Some things would be easier if you were in charge. But you probably wouldn’t learn as much.
Collaborating

Take 2 minutes.

Each of you remind your teammates of one or two things you want to improve with respect to your effectiveness at collaboration.

As you listen to each other, ask yourself, “How can I help with that?”

This is an exercise in letting others know a little bit about your vulnerability. Allowing others in on your vulnerability (in small, managed steps) is what builds trust. Trust among team members fuels efficacy and resilience: you can move through difficulties more quickly and completely with people you trust.
Last time we looked briefly at self-awareness. Today, we’ll look at social awareness and relationship management.
Recall that last week we determined that you come into this class with very different experiences of yourself. We also noticed that it’s possible to take a judgment and change your perspective on it, thereby loosening it up and becoming more flexible about it.
Challenge #2:

We are hard-wired for fight or flight.

Collaboration

We noted that problems, difficulties, mistakes, failures are easier to recall, and more vivid. Our brain is on the lookout for threat.
I can learn to slow myself down on the ladder of inference, re-examine the conclusions I automatically jump to, re-assess my interpretations and evaluations.
What, then, can I do about you?
I can’t change who you are or what you think. Nor can you change me!
What then?
My amygdala is screening for threat, and...
..so is yours.
So we face the possibility of creating self-reinforcing interpretative loops.

(Remember, we are talking about the 2% or 3% or 5% of the time when things aren’t smooth.)
Look at each of these photos, and ask yourself what’s going on with this person (Paul Krugman, noted economist)? Then ask yourself what is probably causing that? We can come to reasonable agreement that the expression in the first photo is something like “interest,” the second is “skeptical,” and the third is, more or less, “Oh no!”
So we’re pretty good at reading each others’ broader emotions. But as for what’s causing those emotions--we have no real idea. We may think we do; we can certainly imagine scenarios. But we don’t really know.

How is this realization--this distinction--important to collaboration? What do we often do that gets us into trouble? What can we do differently?
As with the Ladder of Inference, we misinterpret each other, we don’t realize it, we act on that misinterpretation, and problems ensue.
Collaboration
Challenges #3, 4, 5:

• What is influence?
• What is listening?
• What is questioning?
AN INFLUENTIAL PERSON:

• **listens** more than they advocate their own views;

• **knows** about the **people** they work with, their likes and dislikes;

• is seen as understanding, or **empathetic**, rather than as persuasive or articulate;

• is seen as **flexible**, open to new ideas, able to be influenced;

• **talks openly** and directly, rather than keeping their views “close to the vest”;

• builds a **network** and uses it.

Source: David Burnham, BurnhamRosen Group, personal communication

Studies have shown that influential people are more likely to be open and available than not.
AN INFLUENTIAL PERSON:

is (intelligently) trusting.
Trust exists outside of language. If I tell you that you can trust me, I’ve done nothing to engender trust. (In fact, telling you might actually make you suspicious!)
Trust takes two: one to expose a vulnerability, the other to fail to exploit it. It also takes time. The vulnerability must be shown. The attack must be withheld.
Trust consists of two communications: “I could.” “But I won’t.” This transaction can happen by accident or by design. I can tell you something about me that makes me (a bit) vulnerable. You can either exploit that, or not. I need to be responsible for not opening up too much; if I expose a weakness, I want to feel certain that, even if you exploit it, I’ll survive. Then, the next time, I can expose something a little more risky, and see whether you exploit it. And so on.
Guidelines for preventing team conflict down the road, when the fan gets hit.

Shortly, we’re going to ask you to:

Work as a team, using the form provided, to come up with guidelines that you agree to use when under stress, to ensure:

- full participation, and
- equitable sharing of the work
BU-BU-BU [COMMUNICATION] BINGO

* named by Will Drevo, 6.141 S12
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame: lead with your intention or concern</th>
<th>Ask questions to understand more fully</th>
<th>Listen with more curiosity</th>
<th>Try on another point of view</th>
<th>Get more information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask for useful feedback</td>
<td>Offer useful feedback</td>
<td>Make a proposal</td>
<td>Make a request</td>
<td>How might someone else handle this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find common ground</td>
<td>Frame: lead with your intention or concern</td>
<td>Do what someone else would do</td>
<td>Have a higher purpose</td>
<td>Ask more questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a break</td>
<td>Ask more questions</td>
<td>Change your point of view (make it good/bad, right/wrong....)</td>
<td>Team against the problem! (not team member against team member)</td>
<td>Withhold judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withhold judgment</td>
<td>Make a proposal</td>
<td>What part can you own?</td>
<td>What might they think is important?</td>
<td>Find common ground</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* named by Will Drevo, 6.141 S12
Framing is an invaluable tool. It can clarify, smooth over, prevent, reassure, explain, persuade.... It is a metacommunication that can get you and your listeners onto the same page when trust is not yet sufficiently developed to carry a complex communication.
Now we'll look quickly at making proposals.

When your meeting get stuck:

1. Think of something to try.*
2. Say: “I propose x.”
3. Have your team discuss it and either (a) accept it, or (b) make an alternate proposal.

* Proposing something is more important than figuring out the “right” thing. The energy of proposing will begin to move you forward.

Making a proposal—almost any reasonable proposal—is one way to get your team unstuck when your discussion seems unproductive. Suggest some action, and your team members will be likely to say either “OK,” or, “No, but what about....?” Either way, you’re now moving rather than circling the drain.
Feedback is crucial. And difficult to get right— that is, to make useful. Useful feedback depends on how it is said, and how is it heard.
MAKING FEEDBACK USEFUL

• Assume they mean well.

• Ask questions to find out what they mean.

• Try on the possibility that they’re right.

If you are trying to be helpful with your feedback, and your listener gets defensive (just like you do sometimes!), you can step back, frame your intention again, ask them to help you find a way to say things so that they won’t get defensive.... If you’ve built enough trust, you can remind them that they can adjust the attitude with which they’re listening. But don’t be accusatory. Be responsible.
Guidelines for preventing team conflict down the road, when the fan gets hit.

Take until 1:50.

Work as a team, using the form provided, to come up with guidelines that you agree to use when under stress, to ensure that:

- work is shared equitably
- everyone stays in communication
Guidelines for preventing team conflict down the road, when the fan gets hit.

Turn in your guidelines.

We will copy them, and then return them to you.

We hope that you’ll use them, and continue to refine them, so that they help your team sail smoothly through stressful times.
You can’t always forestall disasters, but you can usually affect the way you and your team handle them.
People have said I’m a terrible listener. I always thought they meant I should just shut up more. But I just realized they meant I should…you know…listen! And find out what other people really mean!

MIT undergraduate in 6.141,
Robotics Science and Systems, S12
Confident:

Having strong belief, firm **trust**, or sure expectation. [OED]

from Latin *com-* intensive prefix, + *fidere* "to trust".

**ARROGANT:**

Making or implying unwarrantable claims to dignity, authority, or knowledge. [OED]

from Latin *arrogare* "to claim for oneself, assume."