6

Collaboration in Diverse Settings

Insights from the Podcasts

Paul F. M. J. Verschure

As discussed in the Introduction, prior to the Forum we conducted a number of interviews[1] to gain insights into how people collaborate. This chapter summarizes people's attempt to clarify the phenomenon. In each interview, we posed "simple" questions—What is collaboration? What is it good for—answering these questions proved more difficult than one might imagine.

> Collaboration…especially depending on your environment…could be portrayed in a number of different ways…I think that there's a synergistic approach to it…that's what makes a really special collaboration better than the next one. One of the things I constantly think about is how everybody I worked with in the army, this team of 11 other guys, was always on the same page. Everybody brought something different to the table. And just taking those different opinions and backgrounds and experiences and leveraging them toward a common goal, I believe it's one of the highest levels of collaboration I've ever been a part of. (L. Sciulli, 2:53)

Collaboration was recognized as a synergistic effort at its core, yet when one tries to formulate a single definition that would apply to all synergistic behavior, several challenges are encountered. Historically, collaboration is associated with very negative moral judgments and societal values. During World War II in Western Europe, for example, collaboration referred to the actions of people who cooperated with or willingly assisted the enemy or occupying force to the detriment of one's own country (R. Van der Laarse, Ernst Numann, S. de Jong, T. Mulder). A more contemporary view, however, situates collaboration as a positive, joint pursuit of a common goal, requiring active voluntary

[1] Podcasts are available at https://esforum.de/forums/ESF32_Collaboration.html?opm=1_3. Here, key positions are attributed to individual interviewees; block quotes are cited using the timestamp from the podcasts (minute:second).

From "The Nature and Dynamics of Collaboration,"
edited by Paul F. M. J. Verschure et al. Strüngmann Forum Reports, vol. 33,
Julia R. Lupp, series editor. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. ISBN 9780262548144

participation and shared intent (A. Nuyken, M. Levi), grounded in trust, communication, shared interest, and shared values (R. Poropatich).

Collaboration transcends temporal and spatial boundaries; it evolves across geographies (M. Levi), over time, and even generations, as evidenced by the development of jurisprudence (E. Numann), culture (H. Keller), scientific advancements (S. Fitzpatrick), and even the deliberations of the Nobel Prize committee (S. Grillner). In some settings, it shapes identities and communities through active, reciprocal relations (S. Puri), whereas in others, it provides benefits without direct reciprocation or influence (M. Levi).

Numerous definitions were attempted by the interviewees, who characterized collaboration as

- a cooperative venture toward mutual objectives, where diverse levels of commitment converge (E. Numann, I. Schmiel);
- processes that involve building trust (mentioned by everyone), leveraging individual strengths and recognizing the complementary nature of participants (L. Kramer, R. Malpica Padilla, M. Jones, C. Hedegaard, E. Slingerland), and fueling deeper self-understanding (S. Puri); and
- a voluntary and affectionate union of parties (D. Narayan) and within-family dynamics driven by love, respect, and shared ideology (N. Chaudhary).

Further, collaboration occurs in specific contexts and is thus shaped by cultural norms. In a Western context, for example, individual contributions to a goal are often emphasized in contrast to communal goal setting in other societies (H. Keller; see also Chapter 8, this volume).

The importance of communication—in particular, dialogue and mutual understanding—was also emphasized (R. Malpica Padilla, E. Wiecko, A. Nuyken, R. Poropatich, C. Hedegaard, J. Manzolli; see also Chapter 9, this volume). In addition, collaboration was described both as an engagement free from hierarchical dominance as well as one shaped by existing organizational structures, where individual contributions align with predefined corporate (A. Nuyken, E. Wiecko) or societal objectives (H. Keller).

Individuals who engage in collaboration must have certain psychological traits (for further discussion, see Chapters 2, 11, 13, 16–18, this volume). They must be able to think strategically while acting operationally, bridging the gap between high-level vision and practical work and placing seemingly unrelated elements into a higher vision (R. Poropatich). Collaboration requires an intrinsic motivation to collaborate (M. Levi, E. Slingerland), empathy (R. Poropatich, S. Puri, C. Hedegaard, R. Malpica Padilla), reciprocal behavior, mutual understanding, shared interests (R. Axelrod, M. Levi, C. Hedegaard), as well as trust, affection, respect, and a tolerance for dissent. Negative traits that disrupt collaboration include egoism, personal agendas, the drive for recognition (A. Nuyken), inferiority and leadership complexes (L. Sciulli), miscommunication, lack of recognition, freeloading, and the tendency to jump

From "The Nature and Dynamics of Collaboration,"
edited by Paul F. M. J. Verschure et al. Strüngmann Forum Reports, vol. 33,
Julia R. Lupp, series editor. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. ISBN 9780262548144

on the bandwagon (S. Grillner), along with the creation of echo chambers which preclude the generation of a shared view (M. Levi). Diversity of various psychological traits was advanced as a potential advantage (A. Nuyken) and a risk (M. Levi).

Examples of operational strategies that foster collaboration include easing institutional tensions to promote synergy (T. Mulder) and enhancing complex interactions within organizations (E. Wiecko, A. Nuyken) and between different components of the legal system and the *trias politica* (E. Numann). Collaboration was perceived as vital for addressing large-scale challenges, such as emergency response (e.g., A. Sparrow). In professional settings, successful collaboration was hardly static; it always adapted to the needs of an organization (E. Wiecko).

Wide-ranging cases of how collaboration was practically implemented demonstrate the importance of cross-disciplinary work to harmonize disparate individual goals (R. Axelrod, M. McKee, S. de Jong, N. Agrawal-Hardin): in medicine and the World Health Organization (A. Sparrow), in finance and trade (A. Nuyken, E. Wiecko), in intergovernmental organizations such as the United Nations (M. Jones), in international politics (C. Hedegaard) as well as the military (L. Sciulli, R. Poropatich), and in funding agencies (L. Kramer). Collaboration, however, is not restricted to specific spheres of human activity. One example of an extended collaboration (involving global political interests, commercial incentives, and collective health strategies) is provided by the historical account of the commercial interests in public health during the cholera pandemic (A. Sparrow). This example underscores the role of collaboration in reaching international consensus on health regulations (A. Sparrow).

In summary, collaboration is a dynamic and complex phenomenon, not easily contained in a singular definition. It is an orchestrated effort that integrates trust, shared vision, leadership, and proactive engagement to achieve collective aims. Collaboration transcends cultural, institutional, and disciplinary boundaries, embodying the essence of joint human endeavor and the pursuit of a common purpose.

> I was thinking, I'm not qualified to offer a definition, but it was funny because when this invitation came along, I asked myself: What is it? And because it didn't approach, it didn't initially evoke an immediate image. But then I gave it a little thought. And it seems to me it's similar to cooperation but feels different. (S. Puri, 04:37)

Collaboration versus Cooperation

> Historically, there's always been a commercial interest, particularly for public health. 150 years ago, nations started meeting and arguing over the cholera pandemic because they didn't want Europe, America, and the UK infected by "those Asiatics" or those "Muslims" bringing cholera across the Mediterranean. They argued about it for four decades worth of sanitary conventions and conferences.

From "The Nature and Dynamics of Collaboration,"
edited by Paul F. M. J. Verschure et al. Strüngmann Forum Reports, vol. 33,
Julia R. Lupp, series editor. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. ISBN 9780262548144

> The only reason they then came to a consensus was when the British lost control of the Suez Canal in 1898. And when it opened up, there was a commercial common incentive…to standardize quarantine measures…that then became the international sanitary regulations, which were the forerunner of today's international health regulations, which countries are meant to adhere to, particularly to control pandemic threats. (A. Sparrow, 23:25)

The concepts "collaboration" and "cooperation" are frequently used interchangeably, indicating an unclear boundary between the two. Collaboration is positioned as a particular form of cooperation that pursues explicitly defined goals and capitalizes on the diversity of participants' talents, backgrounds, and perspectives (R. Axelrod). While cooperation may be less structured and can manifest in simpler transactional interactions, such as trade (T. Mulder), collaboration is defined by the collective effort toward common objectives, informed by a shared interest and a voluntary commitment to these goals (R. Axelrod, S. de Jong, M. Jones, M. Levi, T. Mulder, D. Narayan). The synergy that results from combined skills and ideas amplifies a group's capacity to achieve goals within a shared task space (R. Malpica Padilla), which they would not be able to achieve individually or without advanced coordination (R. Axelrod, R. Van der Laarse, E. Slingerland, I. Schmiel). In addition, cooperation can be seen to occur between homogenous entities, whereas collaboration involves "heavy lifting" by virtue of the heterogeneity among the players (M. Jones).

Cooperation is generally used as a broad term encompassing collective efforts toward mutual objectives, whereas collaboration is a subset that specifically harnesses the unique attributes of participants for a more complex, goal-oriented interaction (E. Numann, R. Axelrod). Through its requirement for a common vision and leadership, collaboration also implies a more structured and goal-centric endeavor than cooperation (M. Jones). Conversely, an "extra ingredient" in collaboration is the commitment to engage in actions beyond individual inclinations, promoting an environment of active and meaningful participation (M. Levi).

In conclusion, while cooperation is a general concept of collective action, collaboration was viewed as a specialized interaction that necessitates a shared vision, proactive engagement, and, often, leadership. Collaboration harnesses distinct contributions toward well-defined objectives, with the dynamics between participants pivotal to its success.

> You raised a very good point before about "the people"….Collaboration really only works with the right mix of people.…it's the people at the table that will make that collaboration work.…The most successful collaborations I've worked in have been with the people who will get out of bed at 3:00 a.m. and crawl across broken glass because this has to be done now. That gets back down to… good leadership and trust. Trust that the vision…can be achieved... Trust in each other that collectively, "alone I can go fast, but together we go far"…I think good

From "The Nature and Dynamics of Collaboration,"
edited by Paul F. M. J. Verschure et al. Strüngmann Forum Reports, vol. 33,
Julia R. Lupp, series editor. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. ISBN 9780262548144

> collaboration starts with the right people, the right entities, and then you can get those results over time. (M. Jones, 17:00)

Goals

Establishing and aligning goals within a collaborative framework are considered pivotal for success. Each expert underscored the importance of having clearly defined, shared goals as the driving force behind a collaborative effort. The richness and complexity of collaboration depend on the features of these goals. Goals can be seen as hierarchically structured in collective and individual interests as well as objectives (A. Nuyken), which are dynamic and under the recurrent influence of the collaborative process (E. Slingerland). The alignment of these individual and collective goals within an organization is essential for effective collaboration (see also Chapter 12, this volume). This implies that an overarching purpose must be articulated that resonates with every participant, enabling them to work toward shared objectives while pursuing personal (sub)goals and finding a balance between the collective good and individual interests. Collective goals serve communities, and their realization thus depends on a mutual understanding of these goals, their benefits to the community, and how to contribute to them jointly (H. Keller). Here, cultural diversity should be considered as enriching the collaborative process (S. Puri, A. Nuyken). It also shapes some of its core characteristics (H. Keller) and possibly creates obstacles to goal alignment. In a diverse collective, cohesion in the collaborative process can be brought about through a "community of fate" and recognizing common destinies (M. Levi).

Goals can be seen as implicit and emerging from the interaction between individuals or through the adherence to explicitly defined collective objectives (H. Keller, E. Slingerland, E. Wiecko). For the effective realization of collaboration, a shared perception of goals must be shaped and communicated. This can be a role for the judicial system (E. Numann), military processes (L. Sciulli, R. Poropatich), politics (C. Hedegaard), or shared ontological belief systems as provided by religion (R. Malpica Padilla, S. Puri, E. Slingerland) or procedures (S. Grillner). Hence, a fundamental step in building and sustaining collaboration requires understanding different interests and goals, how they align (A. Nuyken, M. Levi, I. Schmiel, E. Wiecko), and the mechanisms that shape them. These steps, combined with a tolerance for goal adjustment, can require the compromise of individual goals (C. Hedegaard) and serve to define the quality and sustainability of collaboration itself (E. Slingerland). At the same time, the quality of a collaboration must be assessed according to its outputs and the ability to achieve common goals (see also Chapters 2 and 11, this volume).

Ideally, academic collaboration is propelled by the shared aim of advancing knowledge, with intellectual curiosity and the joy of collaborative learning and ideation outweighing material gain (R. Axelrod). Such collaborations benefit

From "The Nature and Dynamics of Collaboration,"
edited by Paul F. M. J. Verschure et al. Strüngmann Forum Reports, vol. 33,
Julia R. Lupp, series editor. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. ISBN 9780262548144

from a willingness to engage with diverse fields and individuals, team up with others, and maintain a balance between focused research and the flexibility to step back when needed. Yet, in scientific collaborations, the prospect of tangible benefits is crucial for sustained collaborative engagement where the practicalities of collaboration intertwine with ideas and financial incentives (T. Mulder). This degradation of the ideals of the scientific enterprise into a battle of ego and personal gain is illustrated by the dynamics of high-energy physics experimentation, which requires large-scale collaboration and extremely expensive instruments:

> Typically, the cycle in a large experiment is that people dream of doing something spectacular, and then the day they find out…I can't do it alone…they round up a couple of friends and…the circle gets larger and larger.…At some point, you have the volume to jump to the big enterprise.…this design phase is usually like…a huge cage fight because you know you're condemned to one another, yet you want to kill the enemy…and at some point…[they] realize…we should have started building…to make it for the deadline …Then…there's first panic [and] a lot of blaming and shaming on who is guilty of this. And then people realize…we have to really work together again. So then there's usually a very rapid stage of convergence and…the whole thing is going to be commissioned. There's usually a great group spirit, great satisfaction and group identity…And then you have to start the experiment. [After the first publications] you get to the stage where you have to accumulate more data…and then people start to fight again because there is one analysis against the other because they're basically waiting for data. (S. de Jong, 05:40)

The adversarial ethos of the "cage fight" expressed by de Jong reflects a detrimental community of fate dynamics. The success of large-scale physics experiments is not solely defined by achieving expected outcomes; unexpected results can be interpreted as potentially leading to paradigm shifts, thus valuing the discovery process itself (S. de Jong). Alternatively, this can be seen as a misappropriation of the Popperian notion of falsification, used to justify a failed yet excessively expensive experiment.

The interviewees implicitly aligned with Elinor Ostrom's concept of the common pool resources, where groups manage shared resources for collective benefit that show excludability and subtractability (see Chapters 7 and 16, this volume). None of them, however, explicitly used this construct, which stems from economics. For instance, collaboration requires alignment on a collective's overarching goal, distinguishing it from more opportunistic cooperation, as described earlier. Collaboration can be placed on a spectrum of various factors, with varying weights. One example involved the pooling of funding from multiple foundations for the shared goal of addressing climate change, embodying the notion of managing a commons (L. Kramer).

In summary, successful collaboration relies on establishing shared goals that harmonize collective aspirations with individual motivations, bolstered

From "The Nature and Dynamics of Collaboration,"
edited by Paul F. M. J. Verschure et al. Strüngmann Forum Reports, vol. 33,
Julia R. Lupp, series editor. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. ISBN 9780262548144

by trust, community recognition, and practical considerations of resources and incentives.

Trust

> Trust is not that I believe in you. It means that I give you the opportunity to give something to me that pleases me. This is trust to me. Trust involves not just serving but the pleasure of staying together, of amplifying it. Trust must exist between a conductor and the orchestra or, as in the latter example, between individuals and the community… Let's just take, again, Steve Reich as an example. After being in Africa, he returned to New York and wrote, for example, *Clapping Music*. He took a bit of the structure of what he heard, focused on the structure of the pulse, and conceived this as a music composition. In that sense, he made an abstraction and brought it into another framework (social relationship and trust) to complete his idea. When *Clapping Music* is performed, there is one layer that I recognize as the symbolic notation, and one that reflects the way people play the score. Importantly, the composer is the person that brings this abstraction to the score, but the score is not enough. (J. Manzolli, 28:17)

A recurring theme centered around the multifaceted role of trust in collaboration: "We move at the speed of trust" (N. Agrawal-Hardin). "The currency of collaboration is trust" (A. Sparrow). In the podcast transcripts, the word "trust" was used with the highest frequency (303 times or 0.5% of all words). Despite being ubiquitous, trust is equally an intangible feature of collaboration (S. Puri). No explicit procedures have been advanced or formulated by any organization discussed in the podcasts, although implicit approaches were described (discussed below). Collaboration requires trust that the other will honestly try to contribute and not freeload (R. Axelrod, M. Levi; see also Chapters 2, 11, and 13, this volume). To determine whether this is true, one must first commit to the collaboration (R. Axelrod), and this involves a risk. One way of overcoming this risk is to "assume best intentions" (N. Agrawal-Hardin), thus reducing the need for explanation and justification, or "have a good heart" and seek dialogue (J. Manzolli).

Diverse definitions of trust emerged. For instance, Jônatas Manzolli views trust as the pleasure of mutual contribution, akin to the relationship between a conductor and an orchestra, driven by intrinsic motivation. Larry Kramer suggests that trust must be built within a relationship, focusing on understanding shared goals and allowing partners the freedom to work independently. Trust is the foundation of collaboration because it underpins the belief in mutual values before outcomes are realized. This suggests that it is essential for individuals to be able to commit to a collaboration with an expectation of shared benefits and that each party will contribute honestly and effectively to the shared endeavor (R. Axelrod). Trust is also required to create a commitment to the collective vision and leadership, indicating that it is crucial for individuals to opt into a collaboration, building trust through active participation and dialogue

From "The Nature and Dynamics of Collaboration,"
edited by Paul F. M. J. Verschure et al. Strüngmann Forum Reports, vol. 33,
Julia R. Lupp, series editor. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. ISBN 9780262548144

(M. Jones). Once established, trust provides resilience in a collaboration to overcome contentious phases and lay a foundation for conflict resolution in organizations (T. Mulder). Theo Mulder delved into the intricacies of trust in organizational contexts. In his reflections on the trust placed in leaders during the transformation of an institute, he pinpointed the need for trust in processes that allow group tensions to self-resolve, advocating for the reduction of jealousy to enhance trust and collaboration as well as a reduction of hierarchical differences to ensure the collective success of projects.

The need for trust applies to many settings, from internal dynamics within organizations to external collaborations between them. The challenge lies in establishing trust across diverse individuals as well as different organizational cultures and adapting collaborative processes accordingly.

Trust is a state of the collective as well as of each individual. Building collective trust is crucial and, where applicable, needs to be cultivated by those in leadership positions. Trust also involves the subjective experience of each individual in the collaborating collective, defined in relational terms (N. Chaudhary). A personal level of trust can be created through actions and by demonstrating qualities like humility and maturity, especially in international collaborations (S. Puri). In contrast, political and legal systems can only function based on collective trust, gaining credibility through their operation based on established rules (E. Numann). Trust is the bedrock of the rule of law and is essential for the legal framework and judiciary to be perceived as credible.

Collaborative processes can be enhanced by structures and processes supporting the development of a shared understanding and commitment among participants. To illustrate this, Susan Fitzpatrick described how the foundation she represents has supported collaborations built around a project that was advanced by a particular individual. If that individual, however, is primarily interested in advancing their own objective (e.g., a scientific goal) and views collaborators as a means to that end, trust can be undermined and lead to disastrous outcomes. She proposes that trust is enabled when collaborators perceive that the structure is designed to support everyone's contributions and that there is a genuine shared interest rather than a single person's agenda. This structure should facilitate distributed decision making and a sense of shared ownership over the project rather than serve one individual's goals.

Within collaborative projects, trust is a dynamic and action-based phenomenon (S. Puri). Reflecting on a housing project, Shantamritananda Puri underscored how trust is built incrementally as individuals demonstrate commitment through actions that exemplify humility, flexibility, and maturity. He extended this notion to international collaborations, highlighting the significance of trust when coordinating across borders, where reliance on distant partners is imperative for success. In a deeply personal account, Nandita Chaudhary shifted the focus to the emotional and relational aspects of trust. Breaches of trust have a profound personal impact and are reciprocal in that in addition to trusting others, being trusted by others is critical to successful

From "The Nature and Dynamics of Collaboration,"
edited by Paul F. M. J. Verschure et al. Strüngmann Forum Reports, vol. 33,
Julia R. Lupp, series editor. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. ISBN 9780262548144

collaboration. Her experience highlights trust as a deeply held personal value integral to professional interactions and collaborations. Working toward purposeful collaboration, one can interact solely to build trust rather than achieve some external goal:

> That kind of gathering where you don't know each other, but you're trusting each other with things like preparing each other's meals or you're sleeping in the same room with people…you don't know…It's huge for collectively building trust. (N. Agrawal-Hardin, 1:00:29)

Some philanthropic funders use social activities specifically to build trust; trust is built on relationships (L. Kramer).

> One of the things…is to start with a social activity…you have to break bread. You have to form the fact that we are a group of people…coming together for a purpose.…Making these social activities nonoptional is very important [yet] uncomfortable…particularly if you've asked them not to do their traditional academic thing of giving their talk. And it's not until [this moment that], you really can begin to develop this trust.…That's often a role that the foundation plays.… we know you care about this…and everyone else in this room has that same intention…The moment when you know whether it's going to work or not [is] when somebody will finally say, "I've been listening to these talks for two days, and I don't understand what you're talking about." That's when you know this is going to work. (S. Fitzpatrick, 14:27)

A "circle of trust" can be generated through social activities where all members define a map of potential collaborations, synergies, and complementarities, thus creating a foundation for future collaboration to unfold (A. Sparrow). In philanthropic funding, trust can be instilled through procedures that are followed to provide funding as well as through the behaviors that the funder demonstrates in doing so (L. Kramer): What is requested to inform the funding decision? Is it reasonable and proportional? What is the form of dialogue and the required balance between listening and telling? Conversely, factors that erode trust include competition, excessive control (L. Kramer), and organizational inertia, contradicting overtly stated and pursued goals (A. Sparrow). Only one participant questioned the importance of trust and made the observation that people with mutual distrust can also work together (S. de Jong).

In summary, trust was valued as a crucial element of collaboration, serving as its foundation, providing resilience, involving emotional and relational aspects, demanding action and leadership, influenced by structural designs, and varying across cultural and contextual lines. Trust was depicted as a multidimensional construct essential for successful collaboration. It is established through consistent, positive actions; it becomes part of the social fabric within organizations and is crucial for overcoming cultural and traditional barriers. Trust is not only a professional necessity but also an emotional and personal principle that, when broken, can have significant consequences. Be it in international projects, legal systems, organizational management, or personal

From "The Nature and Dynamics of Collaboration,"
edited by Paul F. M. J. Verschure et al. Strüngmann Forum Reports, vol. 33,
Julia R. Lupp, series editor. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. ISBN 9780262548144

relationships, trust is the cornerstone of collective endeavors and a fundamental human value. Trust is the currency and lifeblood of collaborative endeavors, vital for achieving common objectives.

Communication

Communication is an indispensable element of successful collaborations across diverse professional realms, serving to build trust and relationships and providing a means to overcome boundaries (L. Kramer, M. McKee). L. Kramer emphasized the necessity of immediate and personal communication methods (e.g., direct messaging) to maintain trust, particularly in policy-related interactions. Here, clarity about the limitations of one's work and the virtue of listening are crucial; self-doubt also facilitates a healthy reliance on others. Similarly, Martin McKee underscored the significance of transparency and the balance between self-doubt and confidence in fostering collaborative dialogues. Communication is essential to transmit goals and align people behind ongoing work, especially when communication is conducted remotely across different geographic regions (A. Nuyken).

Effective communication is necessary to exact buy-in and engagement from all parties, acknowledging the diverse experiences and settings of everyone involved (M. Levi). The efficiency in communication was underscored. Drawing from military principles and the adage "be bold, be brief, be gone," Ron Poropatich stressed the importance of exercising concise, precise communication that is mindful of everyone's role in the collaboration, akin to the practices of surgeons in operating rooms. Efficient communication facilitates the coordination and synchronization of the team.

The structure of communication and how information is dispensed or received impacts the collaborative process as it influences how people decide what is important. This is relevant from a pragmatic point of view regarding material gain and a community's sense of identity and place in the world (M. Levi). Such considerations can drive the formulation of distinct communication protocols that govern member behavior and incentivize collaboration. The role of institutions as an information architecture implicitly involves communication (see also Chapter 14, this volume). Defining protocols and representational formats of information supports and shapes complex collaborative processes. The rules and incentives within an organization (e.g., a trade union) provide elements of an informational architecture that facilitate collaboration.

In less formal collaborative settings, Robert Axelrod points to the importance of communication in creating mutual understanding and agreements based on specialized knowledge. Success in interdisciplinary collaborations often requires synthesizing diverse expertise and perspectives that can be obstructed because individuals may not initially share the same language or specialized knowledge. Part of the collaborative process, therefore, involves learning from each other and developing a shared understanding of key concepts and terms

From "The Nature and Dynamics of Collaboration,"
edited by Paul F. M. J. Verschure et al. Strüngmann Forum Reports, vol. 33,
Julia R. Lupp, series editor. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. ISBN 9780262548144

relevant to the project. This mutual understanding is crucial for the collaboration to be effective, as it allows each participant to contribute their specialized knowledge and skills toward a common goal.

Communication is a fundamental aspect of engaging with others and must be used proactively to inform stakeholders and adjust projects according to feasibility (E. Wiecko). This involves creating intertextuality, a meeting of minds and horizons, where individuals assume a level playing field and articulate their contexts to envision a new reality that serves as the starting point for conversations (R. Malpica Padilla). Here, the meaning and value of the collaboration emerge from the interaction of the participants with their specific worldviews and expectations as opposed to a single source. This principle holds whether engaging with a small community or the government of a country. Communication is also tied to the emotional aspects of collaboration itself; individuals need to feel effective and that they can act on what they believe is the right thing to do (M. Levi). This emotional benefit comes from the ability to communicate and act—a crucial part of achieving a goal and getting people to move beyond their immediate self-interest. Such communication requires space for challenge and discussion in a civil and structured way; participants need to hear each other and the objections others might have against a particular set of truths, facts, or interpretations of the world. Achieving this level of communication and exchange requires the following psychological ingredients:

- confidence and trust among the group to speak the truth while allowing room for debate and challenge
- civility
- a positive-sum game where all participants have a fair chance to win in the future
- no free riders
- institutional protection of core values
- feeling effective

Challenges in communication can lead to collaboration breakdowns (I. Schmiel, C. Hedegaard). Problems may arise when individual perspectives are pushed forward without consensus, leading to a disintegration of common ground (I. Schmiel). In political contexts, a shared perception of problems and understanding of interests is of the essence (C. Hedegaard). A breakdown in collaboration can occur when mutual understanding is lost. This implies a disruption in effective communication, essential for maintaining the collaboration's momentum and achieving shared objectives. In this respect, insisting on one's own position without seeking consensus is counterproductive. For example, Connie Hedegaard critiqued the slow and siloed nature of political institutions, such as the European Commission, suggesting that their communication and organizational structures are not conducive to the fast and effective collaboration needed to meet ambitious targets and pressing challenges, such as climate change. As a

From "The Nature and Dynamics of Collaboration,"
edited by Paul F. M. J. Verschure et al. Strüngmann Forum Reports, vol. 33,
Julia R. Lupp, series editor. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. ISBN 9780262548144

solution, she advocated for mandates that enable expedient and effective cross-silo work; more integrated and efficient communication practices are needed to overcome institutional barriers and foster successful collaboration through appropriate institutional communication structures.

> I think that divergent views can be both healthy and unhealthy. We have not figured out mechanisms for turning those divergent, extremely held views, often for good reasons. We had an argument the other day at lunch with one of our fellows who wanted to frame racial…issues as white supremacy. I took exception to that because I was willing to admit I was a racist in the United States because we all are, because of the nature of the racial structure. But white supremacist has a whole other meaning to me. And it wasn't clear she and I, though we were very civil and friendly, were going to ever come to an agreement about this. That was a divergence that could be productive, but it also could block us from talking. So, you know how to deal with those things. I don't think there are really good reasons why people have divergent views, that's what I was trying to say. (M. Levi, 52:31)

In summary, communication is fundamental to collaboration for engaging all parties. It builds and maintains trust, aligns goals, ensures efficiency, adapts to changing circumstances, and overcomes institutional and structural barriers. How communication is structured is paramount in various settings: from the military to academia, philanthropy to the legal system, medical fields to political institutions.

Leadership

Throughout the podcasts, leadership was cited to play a significant role in collaboration. Meg Jones highlighted the role of leadership in making decisions, especially in emergency situations. She views leadership as a necessary feature of collaboration but notes that it can be absent in cooperation. She also emphasized that a good leader ensures that the right people are in the room for discussions to manage and coordinate the efforts of different working groups within the collaboration. Although collaboration and consultation are crucial, there are times when a leader must make quick decisions and take charge. This decisiveness is a key leadership quality, essential for addressing urgent issues, including climate change. Yet, leadership builds on humility, experience, and the consolidation of trust over time. She suggests that members in a collaboration should have a role in shaping the vision alongside leadership, reinforcing that trust in both the vision and the leadership is critical for effective collaboration. Connie Hedegaard adds that in the political world, leadership's role is to foster a shared perception of a problem, build a deep understanding of the counterparts' interests, and instill acceptance that one cannot always have everything their own way. Robert Axelrod's experience also reflects this position.

In discussing leadership's role in understanding the adaptability of a mission and the ability to develop contingency plans, Ron Poropatich emphasized

From "The Nature and Dynamics of Collaboration,"
edited by Paul F. M. J. Verschure et al. Strüngmann Forum Reports, vol. 33,
Julia R. Lupp, series editor. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. ISBN 9780262548144

that good leaders, especially in the military, must recognize that situations can change rapidly (e.g., under the "fog of war" on the battlefield) and that plans may not unfold as initially designed. Leaders at all levels must be prepared to adapt and have multiple plans (Plan B, C, and D) ready to address unforeseen challenges. He also noted that leaders should be able to communicate, coordinate, and synchronize these plans effectively with their teams to ensure successful mission execution. In addition, he highlighted the importance of linking strategic thinking and operational execution, suggesting that leaders need to have a high-level vision and be able to translate that into actionable steps. Effective leadership involves understanding how smaller tasks fit into the larger picture and how they relate to seemingly unrelated elements to achieve a higher vision. He pointed out that some individuals may be great thinkers but struggle to implement ideas, while others may be good at execution but lack a broader perspective; leadership needs to find an optimal balance between the skills and talents of team members.

In the context of philanthropy and collaboration, Larry Kramer emphasized that those involved in philanthropy are motivated by a desire to make the world a better place and that they want to be the ones to drive that change (see also Chapter 13, this volume). He suggests that leaders in philanthropy do not necessarily question whether they are the best people to accomplish their goals, but rather are driven by a commitment to contribute to the greater good. This reflects a leadership style that is proactive and self-motivated, with a focus on impact rather than on the validation of role or position. The ethos of leadership directly defines collaborative success, as in the case of the trade unions in the United States and Australia and their actions against exclusion, racism, and colonialism (M. Levi). Here, strong leadership was matched by strong membership. Effective union leadership was defined through a constitution based on "participatory democracy and a relatively easy recall of the leadership." In addition, leadership knew it had to realize results that spoke to the needs of the collective (e.g., wages and working conditions), thus reinforcing the underlying "community of fate."

Leadership also plays a role in managing diversity and effective collaboration. Larry Kramer notes that leadership must ensure collaboration builds on diverse interests and perspectives when shaping goals and decision making within an organization. The ability to compromise and adapt goals in light of diverse perspectives is a key aspect of leadership in successful collaborations. His view suggests that leaders must be open to incorporating a range of viewpoints and be skilled at navigating the complexities of a diverse set of collaborators. Rafael Malpica Padilla further emphasized the importance of engaging with others and embracing differences. He suggests that leadership involves deconstructing systems that impose one group's will over another and instead searches out common ground where all parties can build together without domination. This approach to leadership requires a willingness to listen and engage in a give-and-take process, maintaining flexibility like an elastic band

From "The Nature and Dynamics of Collaboration,"
edited by Paul F. M. J. Verschure et al. Strüngmann Forum Reports, vol. 33,
Julia R. Lupp, series editor. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. ISBN 9780262548144

that can stretch but also return to a shared center. Rafael Malpica Padilla argues that effective leadership is not about dictating from the top down but rather about immersing oneself within a group and responding to their needs. He stresses the importance of listening to others and committing to support their outcomes rather than redirecting them toward one's own goals. This perspective on leadership can be likened to being in the passenger seat: truly listening to communities, showing mutual respect, having a commitment to the shared goals that respect the aspirations and needs of all involved parties, and being committed to their success. This view was also echoed by Ron Poropatich, who recognized that a leader does not have all the answers and that success is achieved through the team's collective effort.

Various styles of leadership that are relevant to collaboration emerged from the interviews. For instance, Meg Jones mentioned the importance of a decisive leadership style, especially in emergency situations. Leaders must sometimes make quick decisions and take charge, ensuring that the right people manage different working groups within the collaboration. Both Ron Poropatich and Luke Sciulli profiled a mission-focused leadership style, particularly relevant in military contexts, where the leader is focused on accomplishing a mission with broad guidance but relies on the team to determine the specifics of execution. This style requires trust in the team's abilities and a willingness to delegate and collaborate to achieve the mission. Ron Poropatich describes a leadership style characterized by a "bearing of quiet confidence" and humility, where leaders maintain composure and confidence in their abilities while suppressing background noise and distractions: "Be hungry, be humble, be smart." This style involves guiding others without being overly assertive or domineering, allowing for a collaborative environment where everyone's contributions are valued and communication is adjusted to the context and the recipients. This is particularly important in military missions where specifications are commonly broad; it avoids micromanagement and trusts the team to determine how the mission will be accomplished. Realizing the mission requires the full capacity of the team to be engaged. A true leader is collaborative: "We take credit as a team." Leadership often entails other qualities as well:

> Good, considerate, empathic leaders, at every point, are necessary for collaborations to survive. If it's just contractual, maybe it works. But you see what happens in large organizations, e.g., Amazon: the bigger it gets, the messier it gets, the more exploitative it gets. (N. Chaudary, 54:39)

> [O]ne place to start is…the pandemic, to take some of the courage that many political leaders showed during the pandemic by presenting in clear language to people what the danger is, what we are faced with here, and what the solutions are, even unpleasant solutions. We saw that those who actually did so gained respect from people, broadly speaking. One of the things that really frightens me is when policymakers are busy telling people that we can make the biggest transformation, maybe ever in the history of mankind, without anybody feeling anything or without it costing anybody anything. I think that people see through that.

From "The Nature and Dynamics of Collaboration,"
edited by Paul F. M. J. Verschure et al. Strüngmann Forum Reports, vol. 33,
Julia R. Lupp, series editor. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. ISBN 9780262548144

> I think a much more straightforward conversation is needed, presenting some of the tough choices, and showing political leadership to get the knowledge out that people understand. People don't believe those policymakers who tell them that you don't have to change anything. It is not trustworthy. (C. Hedegaard, 46:45)

Leadership wielded wrongly can harm collaboration and the objectives of the organization it supports. Shantamritananda Puri issued a cautionary note about the ego of the leader, which may take its inspiration from "the white knight who comes in and saves the day" and disrupt the collaborative process by disempowering other participants in the collaboration. Deepa Narayan proposed that leadership does not require a single person (usually a man) at the top of the hierarchy and stressed that "the desire for total control destroys" as can be seen in unaccountable governments and leaders that "behave like bullies."

Eva Wiecko described her surprise at how much time was required to communicate with leadership in a large company (e.g., CEO, CFO) during routine processes (e.g., mergers). This time was needed to avoid offending anyone. She considers this a bad sign for corporate leadership, as it shows that the culture is too hierarchical. She proposes that C-level executives need to work on this to improve it, as leadership in most organizations are embedded in a hierarchical structure:

> Hierarchical and structured thinking is still prevalent in organizations, even in those who believe they are rooted in meritocracy. In the end, hierarchy prevails, especially in critical situations. (E. Wiecko, 14:00)

This can result in catastrophic failure, as in the case of Lehman Brothers (A. Nuyken) and in military operations (L. Sciulli). In contrast, leadership can also be diffuse, as in grassroots organizations (see Chapter 7, this volume). Narayan describes this as "feminine leadership," which cares as opposed to wants "more, more and more." Such an alternative approach raises the question of how to incentivize bottom-up engagement (L. Sciulli). Annemarie Sparrow provided further examples of grassroots organizations that form and act without top-down control in crisis situations by demonstrating "solidarity in the face of such brutal oppression and determination and that they did it for their children."

These varied leadership styles reflect a spectrum from directive to collaborative, each with its own strengths, weaknesses, and contexts. The common thread is recognizing the importance of leadership in guiding and shaping collaborative efforts while remaining mindful of dysfunctional leadership, which can disrupt collaboration.

From "The Nature and Dynamics of Collaboration,"
edited by Paul F. M. J. Verschure et al. Strüngmann Forum Reports, vol. 33,
Julia R. Lupp, series editor. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. ISBN 9780262548144

From “The Nature and Dynamics of Collaboration,”
edited by Paul F. M. J. Verschure et al. Strüngmann Forum Reports, vol. 33,
Julia R. Lupp, series editor. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. ISBN 9780262548144