildings. The Atrium features four-story windows to Midtown and the striking glass sculptures of internationally renowned glass artist Dale Chihuly. Our Saturday night concluding event will be held here.

The Renaissance Atlanta Midtown Hotel offers easy access to wonderful upscale dining (great cheap eats too), and attractions including the famous Fox Theater, the High Museum of Art, The Georgia Aquarium (the world’s largest!), and of course, the World of Coca-Cola.

Watch ingroup.net for more details on conference submissions, hotel reservations, and conference registration!