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Abstract In order to respond to key challenges in safety and security, individuals and organisations must often collaborate across workplace boundaries, working with people and organisations from different nations and sectors, and with different disciplinary/functional backgrounds. However, research suggests that these kinds of relationships are often fraught with ingroup versus outgroup divisions, which disrupt coordination and hamper operational performance. Against this backdrop, this chapter takes an identity perspective to shed light on the causes of these divisions and potential solutions that may facilitate better relations and cooperation across workplace boundaries. The chapter incorporates recent academic literature in the safety and security domain as well as relevant empirical research to provide evidence-based recommendations. In particular, I discuss how organisations may support positive cooperative actions through communication and rhetoric, through the adoption of human resource management practices related to selection and training, and through boundary-spanning processes and leadership roles.
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1 Introduction: Why Focus on Work Collaborations that Cross Boundaries?

Organisations must often cooperate across geographical, cultural, functional, communicational and regulatory boundaries, in order to remain successful. Indeed, research suggests that boundary-spanning relationships (that is relationships that take place across technical, institutional, organisational, cultural, etc. boundaries),
are becoming increasingly critical in these times of hyper-connectivity and globalisation (Schotter et al. 2017). This is especially true in the international security domain, where the capabilities of multiple international sectors, agencies, teams and individuals must be called upon in order to respond to grand challenges. Major crimes including terrorism, drug and human trafficking occur across national boundaries, while safety-related challenges including the refugee crisis, economic migration and natural and medical emergencies (e.g. Ebola, Covid-19, climate change) necessitate coordinated action among different international and organisational actors (Jacobs 2018; Waring et al. 2018). It is therefore increasingly vital to understand how security partners can work together across boundaries and leverage the skills of diverse (public, private and community) organisations in order to effectively respond to grand, global security challenges.

Recent research has focused on the nature of coordinated action among expats and locals during humanitarian missions (Salem et al. 2018, 2019), among cross-functional teams and agencies in peace-keeping missions (De Vries et al. 2014; Ramarajan et al. 2011) and among supply chain partners and non-government organisations (NGOs) during disaster recoveries (Lu and Xu 2015; Sheu and Pan 2015). This research has underlined the critical importance of effective collaboration among different agencies and actors in meeting today’s greatest security and safety-related challenges (Salem et al. 2018, 2019). Indeed, discussing the importance of collaboration for the effectiveness of humanitarian organisations’ responses to crises, Clarke and Campbell (2015) state: “Coordination is essential to the success of humanitarian response. In most crisis situations, a large number of organisations will be working to provide support in the same area. Under these circumstances, coordination allows all actors to get a better understanding of the situation and to share effective practices” (p. 6).

However, at the same time, these cross-boundary relationships are often found to be fraught with conflict and competition, resulting in ineffective processes and poor performance on the ground (Clarke and Campbell 2018; Ramarajan et al. 2004). In this chapter, I take an identity approach to consider the challenges of working across workplace boundaries, as well as potential solutions to these difficulties. In doing so, I draw on the latest published research, as well as our own empirical findings on collaborative relationships in the security domain, to provide evidence-based recommendations for the field.

2 Problem Definition: The Challenges of Working Together Across Boundaries

Research suggests that relationships between members of different subgroups or partner organisations are often characterised by conflict and competition, which hamper their abilities to work together effectively (Fiol et al. 2009; Glynn 2000;
Horton and Griffin 2017). Indeed, safety and security missions are often found to be hindered by fractious and ill-tempered relationships among cooperating partners (Clarke and Campbell 2018; Ramarajan et al. 2004). Discussing the challenges experienced by international peacekeeping missions, Ramarajan and colleagues (2011, p. 887) write: “International peacekeeping is a situation in which many organizations, such as peacekeeping missions, local authorities and international organizations, are simultaneously trying to resolve a multi-faceted social problem […] Unfortunately, in such complex or uncertain settings, where lack of coordination and differences in organizational goals abound, negative boundary spanning relationships seem to be common” (Aal 2000; Sion 2008). Similarly, Clarke and Campbell (2018) discuss the propensity for competition, disruption, duplication and inefficiency among humanitarian organisations as they attempt to provide coordinated responses in the aftermath of major humanitarian events.

A key theory that offers an explanation as to why such fractious inter-group relations may exist is Social Identity Theory (Tajfel and Turner 1979) and its sister theory, Self-Categorisation Theory (Turner 1985; Turner et al. 1987), which are together labelled the Social Identity Approach. Essentially these theories argue that individuals categorise themselves and others into social groups and typically perceive their ‘ingroups’ (of which they are members) in more positive terms than comparison ‘outgroups’ (of which they are not members) (Hogg and Terry 2000). The Social Identity Approach further describes how categorisations into ingroups and outgroups can lead to competitive dynamics in which ingroup members are favoured over members of other groups (Lipponen et al. 2003; Oaker and Brown 1986). Supporting this theory, organisation-based field research indicates that relationships between workplace subgroups are often characterised by ‘us-versus-them’ dynamics and in the worst cases may be marred by intractable conflicts (Fiol et al. 2009; Glynn 2000; Hambrick et al. 2001).

Moreover, such dynamics are not limited to the for-profit sector. Indeed, empirical findings in the safety and security domain have demonstrated a widespread tendency for ingroup/outgroup categorisations among safety partners. Crucially, these kinds of dynamics may be especially prevalent in complex settings such as disaster recovery and emergency situations, where subgroup differences in norms, languages, cultures and perspectives are likely to be particularly salient (Ramarajan et al. 2004; Salem et al. 2018). Discussing inter-organisational responses to humanitarian crises, Clarke (2013, p. 9) contends that, “organisations will have varying mandates, priorities and philosophies, and will often be in competition for funds and media attention. So it is not surprising that intense competition and disagreement are common elements of humanitarian responses.”
Such subgroup divides are often compounded by clear visual markers and symbols of group membership, such as the use of uniforms, vehicles and artefacts, which demark subgroup affiliations and interest groups (Ramarajan et al. 2004). Similarly, research focusing on inter-organisational responses to crises suggests that subgroup siloes are commonplace, with expatriate and local groups often operating almost entirely independently and showing little inclination to share their skills or to provide a coordinated response (Carr and McWha-Hermann 2016; Salem et al. 2018, 2019).

Even in more routine circumstances, such as in community policing initiatives, which depend on partnerships among various community stakeholders, fractious dynamics may undermine cooperative actions. For example, researchers have long observed the tendency for police organisations to isolate themselves from other actors in the community, adopting “a ‘we versus they’ attitude toward citizenry” (Paoline 2003, p. 203). Indeed, we found evidence of these kinds of dynamics in interviews with 155 European police officers, in which officers described stark divisions between various (hierarchical, functional, geographical) subgroups within the police and between the police and some of their key stakeholder partners (Horton et al. 2015).

Crucially, research suggests that these ingroup-outgroup dynamics may be highly detrimental to collaborative actions that take place across workplace boundaries, regardless of whether those boundaries occur within organisations (e.g. cross-functional teams working across technical/functional boundaries) or between them (e.g. inter-organisational collaborations or collaborations among different stakeholders). For example, in a 2015 study with the Federal Road Police (PRF) in Brazil, we examined how administrative and operational officers coordinated their activities across technical boundaries (Horton and Raab Pires 2015). Based on survey data collected from a sample of more than 800 officers across the country, we found that officers felt they were better able to coordinate their activities with members of their own (administrative/operational) groups than with members of other groups, and experienced more misunderstandings and heightened inefficiency when working across group boundaries.

These kinds of process and performance losses also commonly occur in inter-organisational collaborations. Citing evidence from Sri Lanka, Russia and South Sudan, Salem et al. (2018) conclude that failures in collaboration among different agencies may be key to performance losses in the aftermath of humanitarian crises. Similarly, in their own (2019) study, they found that the operational performance of humanitarian field offices depended on the effectiveness of the collaboration between (local and expatriate) groups. Likewise, aid workers interviewed in ALNAP’s¹ State of the Humanitarian System Report (2010) cited poor leadership and coordination among different agencies as the “single most important constraint to effective operations” (Clarke 2013, p. 4).

¹ALNAP is a “global network of NGOs, UN agencies, members of the Red Cross/Crescent Movement, donors, academics, networks and consultants dedicated to learning how to improve responses to humanitarian crises”. See https://www.alnap.org/.
3 Solutions: What Can Leaders Do to Improve Cross-Boundary Collaborations?

Being cognisant of the potential (and indeed probability) of such ingroup-outgroup divides among international security organisations may be an important first step in addressing this issue, but what can organisations/leaders actually do to improve cooperation across disciplinary, technical and organisational boundaries? Based on the extant literature, it is suggested that organisations can facilitate cross-boundary collaboration by: (a) Fostering a sense of shared identity and/or a collectivistic identity orientation; (b) Increasing communication and contact (under the right conditions); (c) Introducing boundary-spanning and leadership roles and processes; (d) Altering human resource management (HRM) practices, such as selection and training. I will next discuss each of these potential solutions in detail.

3.1 Building a Sense of Shared Identity/Mission and/or a Collectivistic Orientation

First, research suggests that one of the primary barriers to effective inter-group working may be the lack of a shared identity among different actors (Cuijpers et al. 2016; Gaertner et al. 1996). More specifically, organisational partners and stakeholder groups often have different agendas, backgrounds and interests, which hamper inter-group relations and consensus-building and disrupt their operational performance (Korschun 2015; Porck et al. 2020; Richter et al. 2006). For example, while police officers may be expected to share a common professional identity that guides their cooperative practices, Bayerl et al. (2014) found that officers in different national settings had different priorities, expectations and perspectives about ‘who the police are’ (i.e. different professional identities), which may prevent them from reaching a consensus on joint actions.

Thus, it may be suggested that leaders can improve cooperation among different safety/security organisations and partners by fostering a shared identity and by emphasising common over-arching goals that unite members from all subgroups. For instance, field leaders at disaster recovery sites can bring disparate teams together by emphasising the common mission (of saving lives) that unites them, while deemphasising the cultural, functional and social divisions that may set them apart (Salem et al. 2018). Importantly, evidence from the area of social and organisational psychology shows that fostering a shared identity is beneficial for a range of inter-group outcomes, such as knowledge sharing, coordination and performance (Gaertner et al. 1996; Richter et al. 2006). For example, in a study focusing on cross-functional relations between naval teams, I found that strong identification with a shared organisational target was associated with greater knowledge sharing across team boundaries (i.e. with members of other functional teams within the organisation; Horton 2011), while Ernst and Yip (2009) described how the activation of a shared vision/mission within
an NGO in India enhanced cooperation and decision-making across the 17 Indian states in which it was operating. Thus, by fostering identification with a shared target that transcends group boundaries (such as a joint mission or broader collective identity), leaders of security organisations can enhance knowledge sharing, coordination and operational performance among different subgroups/organisations.

In a similar vein, research suggests that organisations can improve inter-group collaborations by embracing a collectivistic identity orientation (that is one that incorporates collective e.g. stakeholder, community, sustainability, etc. interests in its definition), as well as by positioning the organisation as part of a broader (e.g. societal) network. For example, Korschun (2015) proposes that while individuals who strongly identify with their organisations may typically have poorer relationships with external stakeholders, these relationships are likely to be more collaborative and less adversarial if stakeholder relationships are seen as central to the organisation’s identity and the organisation embraces a collectivistic identity orientation.

Importantly, organisations may promote shared identities and collectivistic identity orientations by developing and envisioning shared goals that transcend group boundaries and incorporating these values in their mission statements (Cuijpers et al. 2016; Fiol et al. 2009). In addition, they can adjust their task, organisational and reward structures to reflect the importance of higher-order (collective) goals within the organisation, ensuring that subgroups are aligned in serving and contributing to broader/overarching values and missions (Brickson 2000; Ernst and Yip 2009; Korschun 2015).

### 3.2 Communication and Contact

Researchers have long highlighted the important role of communication in facilitating inter-organisational and inter-stakeholder relations (Allport 1954). In our interviews with European police officers, we found that officers often struggled to reconcile their own organisation’s interests with those of key stakeholder partners (including the judiciary, other emergency organisations, the public, media and political bodies), and that this had a detrimental effect on their partnerships with these groups (Horton et al. 2015). However, these interviews also highlighted the critical importance of communication in (re)aligning stakeholder interests and (re)building relationships. In particular, officers explained that fractious stakeholder relationships were often borne out of a lack of understanding of police roles and processes. As such, by engaging in more intense dialogue within their communities, officers and stakeholders could develop mutual understanding about the underlying motives and interests of different parties and go some way to reconciling these divisions.

Thus, public (organisational/community) forums that encourage conversation and dialogue between groups may be important in improving relations, offering a platform for inter-group contact that enhances familiarity and understanding between groups (Cuijpers et al. 2016). It has long been suggested that inter-group contact may be important for collaboration. Indeed, from as early as 1954 when Allport first
presented his *contact hypothesis*, it has been recognised that increased contact is beneficial in reducing outgroup stereotypes and encouraging the perception of similarity and familiarity with others. That said, research suggests that in order for contact to enhance rather than exacerbate inter-group relations, the right circumstances must be in place. Indeed, Ramarajan and colleagues (2004, 2011) showed that in the absence of pre-established protocols and norms for cooperation, contact between members of different NGOs during peacekeeping missions may be associated with heightened cultural and work-related problems and conflict, rather than reduced issues. Interestingly, the authors point out that the optimal conditions for contact, as described by Allport (1954), which include equality in group status, shared objectives and goals, and the backing of local authorities, customs and laws are rarely found in these kinds of complex and turbulent ‘crisis’ situations. Thus, leaders should be cognisant of the impact that inter-group contact may have under such conditions and intervene where necessary to facilitate more positive interactions and contact among different groups.

In this vein, Ernst and Yip (2009) suggest that one way forward is for leaders to provide a *third space* that allows for contact between members of different subgroups in a neutral environment (away from work), where individuals can interact with each other on a personal basis rather than as representatives of their respective subgroups. This is beneficial in giving individuals the opportunity to have interpersonal exchanges with ‘outgroup’ members that challenge inaccurate stereotypes and increase interpersonal trust, thus facilitating better cooperation.

### 3.3 Boundary-Spanning and Leadership Roles

Boundary-spanning roles are directed at guiding, aligning and uniting the efforts of different subgroups in the pursuit of higher-order objectives (Cross et al. 2013; Salem et al. 2018). They thus play a key role in enhancing cooperative actions and improving operational performance in cross-boundary teams. Given that leaders often oversee and coordinate operations at a macro level, they are often tasked with performing boundary-spanning activities (Salem et al. 2018). But what kinds of strategies can leaders/boundary-spanners use to improve inter-group performance?

Research suggests that individuals in strategic/leadership positions may enhance collaborative processes by clarifying the roles and processes of different teams and providing common frames of reference for all parties involved. Focusing on inter-team cooperation between first responders, utility companies, government and military units in a simulated exercise of a national disaster, Waring and colleagues (2018) found that boundary-spanners could improve inter-team information sharing by clarifying the respective operating procedures and roles enacted by different component teams and by providing common frames of reference for information exchange. In
particular, cooperation among different partners was found to be more effective when
groups refrained from using technical/specialist language and when they were fully
aware of other groups’ roles, responsibilities and capabilities in responding to the
crisis. Thus, boundary-spanners/leaders can enhance cooperative actions by ensuring
that all parties involved know when and with whom to share information and how
different component groups are expected to contribute to the collective response.

In addition, leaders may act as crucial role models of cooperative behaviour, show-
casing the optimal behaviours that their team members should follow and embodying
cooperative values themselves (Salem et al. 2018). In this vein, one key theory that has
been highlighted as especially relevant for boundary-spanning leaders is the Inter-
group Leadership Theory (Hogg et al. 2012). Essentially this theory proposes that if
circumstances make it impossible to integrate different subgroups within a broader
shared identity/mission, as recommended previously in this chapter, then the success
of the inter-group collaboration may rest on the leader’s ability to activate an inter-
group relational identity among collaborators. A strong inter-group relational identity
is characterised by the recognition that the success of one’s own group depends on
having close relational ties with other subgroups. Research by Salem et al. (2019)
examining collaborations between local and expat teams during humanitarian oper-
ations provides support for this suggestion. In particular, they found that when field
office leaders actively promoted an inter-group relational identity among workers,
there was greater cooperation between local and expat partners and better operational
performance on the ground. This research also points to a number of concrete steps
that leaders can take to enhance inter-group relational identities through their rhetoric
and behaviours, such as by highlighting the importance of inter-group relational ties
for overall operational performance and by ensuring that they balance their time and
resources among different subgroups. In addition, it underlines the important role
that boundary-spanning leaders may play in role modelling positive collaborative
behaviours and disseminating these values among their workers.

3.4 Human Resource Management (HRM) Practices:
Selection and Training

Research has also focused on what kinds of people are best suited to working in cross-
boundary teams. Two important aspects that have been highlighted in this research are
the breadth/diversity of individuals’ past experiences and their cognitive complexity.
For example, based on evidence from an international peace support training mission
and a municipal administration, De Vries et al. (2014) suggest that individuals with
broad functional experiences may be better able to anticipate, understand and inter-
pret social situations (having higher interpersonal cognitive complexity), thus being
better able to coordinate their activities with members of other teams (when they
identify strongly with the organisation). In a similar vein, research indicates that
individuals with complex identities (who identify with multiple social groups or identities) may be less likely to develop fractious relationships when working in cross-functional teams (Horton and Griffin 2017). As such, HR managers may wish to make purposeful selection decisions, explicitly targeting employees with broad (functional) backgrounds and experiences and with complex cognitive profiles for boundary-spanning roles. In addition, they can use human resource management initiatives, such as cross-functional training and job rotations to foster these skills and to familiarise individuals with a range of different functions and roles (De Vries et al. 2014).

Furthermore, research suggests that boundary-spanning workers may benefit from tailored development programmes focusing on communication, negotiation and inter-cultural understanding, which are essential skills for these types of roles (Drach-Zahavy 2011; Leeds 2001). They may also benefit from conflict management skills training, which aims to develop constructive methods of de-escalation and resolution when working with others. Such initiatives may be especially vital when safety/security partners are operating in stressful situations, such as during humanitarian crises and peace-keeping missions (Ramarajan et al. 2004). Finally, HR managers may wish to implement dedicated selection and training programmes for leaders, in order to identify and foster the boundary-spanning leadership skills identified in the previous section.

4 Summary: Policy and Practice Recommendations for Organisations

In sum, cross-boundary collaborations are vital in order to meet major security and safety-related challenges. However, factions and divides between subgroup partners often undermine organisations’ abilities to capitalise on these crucial cross-boundary networks. This chapter integrates insights from identity research to provide evidence-based recommendations aimed at facilitating more effective collaborative practices. (For a full summary of the recommendations, please see Table 1). It is suggested that by improving collaborative actions that cross workplace divides, organisational leaders will be better able to leverage the skills of private, public and non-governmental groups in order to address the major safety and security challenges of our times. In particular, by minimising subgroup conflicts and coordinating their capabilities, security organisations can reduce duplications in work, and provide a united response to shared (e.g. environmental, criminal and humanitarian) threats. This chapter aims to contribute to that goal by supporting positive, harmonious and collaborative approaches to safety management in the future.
Table 1  Policy and practice recommendations aimed at improving collaborative actions

| Type of strategy | Descriptions of specific strategies/actions |
|------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Identity-related | • Foster perceptions of a shared identity/collectivistic identity orientation by developing and envisioning shared goals/values and incorporating these in mission statements etc.  
• Adapt task, organisational and reward structures to highlight the importance of higher-order goals/identities |
| Communication and contact | • Encourage communication among parties to align interests and enhance understanding  
• Facilitate contact among inter-group partners (under the right conditions)  
• Provide a neutral third space that allows for interpersonal interactions |
| Boundary-spanning and leadership roles | • Provide common frames of reference  
• Clarify the roles, responsibilities and capabilities of different component groups  
• Ensure leaders act as role models of cooperative behaviour  
• Utilise effective inter-group leadership practices e.g. foster inter-group relational identities through rhetoric and behaviour |
| HRM practices: Selection and training | • Make purposeful, targeted selection decisions for cross-boundary work positions—especially hiring individuals with broad experiences and with complex cognitive/identity profiles  
• Implement cross-functional training initiatives and job rotations to familiarise individuals with a range of different functions and roles  
• Provide inter-group training for members of cross-boundary work-teams, focusing on communication, negotiation, inter-cultural understanding and conflict management  
• Select and train leaders, focusing on developing the boundary-spanning leadership skills identified above |
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