Building Infrastructure for International Collaborative Research in the Social and Behavioral Sciences: Summary of a Workshop

ISBN
978-0-309-31345-2

54 pages
6 x 9
PAPERBACK (2014)

Beryl Lieff Benderly and Lois Peterson Kent, Rapporteurs; USNC/Psychology Workshop Planning; Committee on Building Infrastructure for International Collaborative Research in the Social and Behavioral Sciences; Policy and Global Affairs; National Research Council

BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE for INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH in the SOCIAL and BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

SUMMARY OF A WORKSHOP

Beryl Lieff Benderly and Lois Peterson Kent, Rapporteurs

USNC/Psychology Workshop Planning
Committee on Building Infrastructure for
International Collaborative Research
in the Social and Behavioral Sciences

Policy and Global Affairs

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL
OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES

THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES PRESS
Washington, D.C.
www.nap.edu

THE NATIONALACADEMIES PRESS 500 Fifth Street, NW Washington, DC 20001

NOTICE: The project that is the subject of this report was approved by the Governing Board of the National Research Council, whose members are drawn from the councils of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine. The members of the committee responsible for the report were chosen for their special competences and with regard for appropriate balance.

This workshop was supported by Grant No. 201300148 between the National Academy of Sciences and the Spencer Foundation. Additional support was provided by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 0908053. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the organizations or agencies that provided support for the project.

International Standard Book Number 13: 978-0-309-31345-2
International Standard Book Number 10: 0-309-31345-7

Additional copies of this report are available for sale from the National Academies Press, 500 Fifth Street, NW, Keck 360, Washington, DC 20001; (800) 624-6242 or (202) 334-3313; http://www.nap.edu.

Printed in the United States of America

THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES

Advisers to the Nation on Science, Engineering, and Medicine

The **National Academy of Sciences** is a private, nonprofit, self-perpetuating society of distinguished scholars engaged in scientific and engineering research, dedicated to the furtherance of science and technology and to their use for the general welfare. Upon the authority of the charter granted to it by the Congress in 1863, the Academy has a mandate that requires it to advise the federal government on scientific and technical matters. Dr. Ralph J. Cicerone is president of the National Academy of Sciences.

The **National Academy of Engineering** was established in 1964, under the charter of the National Academy of Sciences, as a parallel organization of outstanding engineers. It is autonomous in its administration and in the selection of its members, sharing with the National Academy of Sciences the responsibility for advising the federal government. The National Academy of Engineering also sponsors engineering programs aimed at meeting national needs, encourages education and research, and recognizes the superior achievements of engineers. Dr. C. D. Mote, Jr., is president of the National Academy of Engineering.

The **Institute of Medicine** was established in 1970 by the National Academy of Sciences to secure the services of eminent members of appropriate professions in the examination of policy matters pertaining to the health of the public. The Institute acts under the responsibility given to the National Academy of Sciences by its congressional charter to be an adviser to the federal government and, upon its own initiative, to identify issues of medical care, research, and education. Dr. Victor J. Dzau is president of the Institute of Medicine.

The **National Research Council** was organized by the National Academy of Sciences in 1916 to associate the broad community of science and technology with the Academy's purposes of furthering knowledge and advising the federal government. Functioning in accordance with general policies determined by the Academy, the Council has become the principal operating agency of both the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering in providing services to the government, the public, and the scientific and engineering communities. The Council is administered jointly by both Academies and the Institute of Medicine. Dr. Ralph J. Cicerone and Dr. C. D. Mote, Jr., are chair and vice chair, respectively, of the National Research Council.

www.national-academies.org

USNC/PSYCHOLOGY WORKSHOP PLANNING COMMITTEE ON BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE FOR INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

OSCAR A. BARBARIN, III (Cochair), Tulane University
JUDITH V. TORNEY-PURTA (Cochair), University of Maryland, College Park
MERRY BULLOCK, American Psychological Association
PAMELA E. FLATTAU, Institute for Defense Analyses
SONIA SUCHDAY, Pace University
CHARLES M. SUPER, University of Connecticut
BARBARA TVERSKY, Columbia University, Teachers College
JEFFREY ZACKS, Washington University in St. Louis

Staff
KATHIE BAILEY, Director
PAMELA GAMBLE, Administrative Associate
KARUMUNA A. KAIJAGE, Program Officer (until October 2013)
LOIS PETERSON KENT, Senior Program Officer (after October 2013)
LYNELLE VIDALE, Senior Program Assistant (until October 2013)

U.S. NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR PSYCHOLOGY

SONIA SUCHDAY, Chair, Pace University
CHUANSHENG CHEN, University of California, Irvine
PAMELA E. FLATTAU, IDA Science and Technology Policy Institute
ROBERTA KLATZKY, Carnegie Mellon University
ANN MASTEN, University of Minnesota
VALERIE REYNA, Cornell University
CHARLES M. SUPER, University of Connecticut
JUDITH V. TORNEY-PURTA, University of Maryland
DANNY WEDDING, Alliant International University
GAIL WYATT, University of California, Los Angeles
JEFFREY ZACKS, Washington University in St. Louis

Ex-officio members
OSCAR A. BARBARIN, International Union of Psychological Science Executive Committee, Tulane University
JOHN HILDEBRAND, Foreign Secretary of the National Academy of Sciences, University of Arizona, Tucson

Society Liaisons
LONNIE R. SHERROD, Society for Research in Child Development
NELSON COWAN, Psychonomic Society (Carnegie Mellon University)
ALAN KRAUT, Association for Psychological Science
MERRY BULLOCK, American Psychological Association

Staff
KATHIE BAILEY, Director
PAMELA GAMBLE, Administrative Associate
KARUMUNA A. KAIJAGE, Program Officer (until October 2013)
LOIS PETERSON KENT, Senior Program Officer (after October 2013)
ESTER SZTEIN, Assistant Director
LYNELLE VIDALE, Senior Program Assistant (until October 2013)

BOARD ON INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATIONS

Preface and Acknowledgments

Enhancing the extent and quality of collaborations among scientists from different cultural and national settings is a matter of considerable importance to the National Research Council. This topic relates directly to the expertise found in the U.S. National Committee (USNC) for the International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS). The USNC/IUPsyS is the only committee under the National Academy of Sciences' Board on International Scientific Organizations that is related to the behavioral and social sciences. About 10 years ago, because of the resources present in its membership, this committee found itself uniquely positioned to contribute to understanding the *process* of international collaboration and steps that might be taken to enhance it.

The USNC/IUPsyS organized a workshop entitled International Collaborations in the Behavioral and Social Sciences, held in 2006. That workshop's report, released in 2008, established in compelling terms the value of cross-national research collaboration in an increasingly interdependent world of science, policy, and practice. It highlighted the benefits of international collaboration in improving social and behavioral science research. However, nearly every speaker referred to barriers and challenges in the collaborative research process. These were spelled out in detail in responses to a pre-workshop survey from 26 project leaders who had worked cross-nationally.

In 2012 the USNC/IUPsyS held a meeting to set its future agenda of projects. Members who had attended the 2006 workshop argued that the fostering of international collaboration remained an important but unfinished agenda item. In particular, problems such as the participation of early-career behavioral and social scientists in these collaborations had been raised, but few widely applicable solutions had been suggested. Pressure to limit the time spent earning a doctorate, as well as promotion and tenure policies, still discouraged participation by young scholars in cross-national research at the very time they were laying the foundations for their future careers. Other recurring issues related to training, to negotiating the institutional review board process, and to dissemination of findings. Since 2006,

additional issues had been raised by advances in data sharing and digital data collection. For example, some psychologists have expressed concern about the validity of generalizations drawn from the nonrepresentative samples that have been facetiously described as WEIRD (from Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic societies)[1].

On a more serious note, recurring surveys from the National Science Foundation showed that a relatively small proportion of social and behavioral scientists reported participating in international collaborative projects (compared with physical and life scientists and with mathematicians and computer scientists). USNC/IUPsyS was again uniquely positioned to make a contribution.

Consultations began with potential funders, with pivotal individuals in major professional organizations, and with scholars who had coordinated successful international collaborative projects. The National Research Council appointed a Planning Committee to organize the 2013 workshop, which we were appointed to chair. The intent was to move beyond identifying and discussing the problems associated with international collaboration (since the first workshop had largely accomplished this aim). Instead, we set out to identify existing approaches, policies, and infrastructure elements that might overcome some of the most serious impediments standing in the way of successful international collaboration. The workshop would engage scholars with experience in cross-national collaborations, individuals from professional associations, university administrators, and potential funders (in the public sector and foundations). We invited participants from outside of the United States to broaden our understanding of potential solutions. Although the participants came from developed countries, many had significant experience involving international collaborators from a wide geographic range, including but not limited to the Middle East, Africa, Latin America, and Oceania.

Building Infrastructure for International Collaborative Research in the Social and Behavioral Sciences took place September 22–24, 2013, at the National Academy of Sciences in Washington, D.C. Over the course of two and a half days, 50 individuals from universities and federal agencies, professional organizations, and other parties with interests in international collaboration in the behavioral and social sciences and education made presentations and participated in discussions. They came from diverse fields, including cognitive, developmental, educational, and organizational psychologies; comparative education; educational anthropology; sociology; the health sciences; international development studies; higher education administration; international exchange; and human development.

Our goal in this effort has been to identify ways to reduce impediments and to increase access to cross-national research collaborations among a broad range of American scholars in the behavioral and social sciences (and education), especially early-career scholars. This effort began and ended with a great deal of optimism. The

[1] Joseph Henrich, Steven J. Heine, and Ara Norenzayan (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33, pp. 61–83. doi:10.1017/S0140525X0999152X.

optimism is justified by the availability of creative solutions to problems of training, preparation, support, and communication that have often seemed nearly insurmountable. In this report, we want to give life to the solutions and strategies offered by the distinguished group of participants who gave generously of their ideas and time. We hope that these ideas will be seriously considered and, if found to be effective, widely implemented.

The USNC, of which we are members, represents U.S. scientists to the IUPsyS, while the parent Board on International Scientific Organizations represents U.S. scientists to the International Council for Science. We believe that international scientific organizations such as these and their international scientific congresses provide an important opportunity for fostering and developing relationships among potential collaborators. In particular, travel grants for graduate students and early-career faculty to attend these congresses give them an unparalleled opportunity to see their research in an international perspective.

This document has been prepared by the workshop rapporteurs as a factual summary of what occurred at the workshop. The language used in this volume is that of the rapporteurs and is based on a transcript of the workshop sessions and on written documentation summarized during the sessions. The planning committee's role was limited to planning and convening the workshop. The views contained in the report are those of individual workshop participants and do not necessarily represent positions of the workshop participants as a whole, the planning committee, or the National Academies.

This workshop summary is the result of substantial effort and collaboration among several organizations and individuals. We extend a sincere thanks to each member of the planning committee for their contributions in preparing the framework for discussion, developing the participants' list, and thoughtfully participating in the sessions. The project was made possible by financial support from the National Science Foundation and the Spencer Foundation. We also recognize the assistance of the chair of the U.S. National Committee for Psychological Science (Sonia Suchday), the program officer (Karumuna Kaijage), and the program assistant (Lynelle Vidale) in the organization and holding of the workshop. We appreciate the assistance of Ester Sztein and Lois Peterson Kent, both Board on International Scientific Organizations staff, in the editing and production of the report.

This report has been reviewed in draft form by individuals chosen for their diverse perspectives and technical expertise, in accordance with procedures approved by the National Academies' Report Review Committee. The purpose of this independent review is to provide candid and critical comments that will assist the institution in making its published report as sound as possible and to ensure that the report meets institutional standards for quality and objectivity. The review comments and draft manuscript remain confidential to protect the integrity of the process.

We wish to thank the following individuals for their review of this report: Carole Ames, Michigan State University; Robert Chen, Columbia University; Frederick Leong, Michigan State University; and Charles Super, University of Connecticut.

Although the reviewers listed above have provided many constructive comments and suggestions, they were not asked to endorse the content of the report, nor did they see the final draft before its release. The review of this report was overseen by J. Bruce Overmier, University of Minnesota. Appointed by the National Academies, he was responsible for making certain that an independent examination of this report was carried out in accordance with institutional procedures and that all review comments were carefully considered. Responsibility for the final content of this report rests entirely with the rapporteurs and the institution.

Judith Torney-Purta
University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland

Oscar Barbarin
Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana

Cochairs of the Planning Committee on *Building Infrastructure for International Collaborative Research in the Social and Behavioral Sciences*

Contents

1
Introduction

In recent years, as science becomes increasingly international and collaborative, the importance of projects that involve research teams and research subjects from different countries has grown markedly. Such teams often cross disciplinary, cultural, geographic, and linguistic borders, as well as national ones. Successfully planning and carrying out such efforts can result in substantial advantages for both science and scientists. The participating researchers, however, also face significant intellectual, bureaucratic, organizational, and interpersonal challenges.

To examine the issues involved in carrying out such projects, in 2006 the National Research Council's (NRC) Committee on International Collaborations in Social and Behavioral Sciences convened a workshop that resulted in a 2008 report entitled *International Collaborations in Behavioral and Social Sciences Research: Report of a Workshop*. Participants in that workshop enumerated the many benefits of work that takes advantage of the expertise, energy, contacts, and insights of researchers from more than one country. In addition, participants identified a number of obstacles that can hamper or even prevent success and sought ways to increase the chances that such projects will succeed. Building on that effort, a second workshop was convened in September 2013 to examine in greater detail a number of the practical issues raised at the earlier gathering. The current report summarizes the discussions at the 2013 Workshop on Building Infrastructure for International Collaborative Research in the Social and Behavioral Sciences.

"Research undertaken in international collaborations has the potential to inform theory, methods, education and training, policy, and practice," states the report on the 2006 meeting. "The processes constituting these collaborations, which can be seen as complex forms of joint activity, deserve attention along with their scientific results." [1]

These ideas—the distinctive and significant scientific benefits of international research and the equally distinctive and significant challenges and obstacles experienced by those who work to carry out such research—formed the basis for the 2013 workshop's discussions. The 2006 meeting concentrated

[1] National Research Council (NRC). *International Collaborations in Behavioral and Social Sciences Research: Report of a Workshop* (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2008), 1. Available at http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12053.

on delineating challenges; however, the 2013 workshop devoted its major attention to examining approaches designed to anticipate, forestall, and overcome those difficulties, and especially to methods, procedures, and organizational fea-tures shown to be successful in paving the way toward productive international collaborations.

Broadening perspectives, expanding possibilities, and sheer practicality rank high among the advantages of international collaboration cited in the 2008 report. Unlike the "lone frog in a deep well," which has "a superb view…of an extremely circumscribed patch of sky," the 2008 report says, participants in international collaborations develop much broader perspectives on research projects. This often leads to more conceptually complex research questions and answers and more discoveries than when researchers work only with their compatriots.[2]

A second advantage is the ability to answer questions that simply cannot be answered within the boundaries of a single country, such as rare diseases or other phenomena and comparative studies of human behavior, development, family structure, education, or similar areas.[3] A third reason for collaborating internationally instead of "parachuting into a foreign research setting" to do "hit-and-run research" is practicality; on average, international projects produce superior research results, the report continues.[4] Beyond that, international collaborations have the potential to build research capacity useful for answering future questions.

The specific obstacles to successful international collaborations that the 2006 workshop identified are, however, anything but trivial. They include often exceptionally long periods of time needed for planning and developing projects because researchers must resolve such important issues as locating appropriate collaborators, obtaining adequate funding, and developing research designs acceptable to people from different intellectual disciplines, cultural traditions, and institutional settings. Many intellectual, bureaucratic, and political questions must be worked out. In addition, all international collaboration may involve communication difficulties among would-be collaborators, not only because of linguistic differences but also because of differing cultural styles and unequal power positions that might exist.

Questions surrounding protection of human subjects and other ethical issues can be particularly complex and intense, given different countries' formal requirements for clearances and consent, as well as their differing informal understandings of various questions. Privacy, ownership, and handling of datasets can also be problematic across national borders, as is the risk of bias in "constructs, methods, instruments, samples, measures, or administration,"

[2] NRC, *International Collaborations in Behavioral and Social Sciences Research*, 4-5.
[3] NRC, *International Collaborations in Behavioral and Social Sciences Research*, 6-7.
[4] NRC, *International Collaborations in Behavioral and Social Sciences Research*, 9-10.

according to the 2008 report.[5] Publication and dissemination also raise questions involving the sometimes disparate practices of different nations regarding authorship and ideas of who should get credit and/or ownership of the products of research.

The National Research Council workshops are not the only high-level efforts that look into the issues of international collaborative research, noted Pam Flattau, adjunct research staff member at IDA Science and Technology Policy Institute. In 2005, she said, the National Science Board, the National Science Foundation's governing board, organized a task force on international science. As a result, a series of research roundtables was held around the world, resulting in a February 2008 report.[6] This effort highlighted the role that the federal government can play in fostering international research collaborations. Approaches suggested included establishing what Flattau termed "coherent and integrated U.S. international strategic priorit[ies]."

Other suggestions included involving multiple U.S. government entities through lead officials named at each agency; coordinating between the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy and the State Department to develop strong international partnerships; doing more to foster intellectual exchange through support of brain circulation rather than brain drain; and cooperation with the private sector to develop international scientific standards.

ORGANIZATION OF WORKSHOP AND REPORT

The NRC workshop chronicled in this report focused on ways to overcome the challenges inherent in international collaborative research for behavioral and social scientists and educational researchers. It took place in September 2013 as a follow-up to the 2006 NRC event, which had examined the overall landscape of international collaborative research. Organized by an NRC-appointed workshop committee under the auspices of the U.S. National Committee for the International Union of Psychological Science, the 2013 workshop was designed to provide participants the opportunity to discuss ways that universities and collaborative projects have tried to deal with challenges and issues similar to those raised in the 2006 workshop.

At the opening session, Judith Torney-Purta, professor of human development and quantitative methodology at the University of Maryland and cochair of the 2013 workshop committee, discussed the need for such exchanges. Although international collaborations have become more frequent in the behavioral and social sciences, she said, they remain less common than in other sciences and in mathematics or computer science. In addition, the fact that

[5] NRC, *International Collaborations in Behavioral and Social Sciences Research*, 20.

[6] National Science Board. *International Science and Engineering Partnerships: A Priority for U.S. Foreign Policy and Our Nation's Innovation Enterprise* NSB 08-04 (February 14, 2008). Available at http://www.nsf.gov/nsb/publications/2008/nsb084.pdf.

most psychological and educational research has been conducted in English-speaking countries has often created bias, she said.

She next indicated the links between the 2013 workshop and its predecessor, which had identified four phases in international collaborative projects, each of them presenting distinct challenges. The 2013 program's schedule aimed to allow participants to identify innovations in infrastructure and planning appropriate to each of the four phases. Specifically, each session of the workshop focused on a specific phase, with Sessions 3 and 4 both focusing on the same phase:

- Session 1: Elements of the Organizational Infrastructure in the Behavioral and Social Sciences that Facilitate International Research Collaborations
- Session 2: Building Infrastructure for Initiation and Planning of International Research Collaborations
- Session 3: Issues in the Conduct of Internationally Collaborative Research
- Session 4: Issues in the Conduct of Internationally Collaborative Research (continued)
  Group 1: Electronic Data Collection and Privacy
  Group 2: Issues in Relation to IRBs [institutional review boards]
- Session 5: Reviewing Dissemination of the Products of Internationally Collaborative Research and Issues Raised by All Presentations.

Torney-Purta next reminded the group that the summary of the 2006 workshop had addressed the following areas: advanced research training, mentoring, national research centers, communication, cultural issues, data management, publications, dissemination, and funding.

Oscar Barbarin, professor of psychology at Tulane University and a cochair of the 2013 workshop, then addressed the group even more specifically about the workshop's overall purpose: to identify approaches for solving some of the most persistent problems that impede international collaborative research. Such problems include tenure and training policies that preclude the involvement of graduate students and junior faculty, insufficient funding for appropriate dissemination, IRB policies, the challenge of identifying potential collaborators, and challenges in new web-based environments.

Acknowledging funding from the Spencer Foundation, Torney-Purta added that the workshop might consider how to use international collaborative research to inform educational improvement. In addition, Barbarin emphasized that the participants had been invited to explore what can be learned from comparing solutions to the challenges of international collaborative research from different types of institutions, professional associations, and projects.

Beyond attending the workshop itself, Torney-Purta added, workshop participants were also invited to attend "The Science of Science Communication II," a colloquium sponsored by the National Academy of Sciences, during the morning of the workshop's first day. It discussed a number of issues related to disseminating results of scientific research. The communication conference's two keynote speakers were psychologists who are members of the National Academy of Sciences, Susan Fiske and Douglas Medin (who was also a member of the U.S. National Committee for the International Union of Psychological Science).[7]

Given this background, the 2013 workshop moved ahead to consider a variety of approaches to fostering international collaboration so that behavioral scientists can realize the many potential advantages and overcome the challenges of working with a range of international research partners. The workshop consisted of four plenary sessions featuring expert panels or speakers presenting their views on a significant issue. In addition, the topic "Issues in the Conduct of Internationally Collaborative Research" featured a plenary session in Session 3 and, as Session 4, two simultaneous, expert-led, break-out discussions of particularly crucial, sensitive, and technically challenging issues. These discussion topics were (1) collection and privacy of data collected by electronic means and (2) protection of human subjects, particularly as it relates to the functioning and requirements of institutional review boards dealing with international projects. After the two parallel discussions, the entire group reassembled for Session 5, the final plenary session, which was planned to focus on two themes: the major issues likely to arise in the dissemination of internationally collaborative research, and the group's overall impressions and final thoughts about effective strategies for building infrastructure and improving policies and procedures. The workshop was not intended to produce consensus recommendations, but rather a range of ideas that might guide future work.

The current report focuses on the major themes and issues raised in the workshop's presentations and discussions rather than on presenting a chronological account of the proceedings. Participants' remarks therefore appear where they are relevant to the topics being discussed in the report rather than when they occurred during the workshop. There are other issues relevant across scientific disciplines that were not addressed by workshop participants and therefore are not included in this report.[8]

---

[7] National Research Council. *The Science of Science Communication II: Summary of a Colloquium* (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2014). Available at http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=18478.

[8] Another NRC report that addresses similar issues is National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine. *Examining Core Elements of International Research Collaboration: Summary of a Workshop* (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2011). Available at http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13192.

2
How Academic Institutions and Organizations Can Strengthen Infrastructure for International Collaborative Research

Like all academic researchers, behavioral scientists conducting—or hoping to conduct—international collaborative research work within a context of multiple academic entities, including their universities; the schools, colleges, and administrative units that compose those institutions; and other entities such as professional societies, journals, and funding agencies. Session 1 of the workshop focused on elements of this infrastructure that might facilitate international collaborations. "Research collaborations are not done in a vacuum [but] as part of what's going on in institution[s] as a whole," said Robin Helms, senior research specialist at the Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement of the American Council on Education (ACE). Each type of entity can, through its various policies and practices, help or hinder international research efforts, she added.

Even when those policies and procedures have no obvious or intended connection to international work, they often nonetheless create obstacles. Merry Bullock, senior director, Office of International Affairs, American Psychological Association, noted that because of this many investigators find the academic environment inhospitable to international collaborations and see a need to change the culture in academia. Many, in fact, even share the sense that this is nearly impossible to accomplish.

The 2006 workshop identified a number of obstacles that were very specific to disciplines and methodological in nature, noted Helms. Equally important are broader and more generally applicable barriers that institutions can modify or remove. Institutional support needs to become the norm and not the exception in international research efforts, added Bullock.

Bullock and other speakers and participants focused on how institutions can identify and strengthen components of their organizational infrastructure so that they foster, rather than discourage, collaborations. Potentially helpful elements, Bullock noted, exist and can be mobilized at every level of institutional organization: university-wide, in universities' various individual schools or

colleges, in such university administrative units as international offices and institutional review boards (IRBs), and within outside entities such as professional organizations.

AT THE INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Three important barriers to international collaboration affect faculty members across many disciplines and institutions, and therefore efforts by university-wide leadership can help realign policies to mitigate them, Helms said. The first is relatively simple and straightforward: many faculty members have not thought about the possibility of collaborating internationally. If their research agenda is progressing and does not already involve an international component, international involvement may not occur to them.

Second, and far more formidable, is the task of finding appropriate international collaborators. Even faculty who are interested in working internationally may not know how to begin doing so and to find a qualified collaborator, Helms said.

The third barrier that Helms presented, a valid concern of faculty members, is that international work may conflict with the requirements of attaining tenure or promotion. Sonia Suchday, professor of psychology, Pace University, commented that, depending on an institution's policies, collaborative international work can be costly to one's career.

For example, the many complexities involved in organizing international projects often require long lead-up times that can result in time, money, and effort lost if faculty pursue collaborative projects that do not work out, Helms explained. With the tenure clock ticking, any unproductive false start could prevent a faculty member from compiling the publication record needed to win tenure or promotion. Beyond that, tenure rules sometimes prioritize single authorship, thereby implicitly discouraging international collaborations that often lead to joint publications.

Suchday commented that institutions need to build infrastructure, support networks, and awareness of what international collaboration requires. For that reason, Helms noted, the ACE recommends that universities aiming to increase their international activities undertake a policy of "comprehensive internationalization, [defined] as a strategic, coordinated process that seeks to align and integrate policies, programs, and initiatives to position colleges and universities as more globally oriented and internationally connected institutions."

A crucial part of any institutional internationalization strategy would be to consider international background and experience at the hiring phase. Helms noted a growth in the number of institutions considering these factors in hiring faculty in nonexplicitly international fields. She referred to a 2011 ACE survey

that found that 68 percent of surveyed institutions are doing this, more than double the 32 percent reported in 2006.[1]

Another fruitful approach is providing even modest funding to allow faculty to attend international conferences or organize meetings where they can make initial personal contacts with potential collaborators, Helms continued. Universities can also strengthen the infrastructure for collaboration by having clear and well-publicized processes for faculty to establish formal partnerships. A searchable database of existing faculty collaborations can help those considering new ones.

Most crucial, however, is to adjust tenure and promotion guidelines to foster international collaborations, even though changing these policies can be contentious, Helms said. Institutions can also examine the unintended consequences of their current policies, such as those for single authorship mentioned above. However, it is even more important for an institution to take the further step of explicitly rewarding international engagement. The 2011 ACE survey, Helms noted, found that only 8 percent of institutions use international engagement as a tenure or promotion criterion, up only 2 percentage points since 2001.[2]

AT THE LEVEL OF COLLEGES AND DEPARTMENTS WITHIN UNIVERSITIES

Making international collaboration part of a university's culture requires means of supporting it at the level of the institution's various colleges, according to Carole Ames, professor emerita of educational psychology and former dean of the College of Education at Michigan State University. International work must be a central element of the dean's vision that permeates a college's administrative infrastructure. This requires building capacity within the college and harmonizing the college's practices and policies with that goal. Deans can prioritize internationalization in both policy and budgeting and communicate that priority to both faculty and external funders, she said. To change institutional culture, it is best to start with practices rather than policies, she advised. Once internationalization becomes a big part of the culture, faculty members are likely to push for policies to follow.

Giving a specific office within the college responsibility for functions related to international research collaborations creates a central place for faculty wanting to participate in or learn about international collaborations, she continued. Building international capacity within a college entails funding faculty travel and sending faculty, especially early-career faculty, to

[1] American Council on Education (ACE). *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses: 2012 edition* (June 2012), 14.

[2] ACE. *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses*, 14.

international conferences even if they do not make presentations. International study trips are valuable opportunities to learn about research approaches used in other countries and to begin to network. Graduate students also need support for training and travel in order to understand and conduct international collaborations.

Ames gave an example from her tenure as dean of Michigan State's College of Education. The college sponsored faculty-led 3-week trips for graduate students to a country with a very different culture so that they could learn about that culture and its educational policies. These trips usually involved a host university where the visiting students could learn how the country's scholars approached research. Such travel is also crucial for both students and faculty to develop the attitudes and skills that compose intercultural competence. This essential requirement for effective international work is best developed experientially, through living contact with differing cultures. College- or departmental-organized travel programs such as Ames described can greatly facilitate students' and faculty members' intercultural learning.

Along these lines, many workshop participants mentioned that intercultural competence, the ability to function effectively in a culture or cultures other than one's own, is considered crucial to successful international collaborations. Providing opportunities for students and early-career scholars to acquire the attitudes, understanding, and skills that compose intercultural competence is therefore an important part of preparing them for international research. Institutional and organizational infrastructure devoted to this purpose can assist in making those opportunities available. Martyn Barrett, emeritus professor of psychology at the University of Surrey in the United Kingdom, presented a detailed framework that is summarized in Box 2-1, The Components of Intercultural Competence.

Ames described ongoing seminars offered by Michigan State University. Investigators experienced in international collaboration introduce faculty and graduate students to the challenges of their collaborations, including various political and social issues, as well as to the means of negotiating and dealing with obstacles. These seminars also create opportunities for young faculty members to find senior scholars who could serve as mentors in their international efforts.

OTHER INSTITUTIONAL ENTITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Other university entities, including IRBs and international offices, can also play key roles in fostering international collaborations. IRBs are particularly crucial because protection of human subjects is a central value, especially in U.S.-funded behavioral science research. Obtaining ethical approval from the appropriate IRB for a proposed study is therefore an essential step in developing projects, whether international or domestic.

At many institutions, however, the intention to work with foreign colleagues or in foreign countries can greatly complicate this process. Imposing U.S. procedures and assumptions on research populations in other cultures can lower the possibility of success. In a number of other countries, participants noted, notions such as what constitutes consent and who can give it differ from those in the United States. Applying procedures that meet overall U.S. goals while being appropriate to the cultural context of the collaborators or research participants, on the other hand, can go a long way toward overcoming these difficulties.

The 2008 workshop report highlighted three specific obstacles that IRBs can place in the way of international research, noted Sangeeta Panicker, director of research ethics at the American Psychological Association, during the breakout session on issues relating to IRBs. The first is that IRBs often focus on consent as a document, not as a process. Second, IRBs may pay insufficient attention to confidentiality, especially in light of rapidly changing communication technologies. This risk exists in all research today, not just international projects, but international work can add additional issues, she said. Third, IRBs may impose unnecessary delays that do not result in improved research. In recent years, however, some IRBs have moved forward in finding appropriate solutions.

Based on experience at University Hospitals Case Medical Center (an affiliate of Case Western Reserve University), where he serves as vice president of research, Philip Cola presented one such improved approach to resolving these issues to the IRB breakout session.

At any one time, Cola said, Case Medical Center's IRB, which often simultaneously supervises 3,000 active protocols, may also be handling 60–70 active research protocols that, although done outside of the United States, are funded by a U.S. entity. He noted that the IRB's philosophy in looking at human subject protections should start with collaboration, a theme of this workshop. The goal is for researchers to view the IRB not as administrators, but as colleagues and fellow scientists qualified to review the research. In addition to meeting technical standards of competence to review all kinds of research, IRBs need to be collaborative.

Under the traditional model of interaction between researchers and IRBs, Panicker noted, the researcher submits a protocol in written form. IRB members read the document and go back to the researcher with questions. This makes the researcher's original draft the basis of discussions and can therefore make the interaction somewhat adversarial rather than collaborative.

A much better mechanism for effective collaboration, Panicker and Cola agreed, is for researchers and the IRB to cooperate in the cocreation of the protocol. Though this collaborative approach is not yet typical everywhere for IRB relations with investigators, Cola said, Case Medical Center uses it by encouraging face-to-face interactions between researchers and the IRB. At Case

Box 2-1
The Components of Intercultural Competence

The components of intercultural competence include attitudes, knowledge and understanding, skills, and actions. The following list of those attributes derives from five decades of scholarly research, is intended to be indicative rather than exhaustive, and focuses on those components amenable to being developed through education.

The *attitudes* include

- Valuing cultural diversity and pluralism of views and practices.
- Respecting and being open to, curious about, and willing to learn from and about people who have different cultural orientations and perspectives from one's own.
- Being willing to empathize with people who have different cultural affiliations from one's own.
- Being willing to question what is usually taken for granted as "normal" according to one's previously acquired experience.
- Being willing to tolerate ambiguity and uncertainty.

The *knowledge and understanding* that contribute to intercultural competence include

- Understanding the internal diversity and heterogeneity of all cultural groups.
- Awareness and understanding of one's own and other people's preconceptions, stereotypes, prejudices, and overt and covert discrimination.
- Understanding the influence of one's own language and cultural affiliations on one's experience of other people.
- Communicative awareness, including awareness of the fact that other peoples' languages may express shared ideas in a unique way or express unique ideas difficult to access through one's own language(s).
- Knowledge of the beliefs, values, practices, discourses, and products that may be used by people who have particular cultural orientations.

The *skills involved in intercultural competence* include

- Multiperspectivity—the ability to decenter from one's own perspective and to take other people's perspectives into consideration in addition to one's own.
- Skills in interpreting other cultural practices, beliefs, and values and relating them to one's own.
- Cognitive flexibility—the ability to change and adapt one's way of thinking according to the context.
- Skills in critically evaluating and making judgments about cultural beliefs, values, practices, discourses, and products, including those associated with one's own cultural affiliations.

- Skills of adapting one's behavior to new cultural environments—for example, avoiding verbal and nonverbal behaviors that may be viewed as impolite.
- Linguistic, sociolinguistic, and discourse skills, including skills in managing breakdowns in communication.
- Plurilingual skills to meet the communicative demands of an intercultural encounter, such as use of more than one language.
- The ability to act as a "mediator" in intercultural exchanges, including skills in translating, interpreting, and explaining.

For an individual to be credited with intercultural competence, they must also apply their intercultural attitudes, knowledge, understanding, and skills through actions.

Relevant *actions* include

- Seeking opportunities to engage with people who have different cultural orientations and perspectives from one's own.
- Interacting and communicating appropriately, effectively, and respectfully with people who have different cultural affiliations from one's own.
- Cooperating with individuals who have different cultural orientations on shared activities and ventures, and constructing common views and perspectives.
- Challenging attitudes and behaviors (including speech and writing) that contravene human rights, and taking action to defend and protect the dignity and human rights of people regardless of their cultural affiliations.

This last action may entail any or all of the following actions:

- Expressing opposition when there are expressions of prejudice or acts of discrimination against individuals or groups;
- Challenging cultural stereotypes and prejudices;
- Encouraging positive attitudes toward the contributions to society made by individuals irrespective of their cultural affiliations; and
- Mediating in situations of cultural conflict.

Adapted and abridged from "Developing Intercultural Competence through Education," by Martyn Barrett, Michael Byram, Ildikò Lázár, Pascale Mompoint-Gaillard, and Stavroula Philippou. Council of Europe, Secretariat General, Directorate of Democratic Citizenship and Participation. January 16, 2013.

Medical Center, the IRB staff holds open office hours for researchers who want to discuss projects that are in development, which allows projects to be cocreated, not created and then coamended. For both investigators and the IRB, this represents a real culture change.

When he began working on the IRB 18 years ago, Cola explained, it would not have allowed an investigator to come to "sacred" IRB meetings. Now, one comes to just about every meeting to answer questions about proposed protocols. Researchers are asked to leave when the board deliberates. This approach has succeeded in breaking down barriers so that the IRB can help researchers think through issues to improve data collection prospects. Case Medical Center uses the IRB in ways similar to the way they use peer review.

To gain the specific contextual information needed for international projects, the Case Medical Center IRB implemented a program of local context review, which provides the perspectives of the other culture or cultures, Cola continued. The IRB has sought out qualified people in the local area who come from all parts of the world and made them adjunct members of the IRB. Such people are offered a small stipend to be part of the group and comment when needed. For example, a nursing student from Uganda serving in this capacity helped make a project feasible by clarifying the unit of measure needed to explain a blood draw to Ugandan subjects. This local reviewer pointed out that many Ugandans would not understand cubic centimeters or teaspoons.

In another case, when an appropriate local reviewer for Papua New Guinea could not be found in Ohio to help with six or seven studies, the IRB contacted experts in that country and started collaborating with them, ultimately bringing them several times to the United States, where Case Medical Center taught them what the institution meant by responsible cognitive research. Most importantly, the visiting experts taught the IRB what responsible cognitive research meant within their own culture, where ways of gaining consent are very different, especially for women. To facilitate this arrangement, Case Medical Center ensured proper Internet connections and infrastructure for the Papua New Guinea experts, who acted essentially as members of the IRB doing the local context review.

Even though the standards used in different countries may differ in some respects, Cola continued, the principles of protecting subjects are the same. When investigators write in a protocol that the reason for doing something a certain way is to respect the culture and norms of the country in which they are researching, IRBs should accept that.

Another fruitful approach to expediting ethics review, Cola said, is to partner with other institutions whose IRBs meet recognized standards. Then, for

projects in which more than one of the institutions is involved, an approval by any partner IRB serves as approval by all.[3]

Other university entities, such as international offices, can also play major roles in supporting, advocating, and leveraging resources for collaborative research even if they are not explicitly involved in research, said Lee Sternberger, executive director of the Office of International Programs at James Madison University. International offices can be at the forefront of campus internationalization and can also assist with the collection of data. In addition, universities can advance this aim by joining international consortia that facilitate forming international partnerships. Sternberger described two such consortia: Worldwide Universities Network, which shares research dollars to support international research activities, and the International Network of Universities, a small organization with the theme of global citizenship (including environmental sustainability) that fosters undergraduate and graduate student exchanges, joint research, and other activities. International offices can also often help to identify both best practices and colleagues with similar interests in a particular culture, country, or region to advise on research. Exchanging Ph.D. candidates and pretenure faculty with universities abroad helps build capacity in both institutions and stimulate research relationships. In addition, as already noted, study-abroad programs can also be transformative learning opportunities for both students and faculty.

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Looking at other infrastructure, Bullock noted that professional associations and funders also have roles to play in facilitating international research. Journals and associations sometimes set policies governing authorship of publications that may inadvertently discourage international collaborations. Charles Super, professor of human development and pediatrics at the University of Connecticut, gave the example of publication guidelines requiring that if an article has more than six authors, only the first six are listed, followed by "et al." If a research project has seven research sites with seven senior investigators and two graduate students, someone will be unhappy, he said. A workshop on publication policies for journal editors could aid in clarifying some policies and changing others, many participants agreed.

Professional associations can also strengthen the infrastructure for international collaborations. Such services as organizing international conferences and programs and supporting journals, databases, and directories provide researchers useful opportunities to identify and meet potential collaborators. Associations also provide informational resources and guidance

[3] For more on IRBs, see National Research Council. *Proposed Revisions to the Common Rule for the Protection of Human Subjects in the Behavioral and Social Sciences* (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2014). Available at http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=18614.

that help researchers understand and overcome the many, often unfamiliar, problems and issues that can arise in international collaborations. The American Psychological Association, for example, offers resources on the international section of its website, as do such organizations as the Social Psychology Network and the International Union of Psychological Science, which maintains a website called Psychology Resources Around the World.

3
Issues in Initiating, Organizing, and Planning International Collaborations

The specific challenges involved in initiating and organizing collaborations constituted the second major set of issues that the workshop examined, with participants presenting both European and U.S. perspectives. These issues arise because international collaborators necessarily come from different cultural backgrounds and intellectual traditions, work within differing national bureaucratic and legal contexts, and often belong to different academic disciplines, which can greatly complicate the task of agreeing on research concepts and methods. Obtaining funding for international research can also be extremely complicated, both because of differing national requirements and policies and because working in an international context generally takes more time and therefore more money than research within a single country. In addition, the many sources of difference among international collaborators can create countless opportunities for misunderstanding, disagreement, confusion, and even conflict among colleagues. Session 2 focused on practical methods of dealing with these problems that might be adapted for particular settings.

Several of the workshop speakers and many other participants agreed that, because of the many potential areas of misunderstanding, international collaborations need to work out detailed agreements at the outset of each project on as wide a range of scientific and operational questions as possible. Formal agreements, however, do not suffice to assure the success of international projects. Strong, trusting, and resilient personal relationships form a more reliable glue for international research groups, speakers and other participants emphasized, advising that collaborators work constantly and systematically to foster them.

Even with apparently comprehensive formal agreements and strong personal bonds, however, cultural differences still remain that can influence both the scientific and personal aspects of the collaboration. Attention and sensitivity toward cultural issues must continue throughout the research, publication, and dissemination process. This chapter covers each of these issues in greater detail.

AGREEING AT THE OUTSET

The need for collaborators to reach explicit agreements on a number of scientific and operational issues received major attention at the workshop. Because of the need for highly detailed agreements, collaborative international projects in Europe can become extremely bureaucratic, said Martyn Barrett, emeritus professor of psychology at the University of Surrey in the United Kingdom. His remarks drew on his experience leading three such projects, especially one entitled "Processes Influencing Democratic Ownership and Participation" (PIDOP) that was carried out between 2009 and 2012 by teams from nine countries with funding from the European Commission (EC). Research done under EC auspices requires a formal consortium agreement drawn up by university lawyers and completed before any money is released, he said. This legally binding document, prepared by the coordinating institution and signed by the partner institutions, controls many aspects of the research project and how it is run.

Topics covered in such agreements include the internal organization and governance of the consortium, how the EC's financial contribution is going to be distributed, management of intellectual property rights and access rights, and the liability and confidentiality arrangements between the partners. All research projects are highly directed; they must be multidisciplinary and policy relevant, supporting policy development at multiple levels. Beyond that, projects must have a European dimension that adds value over and above what a national project could achieve.

Although the process of organizing such agreements can be less formal in the United States, the need for clarity concerning such issues as ownership of data, procedures for sharing it, and the funding of project elements such as data collection, analysis, conferences, and meetings of collaborators is every bit as great, Charles Super noted.

Key points in such agreements should, from the start, make the project truly international and make it clear whether the project has one director or is a federation of equal partners, suggested Joseph Tobin, Elizabeth Garrard Hall Professor of Early Childhood Education, University of Georgia, in written remarks read to the workshop. "Too often," he continued, "the international project begins with a research team from one country who makes up the research questions and then gets other countries to sign on. This may give the project greater consistency, but it's at a cost because the variables to be considered are very often those assumed to be important in just one or two of the countries. A better approach is for a small group of researchers from several countries to collaboratively develop the research questions, conceptual framework, and methods, including the variables to be studied. This allows for more potential to challenge taken-for-granted assumptions, and to provide fresh insights."

As to leadership, the single-leader and federated leadership models each has its advantages. A single leader simplifies coordination, but at the risk that one researcher's perspective will dominate the project. Overall, "international research requires compromises on framing questions, site selection, participant recruitment, and research methods, for example, culturally responsive modifications in how interviews are conducted," Tobin noted. "The group needs to agree from the start what to do when significant differences of opinion arise."

Choosing teams with complementary capabilities contributes significantly to success. Barrett noted that EC practices require justifying the inclusion of each team and specifying the significant contribution it will make. Beyond that, he explained, the EC system also requires dividing the research into distinct work packages and specifying a verifiable endpoint for each one, generally a work product with an established deadline. Though complex, the process of dividing work into packages protects the overall project by limiting the potential damage should any partner fail to fulfill the agreement. Barrett observed that international research, already difficult, can be more so when collaborators have different levels of ability and infrastructure. These detailed agreements with their distinct work packages can allow one partner to move forward with their tasks if another collaborator runs overtime or fails. Beyond that, some partners may choose to participate in only those aspects of the project best suited to their expertise and circumstances.

To assure that each collaborating group can carry out its assigned tasks, Barrett continued, assembling a collaboration also calls for an audit to evaluate each team's expertise and the ethics procedures that govern its work. A separate audit checks the resources available to each team. One project, he noted, had to budget for an electrical generator for a partner in the Republic of Georgia, where frequent power cuts presented the risk of losing work and data.

Budgets may also have to compensate for problems arising from particular funding practices, such as the cost-reimbursable systems used by some funders, said Jennifer Lansford, research professor at the Social Science Research Institute of Duke University. She described the difficult situation created when institutions are expected to spend funds to get projects started and then wait for reimbursement. U.S. institutions often have enough financial backing to provide for reimbursable start-up funding, a luxury that universities in less affluent countries may not enjoy.

In addition to the collaborating teams of researchers, Barrett noted, nonacademic stakeholders often also play crucial roles in policy-relevant research projects and therefore also need to be involved from the outset. His PIDOP project used several methods to accomplish this, he continued, including compiling a directory of stakeholders early in the project and keeping them informed through policy briefing papers and periodic newsletters as work progressed. The researchers also nurtured close relations with a small group of

key stakeholders, seeking their opinions on issues during the design phase and on policy recommendations at the end.

THE ROLE OF RELATIONSHIPS

Despite the high level of formality required for EC collaborations, the actual process of recruiting the participants in research consortia very often rests on unofficial considerations, Barrett continued. Especially central is the need for positive preexisting relationships among the members of the different teams. For that reason, he has always based his collaborations on relationships established through networking. Communication needs to remain open and positive throughout the project, and it is helpful if all participants are comfortable with their assigned duties.

Many participants concurred on the centrality of personal ties and connections in finding and enlisting collaborators, as well as in fostering any project's success, although some also mentioned that cultural differences among collaborators may at times present challenges. Nor have researchers in more affluent countries always recognized the importance of cultivating relationships. Super observed that in the post-World War II period cross-cultural research generally followed the lines of the dissolving empires, particularly the British Empire, with "safari research" in which investigators went abroad, collected their data, and returned. Attitudes toward collaborating with colleagues in less affluent countries have significantly improved in recent times, he noted.

Over time, the importance of working with a local collaborator who could serve as a cultural guide became increasingly evident, especially under the influence of anthropological methods, Super continued. Researchers became aware that the inside perspective tells something different from the outside perspective. The cultural guide could be anyone from a local professional to a local person with minimal education. Graduate students from the culture in question have also often served in that role. More recently, however, research has arrived at "an interesting phase where your collaborators really are [of] equal status in many cases, and in some cases senior status to you," opening up the possibility of long-term collaborations, Super noted.

Researchers with bicultural backgrounds who are actually participants in both cultures may face special issues, such as navigating two different cultures while maintaining relationships in both, noted Sonia Suchday. Although one may understand the rules of both cultures in their contexts, such researchers have the unique challenge of representing one culture to the other, as an insider to both. This presents many additional difficulties and challenges.

FINDING COLLABORATORS

A major challenge of collaborating across national lines is the potentially daunting task of identifying potential collaborators and establishing relationships

with them. Beyond the methods already mentioned in this report, George Alter, director of the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan, suggested that working with data can in itself provide fruitful opportunities for finding international collaborators. He drew on his experience with the ICPSR, a data archive whose mission is to acquire, archive, distribute, and preserve data for future generations. It also provides training in quantitative methods. Founded in 1962, it has grown from 21 member universities to more than 700 today, 400 of them in the United States. It also has more than 40 federation or national memberships, which bring in other international members as well. ICPSR also collaborates with several data sharing initiatives that cross national borders.

Combining data with training is a proven method of building collaboration around data, he said. A partnership between the University of Michigan and the University of Cape Town in South Africa, for example, provides a 2-week course on analyzing data given at Cape Town and taught by instructors from both institutions. In addition to training researchers in South Africa, the program identifies people who could benefit from advanced training and invites them to Ann Arbor as graduate students, to the ICPSR summer program, or to the Survey Research Center. This has resulted in an ongoing source of potential collaborators for joint projects. Starting in 2011, the course is also offered at a second site in Ghana.

A second strategy for building collaborations around data involves projects that coordinate data collection by international collaborators. Alter gave the example of the Barometer studies of public attitudes toward democracy and government that are designed to collect data and also build local capacity in Africa, Europe, the Arab Countries, Asia, and Latin America.

Online technology, especially cloud computing, forms the basis for a third strategy for creating opportunities to work with colleagues in less developed countries. Such partnerships can succeed even in places with less technological abilities, Alter said. One example involves a university in South Africa where a political science instructor had his students do an exercise on the web using data that was provided by the University of Michigan.

International collaborations built around data can, however, also harbor pitfalls, such as the temptation to value skills over local content. In addition, a kind of "data imperialism" may arise if researchers from developed countries tell colleagues in developing countries, "Let's work together. First of all, you send us all your data." To overcome this attitude, Alter observed, would-be collaborators must remember that many very good researchers live outside the United States, and we need to work together and collaborate in a true sense.

THE REALITY OF CULTURE

The need to take cultural differences into account not only in designing research but also in working with colleagues during the project was another major concern of the workshop participants.[1] Doing this can be difficult to accomplish, however, because "people still tend to think culture is just a veneer, something that is not about basic psychological processes," said Michele Gelfand, professor of psychology at the University of Maryland. Her own work emphasizes that this is not the case, but still, "theoretically speaking, we haven't convinced psychologists that [culture] is a very important topic from a theoretical point of view." Many people, furthermore, lack the training needed to do cross-cultural work. Cross-cultural research methods must be taught to make researchers more fluent in the methodology.

Her own experience in international research shows that culture infiltrates the research process. If one does not understand that culture affects behavior in the laboratory or field, data can be misinterpreted. Gelfand noted that culture shapes the questions researchers ask and the methods they use. Even those most aware in cross-cultural psychology in the United States still may ask questions that are biased in their orientation.

Suchday gave the example of cultural difficulties she has faced in dealing with colleagues in India while coordinating plans for U.S. students to travel there. Administrators in the two countries have different academic calendars, different sensitivities to time, and different feelings of urgency about when decisions must be made, often resulting in annoyance and confusion on both sides.

As Gelfand observed, it is important to recognize that all of us are cultural novices in regard to methodology each time we do cross-cultural research. To accomplish this preparatory work, one must partner with and rely on local collaborators as equals and test the appropriateness of the question and methods to the particular cultural context by first doing a lot of pilots and focus groups. Working with local collaborators also helps avoid making embarrassing mistakes and wasting valuable time.

In Arab countries, Gelfand noted, local collaborators pointed out that using money as an incentive or reward for subjects, although routine in the United States, is inappropriate because people see something fundamentally dishonorable about accepting money to participate in research. Instead, she and her colleagues give out blankets or gift certificates.

---

[1] The Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR) at the National Academy of Sciences held a workshop that focused specifically on the role of culture in international research collaboration: National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine. *Culture Matters: International Research Collaboration in a Changing World—Summary of a Workshop* (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2014). Available at http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=18849.

Americans are well known for being decontextualized and answering questions about relationships in the abstract, she continued. In Taiwan, on the other hand, research subjects often say that they need more information about relationships and the social context of interactions before they can answer questions or participate in experiments concerning them. Americans accept the notion of participating in role-playing exercises and then leaving that behind in the lab. In the Middle East, Gelfand has found that if you violate someone's trust, even in the lab, it is not as readily forgotten. In planning cross-cultural research, it is therefore crucial to triangulate research methods—that is, to check them against other methods to see if they produce comparable results—because every research method has its flaws and cultural baggage. Finally, researchers need to remember that culture is operating in all of our collaborations. Even when the questions and training are similar, there are cultural differences among researchers. Gelfand urged collaborators to talk often, truly listening to each other, to manage expectations about research projects.

Barrett observed, however, that he has found multidisciplinary issues to be more problematic than cross-cultural and cross-national ones. Different disciplines have different cultures and modes of reasoning and levels of explanation or terminology.

In negotiations with collaborators across cultural boundaries, whether those of nations or disciplines, the ideal is to come together to create a research project that everyone can agree upon, Gelfand noted. She acknowledged, however, that sometimes you must compromise. She errs on the side of making sure that her collaborators are comfortable with what is happening.

AUTHORSHIP QUESTIONS

Reaching agreement in advance on authorship and dissemination of research results is particularly crucial but can be tricky, participants observed. In many collaborations, it is expected that coauthoring within national teams will follow local traditions. But, Super noted, the details can still be difficult to deal with. Many practices differ among countries, such as those for acknowledging graduate students. American researchers generally grant them authorship if they made a real contribution and share some responsibility for the scientific integrity of the publication, but some other countries do not. Box 3-1, Some Authorship Guidelines, contains two methods of dealing with this issue as presented by Super and by Lansford. In both approaches, the rules for sharing and use of data and for authorship are outlined and agreed upon by collaborators early in the process.

Journals' authorship policies can also complicate the situation, as mentioned earlier. In addition, Merry Bullock noted, issues involving dissemination of research can arise because the broader incentives in many countries may be different from those in the United States. In many countries,

Box 3-1
Examples of Authorship Guidelines

Below are the authorship policies used by two international collaborative projects, "Families for the 21st Century" and "Parenting Across Cultures," as presented at the workshop.

Families for the 21st Century:
An International Study of Parents, Children, and Schools

Guidelines on publications

Sara Harkness, Charles M. Super, Giovana Axia, Harry McGurk, Jesús Palacios, Barbara Welles-Nystrom, Andrzej Eliasz

If issues of authorship arise during the course of the project, colleagues should feel free to address them in an appropriate manner. It is expected that our spirit of good faith will carry us through any such problems that might arise, and that we will be able to resolve them courteously. The following eight principles represent a group consensus and will be used until such time as they may be altered by the group:

Principle 1. Every lead investigator (that is, the senior investigator in each country) has the right to publish (with local team members, as appropriate) his or her national data in any way he or she wishes. In most cases the two project directors (Harkness and Super), and possibly other lead investigators, should be considered for co-authorship, but that may not always be appropriate. In any event, it is appropriate for Harkness and Super, and the lead investigators, to be kept informed about planned single-country publications, and to receive copies in advance.

Principle 2. Publication of data pooled from all the samples will be coordinated (though not necessarily carried out) by Harkness and Super, in order to prevent simultaneous and overlapping efforts.

Principle 3: Co-authorship of any publication using data from a specific country will normally include at least the lead investigator for that country.

Principle 4: No investigator will be included as co-author without consent.

Principle 5: Order of authorship for any report from this project will be discussed by all concerned prior to completion. In general, the person who takes the lead in organizing and writing a report will be the first author. It is assumed that Harkness and Super will play this role on the initial major publication of multi-site data. When co-authors' contributions are essentially equal, the sequence of authorship will be systematically varied.

Principle 6: Every publication, national or international, will include a standard project acknowledgment. A partial draft follows, but this may be amended from time to time: "The International Study of Parents, Children, and Schools is a collaborative project funded in part by the Spencer Foundation (Chicago, USA), the Australian Institute for Family Studies, and ... [SEND ADDITIONS to Harkness and Super]. All statements made and opinions expressed are the sole responsibility of the authors."

Principle 7: It is expected that co-authorship within national teams will follow local traditions and guidelines; however, national teams will attempt to achieve a common standard of equity for multi-team publications.

Principle 8: Persons who leave the project will still be considered for co-authorship under these guidelines, to the extent that this is practical.

Parenting Across Cultures Authorship Policy

Jennifer Lansford
(As presented at the workshop)

For papers that use data from multiple countries, our group has an authorship arrangement that includes the naming of the lead investigator in each participating country. For any given paper, the primary authors do the actual writing and analyzing, and the remaining authors provide critical feedback. The primary authors are listed in order of their contribution to the specific paper; the remaining authors are listed in a revolving alphabetical order.

The first step in our writing process is to send a one-page data use proposal to the entire group outlining the research questions, data to be used, analysis plan, and intended product. The main purpose of the data use proposal is to be sure a researcher in one site is not duplicating the efforts of a different researcher working at a different site.

Although we have geared our collaborative papers primarily toward English-language international journals (as these are given more scientific weight for all of our collaborators), collaborators have sometimes published papers in local or regional journals and in languages other than English. Graduate students at the international sites have tended to take the lead role on those papers, and these outlets have provided an opportunity for students to gain publication experience without the pressure of writing in a nonnative language. Of course, one of the benefits to the international collaborators in the group is that they can take advantage of native English speakers as coauthors when they do publish in English-language journals.

researchers may need to convey their results back to the communities with which they have been working because the process is intended to help address societal problems. This requirement, Bullock continued, is often at odds with academic pressure for high-quality publications and also with some journals' requirement that studies not be published anywhere before appearing in a journal. Barrett responded that one strategy to avoid this conflict can be to present research to affected communities in reports written in lay language and disseminated through local organizations. Another is to convey research through meetings with local communities.

FUNDING FOR INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATIONS

Two representatives of U.S. funding agencies addressed the workshop in hopes of "demystifying" donors, in the words of Janet Shriberg, senior evaluation advisor at the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). "U.S. reliance on international collaboration for high-quality science is growing," added Anne Emig of the National Science Foundation (NSF). Emig noted that *Science and Engineering Indicators,* published by the National Science Board, shows that a growing percentage of highly cited articles have international coauthors.

Nonetheless, Emig pointed out that the fact that collaboration requires scientists and engineers to work together, often each seeking funding from their own national funding agency, creates a coordination problem. To address this issue, in September 2013, the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences Directorate (SBE) of the NSF and the Research Councils of the United Kingdom (RCUK) announced the SBE-RCUK Lead Agency Agreement to facilitate collaborations by the two nations' scientists. The agreement permits collaborators to submit a single proposal to both agencies, which then undergoes a single review process and receives a single decision. The agency providing the larger share of funding serves as the lead.

Some newer NSF approaches that Emig noted also provide opportunities for international work and experience. These include a solicitation entitled Catalyzing New International Collaborations, which will cover start-up costs of establishing collaboration, and Partnerships for Enhanced Engagement in Research (PEER), a USAID program to fund developing-country researchers collaborating with NSF-funded U.S. scientists.

For NSF, Emig noted, major drivers of support for international collaborations include "gaining access to unique facilities, equipment, research environments [and] sharing the costs and risks of scientific investments," as well as "exchanging expertise on techniques and other insights" and building capacity. True intellectual partnership is a core value for NSF collaborations. While some scientists think it acceptable to go abroad, pick up specimens, and come back, that is not true intellectual partnership. Emig stated that NSF

believes "that international engagement should have mutual benefit from synergistic expertise and resources."

Offering suggestions on how to work successfully with her agency, and, by extension, all funding agencies, Shriberg noted the importance of reading the evaluation criteria for the proposal. There is good research that funders do not look at because proposals do not meet the specific evaluation requirements of the particular program. Beyond that, context and partnerships are key. Funders look at who the local collaborators are when evaluating proposals containing international work. Also crucial is demonstrating rigor in quantitative and qualitative methods.

4
Issues in Conducting International Collaborative Research

Once investigators have completed the preliminary tasks of assembling the collaborative team and organizing the project, they may face an array of varied and often vexing challenges once the research gets under way, some of which resemble or overlap with those overcome in the project's earlier stages. Based on their experiences working on a variety of international collaborations, speakers and other participants highlighted some of these major issues, as well as approaches they found useful in dealing with them. Discussion during the workshop centered primarily on the importance of cultivating personal relationships among collaborators, especially in light of the inevitable difficulty of bridging cultural differences that separate them; the need to deal flexibly with unexpected circumstances and changes while carrying out data collection and analysis; using new technologies in both rich and less wealthy countries; and writing up and disseminating results.

CULTIVATING RELATIONSHIPS

Although all agreed that international collaborations generally grow out of personal relationships, workshop participants also emphasized that working harmoniously with colleagues from differing cultural and intellectual backgrounds means overcoming many opportunities for misunderstanding, miscommunication, and even conflict. National and cultural differences will almost inevitably arise during any large project, many participants concurred. Fostering good relations among team members therefore needs to be an important and continuing concern.

Perhaps the most successful strategy for maintaining and improving the ties among team members, workshop participants agreed, is holding regular face-to-face meetings. Although e-mail, Skype, and other forms of communication are helpful, nothing captures the nuances of communication or nourishes personal relationships as effectively as regularly spending time together. No matter how exhaustive and harmonious initial discussions proved to be, researchers working collaboratively should not think everything has been said at the beginning, said workshop planning committee cochair Judith Torney-Purta in reflecting on Joseph Tobin's written statement. Indeed, speakers and participants repeatedly

stated that regular opportunities for collaborators to meet in person should be built into the collaboration plan.

During the five-nation Children Crossing Borders Project in which Tobin participated, for example, the 20 collaborating researchers from England, France, Germany, Italy, and the United States met for a week twice each year to plan next steps, develop coding schemes, analyze data, and write reports and publications, Tobin reported in his written comments. Such discussions are not always harmonious, however, as cultural differences asserted themselves. "At our worst moments," Tobin continued, "we performed versions of national character stereotypes, with the Germans insisting on following the agenda and complaining that the Italians were engaging in side conversations or going off topic, while the French were resisting overlinear thinking and waxing philosophical. The Americans presumed to run everything in spite of having an insufficiently nuanced understanding of various national contexts." One solution to this was for each country to take a turn at chairing the meeting.

Reporting on a different project, Jennifer Lansford noted that regular in-person, meetings over a period of years allowed collaborators to become friends. As such, they trusted each other and felt more free to share ideas. Lansford described how this group tries to keep power relationships in balance by rotating their in-person meetings among the various participating countries, having met only once in the United States. The local collaborator in the host country takes a leadership role in the meeting, is in charge of the local arrangements, and acts as cultural guide. These meetings also purposely include tourist visits to local places of interest and social programs rooted in the local culture. All these shared experiences help build the personal relationships and understanding so useful to the collaboration's success. In an effort to broaden the range of the collaborators' relationships, students who have worked at the local research site also attend some events, and local scholars not affiliated with the project are invited to a one-day conference about the project.

As another way of building local relationships, Laura Johnson, associate professor of psychology at the University of Mississippi, supported the value of researchers bringing their families into the field. Her experience in Africa showed that a more trusting relationship can be built when family members accompany a researcher; the relationship is more than between the researcher and local colleagues and research populations, giving rise to a stronger feeling of good will.

Stressing the importance of trust, Johnson advised researchers to build it by giving back to the local communities and institutions involved in the research and by being helpful in ways other than just collaborating on the project. For researchers in the field, local colleagues can serve as immensely valuable cultural brokers, as when on one occasion she made a significant mistake in local etiquette. The local colleague corrected her error and apologized for her behavior, successfully repairing the situation.

Language may also be an issue among collaborators, Tobin warned. Although English is now widely recognized as the language of science and often serves as *lingua franca* for international collaborations, this linguistic dominance can put even fluent nonnative English speakers at a significant disadvantage. It can be difficult for them to understand the nuances of the discussion or to persuasively make their case, both in oral exchanges and in written reports. Although it is often easier for the U.S. team members to take the role of lead author, this may not be fair to the non-U.S. team members, and can lead to a perception of the U.S. team dominating the reports and papers.

THE NEED FOR FLEXIBILITY

Crucial to success, Tobin also observed, is willingness to balance the commitments collaborators have made to data collection methods with an acknowledgement of each partner's domestic constraints and pressures. Teams might sometimes depart from the agreed-upon plan. From his experience, although some members of the larger group might see this as a failure to meet commitments, the team making changes was provided the opportunity to explain the constraints they were working under, which often proved persuasive.

Johnson, like Michele Gelfand, also emphasized during her presentation the importance of "triangulation," or validation against other methods, in choosing and using research data and methods. She also described an alternative research approach that she learned in the field, a technique called Camera Voice developed by Caroline Wang, an anthropologist in China. People are taught to use cameras and asked to take pictures of things they consider significant in order to express their opinions. This opportunity bridges languages and cultures, giving people voice as they select what to photograph and then explain their choices.

Overall, Johnson recommends an "attitude of adventure," which requires letting go of control and learning to adapt on the fly. At one point, for example, she wanted to narrow her sample to persons of certain ages, but then she discovered that where she was working individuals did not always know their age. This made the defined sample she had planned impossible to achieve. On another occasion, she was expecting to do a focus group of 10, but the entire community wanted to meet with her that day, so she went ahead with the larger group. Johnson warned potential collaborators to not focus on outcomes, since some things will remain unresolved. For her, the research experience is "really about the climb."

USING NEW TECHNOLOGIES

The electronic technologies that have become widespread in recent years present both opportunities and challenges for international collaborations, and are often opposite sides of the same coin, said Barbara Tversky, professor

emerita of psychology at Stanford University. Opportunities include very efficient and effective new means of organizing and managing both collaborations and data, such as video conferencing for planning and discussing research and cloud computing for sharing and analyzing data and working collaboratively on writing proposals, reports, and papers.

Data collection possibilities are numerous, she said, offering examples such as Mechanical Turk, a website that can recruit participants worldwide, and the wide variety of MOOCs (massive open online courses), games, and other platforms that allow interaction among large populations across the world. Other crowdsourcing methods can also recruit large numbers of people to work on scientific problems or provide information. *Foldit*, for example, has enlisted people to work on solving problems in protein folding. Data mining allows investigators to search databases, Facebook, and Twitter. It allows one to see what terms people in different countries are looking for on the web as a response to international events or personal events, Tversky said.

The huge datasets available today also allow for numerous unintended uses that can suggest new hypotheses and unsuspected connections among phenomena, she went on. New tools offer "incredibly clever ways of doing research, not our usual bag of tricks, but searching Twitter feeds, Facebook posts, and again, you have millions of data points all over the world."

The challenges these technologies present are also legion, she continued. One is the danger that technology will drive the research, encouraging investigators to choose methods or measures simply because they are feasible and available. Very large existing datasets also permit investigators to do research on international subjects without actually needing to travel or relate directly to people in other countries. With large datasets and crowd-sourced information, furthermore, the cultural relevance of the research categories and the representativeness of the sample may be impossible to ascertain.

Privacy is another major concern. Online data generally lacks institutional review board protection, and laws, regulations, and standards regarding use of online data differ among countries, adding to the difficulty of protecting privacy, Tversky said. She also alluded to research showing that 87 percent of the U.S. population can be uniquely identified using three pieces of data: birth date, zip code, and gender.

DISSEMINATING RESEARCH RESULTS

Once data collection and analysis is complete, disseminating a research project's results constitutes a crucial final step. Within the academic world, publication in peer-reviewed journals is generally considered to fulfill this role. But, as Sonia Suchday noted, and as several other participants agreed, many types of collaborative international research call for sharing findings with a

broader public, including the communities where the research took place, policy makers, practitioners, and even the general public.

Dissemination efforts must be appropriate to the intended audience and to the cultural context, Suchday continued, and in many cases these efforts also involve cultural translations. Researchers sometimes forget that even the medium of writing may not carry the same weight in different cultural contexts. In some cultures, written documents are formalities not generally used for communication.

To disseminate results and findings in such contexts, therefore, researchers must work to devise other, appropriate means of conveying information, be they face-to-face or community meetings or other types of materials. Johnson noted, however, that such efforts are costly in time and energy, and though they are often very valuable, they rarely get recognition or credit in the academic world. In fact, they may be viewed as distracting from the "real" goal—and certainly the one more conducive to career advancement—of disseminating results to the scientific world.

5
Possible Next Steps

Throughout the workshop, many participants summarized ideas about how various institutions could strengthen their infrastructure to better enable international collaborative research. As had been the purpose of the workshop, participants identified existing approaches, policies, and infrastructure elements that might overcome the impediments to successful international collaboration. In the workshop's final session, the cochairs, Oscar Barbarin and Judith Torney-Purta, encouraged participants to identify specific changes they believed institutions could implement to create an environment conducive to international research collaborations and to convey the importance of improved infrastructure for international collaborative research to the professional groups and associations to which they belong. As a summary of a workshop, this report does not include formal recommendations. Approaches that merit further attention, as suggested by individual participants, are listed below.

- Universities could consider adopting international research and exchange of researchers, including participation at international meetings, as important institutional priorities. These priorities could be reflected at all levels of the institution.

- Universities could consider altering tenure and promotion guidelines to reflect the importance and challenges of international work and to include a more expansive and flexible view of the various methods used to disseminate results of international research.

- Universities could encourage their international offices to work closely with faculty to foster international collaborative research in addition to promoting student exchanges and study abroad.

- Universities could make efforts to educate faculty, deans, and other administrators about the value, process, and challenges of doing international research, including the need for explicit agreements to

guide the collaborations. This could recognize the advantages of collaborators agreeing in advance on guidelines regarding authorship of the research products as well as the ownership and sharing of data.

- Institutions could implement more effective support systems for training social and behavioral scientists to engage in this type of research, including sensitivity to cultural differences.

- Universities could include a consideration of internationally appropriate research methods in relevant courses in the social and behavioral sciences or in educational research. These courses could also inform students about the availability of data sets collected internationally that are suitable for secondary analysis.

- Where feasible, institutions might modify their institutional review board approval processes to harmonize them with the realities of international collaborative research.

- Journals could modify authorship and publication policies to encourage rather than discourage international research collaborations.

- A range of organizations could hold workshops for journal editors, for university administrators and other stakeholders to inform them about the particular demands, characteristics, and requirements of international collaborative research.

- Funding agencies and institutional donors might be urged to do more to encourage international research, and especially to fund the additional time and effort needed to organize, carry out, and disseminate the results of collaborative international research projects.

- Universities and professional associations in psychology, education, and the social sciences could include international collaboration in their advocacy agendas.

- The National Research Council could integrate the behavioral and social sciences and education more fully into its activities, where appropriate, such as the sharing of data across national borders.

- U.S. government agencies could pursue agreements fostering international collaboration with more countries and international entities.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A
Workshop Agenda

Workshop on Building Infrastructure for International Collaborative Research in the Social and Behavioral Sciences

September 22-24, 2013
Washington, D.C.

Sunday, September 22, 2013
One Washington Circle Hotel

4:30pm ***Introduction and Welcome to the Workshop on Building Infrastructure for International Research Collaborations in Social and Behavioral Sciences***

5:00pm Reception

Monday, September 23, 2013
National Academy of Sciences' Building Auditorium

Workshop attendees will join the "***Science of Science Communication II Conference"*** for the morning sessions dealing with communicating and disseminating findings of scientific research in general:

8:30-8:45am ***Welcome***

8:45-9:15am **Lay Narratives and Epistemologies in Communicating Scientific Findings**
Douglas Medin, Northwestern University

9:15-9:35am Discussants: Ann Bostrom, Washington University
Kevin Dunbar, University of Maryland

9:35-10:00am Q and A

10:00-10:30am *Coffee Break*

10:30-11:00am **Motivated Audiences: Belief and Attitude Formation about Science Topics**
Susan Fiske, Princeton University

11:00-11:20am Discussants: Craig Fox, UCLA
Bill Hallman, Rutgers University

11:20-11:45am Q and A

12:00pm Our Workshop attendees will convene in the National Academy of Sciences' Members Room for the ***International Collaborations Infrastructure Workshop***.

Introduction: Judith Torney-Purta, Cochair of the Planning Committee, Professor of Human Development, University of Maryland

1:30pm **Session One**: ***Elements of the Organizational Infrastructure in the Behavioral and Social Sciences that Facilitate International Research Collaboration***.
Session Chair and Presenter: Merry Bullock, Senior Director, Office of International Affairs, American Psychological Association

- Robin Helms, Senior Research Specialist, Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement, American Council on Education
- Carole Ames, Dean of the College of Education and Professor Emeritus, Michigan State University
- Lee Sternberger, Executive Director, Office of International Programs, James Madison University
- Merry Bullock, Office of International Affairs, American Psychological Association

3:15pm *Coffee Break*

3:30pm **Session Two:** ***Building Infrastructure for Initiation and Planning of International Research Collaborations***
Session Chair: Suzanne Bennett Johnson, Distinguished Professor of Medical Humanities and Social Sciences, Florida State University (and Past-President of APA)

- Martyn Barrett, Emeritus Professor of Psychology, University of Surrey, United Kingdom
- Charles Super, Professor of Human Development and Pediatrics, University of Connecticut
- Michele Gelfand, Professor of Psychology, University of Maryland
- George Alter, Director of ICPSR (Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research), University of Michigan

5:15pm Reception

Tuesday, September 24, 2013
National Academy of Sciences' Building – Members Room

9:00am **Session Three**: ***Issues in the Conduct of Internationally Collaborative Research*** (Breakfast Available)
Session Chair: Pam Flattau, Adjunct Research Staff, IDA Science and Technology Policy Institute

- Jennifer Lansford, Research Professor, Social Science Research Institute, Duke University
- Laura Johnson, Associate Professor of Psychology, University of Mississippi
- Janet Shriberg, Senior Evaluation Advisor, USAID
- Anne Emig, Program Manager, National Science Foundation

10:30am *Coffee Break*

10:45am ***Session Four: Breakout Groups: Issues in the Conduct of Internationally Collaborative Research***

Group 1: Electronic Data Collection and Privacy: Barbara Tversky, Professor of Psychology Emerita, Stanford University (Moderator)

Group 2: Issues in relation to IRBs: Philip Cola, Vice President of Research at University Hospitals Case Medical Center and Sangeeta Panicker, Director of Research Ethics, APA (Moderators)

12:15pm-1:00pm Lunch

1:00pm **Session Five:** ***Reviewing Dissemination of the Products of Internationally Collaborative Research and Issues Raised by All Presentations***.
Session Chair: Sonia Suchday, Professor of Psychology, Pace University

2:00pm *Coffee Break*

2:15- 4:00pm ***Conclusions Regarding Strategies for Building Infrastructure and the Workshop Report.***
Session Chair: Oscar Barbarin, Cochair of the Planning Committee, Professor of Psychology, Tulane University

5:00pm *Workshop Adjourns*

Appendix B
Workshop Participants

George Alter
University of Michigan (ICPSR)

Jo-Ann Amadeo
Marymount University

Carole Ames
Michigan State University

Oscar Barbarin
Tulane University

Martyn Barrett
University of Surrey (UK)

Suzanne Bennett Johnson
Florida State University

Merry Bullock
American Psychological Association

Giulio Busulini
Embassy of Italy

Philip Cola
University Hospitals Case Medical Center

Pamela Collins
National Institutes of Health

Debra Egan
Council for International Exchange of Scholars

William N. Elwood
National Institutes of Health

Anne Emig
National Science Foundation

Pamela Flattau
Institute of Defense Analyses

Michele J. Gelfand
University of Maryland

Robin Matross Helms
American Council on Education

Carol Herrera
Department of State

Lori Diane Hill
American Educational Research Association

Martin Iguchi
Georgetown University

Roman Ivanchenko
National Endowment for the Arts

Christine Jessup
NIH Fogarty International Center

Laura Johnson
University of Mississippi

Jennifer Lansford
Duke University

Felice Levine
American Educational Research Association

Melissa Menzer
National Endowment for the Arts

David Miller
American Institutes for Research

Eugene Owen
National Center for Education Statistics

Sangeeta Panicker
American Psychological Association

Hannah Reeves
American Institutes for Research

Lonnie Sherrod
Society for Research in Child Development

Janet Shriberg
U.S. Agency for International Development

Paula Skedsvold
Federation of Associations in Behavioral & Brain Sciences

Susan Sauer Sloan
National Academy of Sciences

Lee Sternberger
James Madison University

Sonia Suchday
Pace University

Charles M. Super
University of Connecticut

Ester Sztein
National Academy of Sciences

Joseph Tobin
University of Georgia

Judith Torney-Purta
University of Maryland

Barbara Tversky
Columbia and Stanford Universities

Gregory White
National Academy of Education

Jeffrey Zacks
Washington University in St. Louis

Martha Zaslow
Society for Research in Child Development