Journal of Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics (2024) 22(7), 16-20
https://doi.org/10.54808/JSCI.22.07.16

Beyond Status Quo: Why is Transdisciplinary Communication Instrumental in Innovation?

James LIPUMA
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, New Jersey Institute of Technology
Newark, NJ 07100, USA.

Cristo LEON
College of Science and Liberal Arts, Office of Research & Development
New Jersey Institute of Technology
Newark, NJ 07100, USA.

ABSTRACT

In an era of rapid technological advancements and complex societal challenges, the imperative for disruptive innovation has never been more acute. The International Multi-Conference on Complexity, Informatics, and Cybernetics (IMCIC) 2024 served as a confluence for thought leaders across the domains of Complexity, Informatics, and Cybernetics to explore the relationship between Transdisciplinary Communication (TDC) and disruptive innovation. This presentation highlighted that TDC's unique toolkit complements and is crucial in bridging diverse fields of study. TDC is essential for fostering innovation capable of transcending traditional boundaries and instigating profound systemic change. Drawing upon various collaborative frameworks, including collaborative, network, and cooperative models, this keynote delved into organizational, collaborative, and social innovation dynamics. It underscored the limitations of the status quo, where incremental change and reform fall short of achieving significant impact. Through a discourse about systemic innovation, the keynote discussed ways to produce desired outcomes that achieve measurable impacts with positive social change. TDC acts as a force multiplier for disruptive innovation initiatives, enabling a departure from conventional solutions and embracing holistic, system-wide transformations.

The article concluded by highlighting the necessity of fostering a culture where TDC catalyzes disruptive innovation and offers a roadmap for tackling global challenges through unprecedented collaboration and creativity.

Keywords: Transdisciplinary Communication in Innovation, Disruptive Innovation Strategies, Systemic Change through Collaboration, Collaborative Frameworks in Complexity Science, Cybernetics and Informatics Integration, Organizational Innovation Models, Social Innovation and Community Engagement, Identity Disclosure in Research Teams, Complexity Science Applications in Cybernetics, Transdisciplinary Approaches to Informatics.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the realm of contemporary research and development, the imperative for disruptive innovation is pronounced, driven by the need to address the complex challenges of today's global society. As we convene at the International Multi-Conference on Complexity, Informatics, and Cybernetics (IMCIC) 2024, this paper argues that transdisciplinary communication (TDC) is not merely beneficial but essential for catalyzing transformative innovations. By facilitating the convergence of diverse disciplines, TDC enables the creation of groundbreaking solutions that surpass conventional limitations.

This exploration seeks to answer the following question: How does transdisciplinary communication facilitate disruptive innovation within complex systems, and what are the identifiable impacts on organizational and societal outcomes? Transdisciplinary communication is critical in navigating the intricacies of cognitive diversity [1], allowing stakeholders to address unknowns and adversity, identify opportunities and risks, and construct compelling narratives that encourage collective engagement in innovation [2]. This approach is pivotal in addressing interconnected, intractable problems that cannot be resolved within the silos of individual disciplines [3], [4]. As organizations adapt to the networked nature of contemporary challenges, the importance of transdisciplinary collaboration in achieving success becomes increasingly apparent [5]. By adopting transdisciplinary strategies, organizations can significantly enhance their resilience, adaptability, and problem-solving capabilities, thereby generating beneficial outcomes for themselves and society [6].

2. THE STATUS QUO AND ITS LIMITATIONS

Traditional models of innovation often focus on incremental improvements within established paradigms. While these models have driven progress in various fields, they are insufficient in confronting systemic, complex challenges that demand radical rethinking and novel approaches [7]. The limitations of the status quo—its tendency towards conservatism and compartmentalization—stifle the potential for groundbreaking change, necessitating a shift towards more dynamic, integrative strategies.

Changing status quo

A change to the status quo is often seen as innovation or change. If the steady state is favorable, a change may seek to optimize the current work or adjust the system to meet external changes. If the current homeostasis is not optimal, alternative options, ways of debugging, or other corrective action may be sought. In the extreme of this latter case, the current system may evolve into something new to innovate the entire inner workings of the system. In either of these cases, the system may be seen as undergoing innovation or being led by an innovation when seen from the perspective of those within it. Often, external changes

are seen as disruptive innovations that force the system to respond, change, or be left behind. However, what if we view this from another vantage point?

Imagine we are not part of the system or seen as functioning effectively. Social innovation identifies that a difference must be made because the system is perfectly designed to maintain the status quo and perpetuate the current inequity and inefficiencies that exist. In this case, the difference sought is for a disruptive innovation that creates new perspectives to achieve change in the path to a new system that does not result in the inequity inherent in the current system. Collaborative change is most applicable here because large-scale social innovation requires understanding and interaction with many complex interconnected systems. Moreover, it must involve individuals and organizations from many sectors and cultures to collaborate to address the need for change and to accomplish the work for the change to be realized.

TDC plays a vital role in each of these responses to disruptive innovation. By providing diverse perspectives and a wide range of expertise, TDC allows the system's members to understand their inner workings and how disruptive innovation may impact the individuals, sub-systems, and the system overall. As the individuals collaborate, TDC is an essential tool to allow each to understand their own set of roles and responsibilities within the scenario faced within the system. At the same time, as these individuals and the organizations they represent come together to take action on the shared vision, effective communication facilitated by TDC is vital in all frameworks for social innovation.

3. DISRUPTIVE SYSTEM CHANGE

Innovation is a significant driver of change when moving beyond the status quo, intentionally or unintentionally. Disruptive innovation is often seen as a key forcing agent that increases awareness of existing issues and spurs action. However, as the problems grow in complexity and scope, those working to innovate must engage with the system.

Disruptive Innovation: Innovation challenges and alters the foundational structures of markets and societies. Unlike incremental innovation, which supports existing systems, disruptive innovation questions and replaces them, offering new values and paradigms. This paper argues that transdisciplinary communication is a critical driver for such innovation, as it allows for the synthesis of knowledge across different fields, fostering unconventional solutions that can leapfrog current technologies and methodologies [8].

Systemic Change: Systemic change involves substantially altering a system's components and processes, leading to a different output or function. TDC facilitates this by encouraging the integration of diverse perspectives, essential for recognizing and manipulating the levers of systemic transformation. This kind of change is profound and sustainable, as it addresses the root causes of issues rather than their symptoms.

4. FRAMEWORKS FOR COLLABORATION AND SYSTEM-LEVEL CHANGE

Understanding systems to enact change efforts requires more than isolated individuals or groups from single siloed disciplines. Here, TDC offers highly effective tools to engage the participants needed for the collaborative change effort to be successful. However, there is a catch-22 since TDC skills are often essential for the leadership of the change effort to identify the root causes of issues, generate interest, and align potential collaborators with the structural elements needed to make an initiative become real. With the first steps enacted, many collaborative change efforts respond to system pressures and social structures to align with a framework for social innovation and/or collaborative change at large scales. Some of the most common are presented below in this section.

Networks: A "Network" is a structure of interconnected individuals or entities that facilitates the exchange of information, resources, or services. Networks are primarily characterized by the connections they facilitate rather than the depth of relationships among the participants. Networks connect; communities care [9].

Community of Practice (CoP): A Community of Practice (CoP), as defined by Etienne Wenger, is a theoretical framework that addresses how learning occurs within a social context. Wenger posits that learning is fundamentally a social phenomenon, rather than merely a cognitive or individual activity. Communities of Practice are groups of people who share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about a topic, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area by interacting on an ongoing basis. Various authors have written about effective communities of practice and their application [10], [11].

> *"On the one hand, a community of practice is a living context that can give newcomers access to competence and also can invite a personal experience of engagement by which to incorporate that competence into an identity of participation. On the other hand, a well-functioning community of practice is an excellent context to explore radically new insights without becoming fools or stuck in some dead end. A history of mutual engagement around a joint enterprise is an ideal context for this kind of leading-edge learning, which requires a strong bond of communal competence and a deep respect for the particularity of experience. When these conditions are in place, communities of practice are a privileged locus for the creation of knowledge"* [12, p. 214]

Collective Impact: The collective impact framework emphasizes the importance of concerted, strategic actions by stakeholders from different sectors to address a common agenda [13]. TDC amplifies the effectiveness of this approach by ensuring that communications and decisions are informed by comprehensive insights, leading to more impactful and inclusive outcomes [14].

Collaborative Infrastructure: Effective collaboration requires robust infrastructures that support seamless communication and interaction across various disciplines. Transdisciplinary communication enhances these infrastructures by incorporating flexible, adaptive elements that respond to the evolving needs of complex projects, ensuring that diverse teams can work together efficiently and creatively [15].

Impacts Framework for STEM Learning Ecosystems: STEM learning ecosystem's community of practice (CoP) harnesses the contributions of educators, policymakers, families, businesses, informal science institutions, after-school and summer providers, higher education, and many others toward a comprehensive vision of STEM learning for all children [16].

Convergence Approach: Convergence involves integrating research strategies, methodologies, and technologies from multiple disciplines to form novel frameworks that address pressing scientific and societal challenges. TDC is fundamental to this approach, providing the communicative link that binds disparate areas of expertise into a cohesive, innovative whole [17].

Collaborative Convergence Pyramid: The Collaborative Convergence Pyramid (CCP) is an analytical framework that fosters efficient and effective communication and collaboration among multi-sector stakeholders [18, p. 24]. The pyramid features four external corners representing the Academy, Government, Organizations, and Society, forming an outer diamond. Recognizing that stakeholders can exist as individual entities and as systems, an additional internal diamond is introduced at the pyramid's base. This inner diamond accounts for the dual roles that individuals may occupy at different stages of their lives or careers. For example, a professor may transition to being a member of the broader Society upon retirement. Conceived as a dynamic model, the pyramid incorporates the concept of 'uncertainty,' which is most pronounced at the base level. As stakeholders ascend the pyramid, they engage in increasingly specific and targeted collaborative activities, reducing uncertainty and culminating at the pyramid's apex, where sustainable solutions are realized through collaborative convergence.

These frameworks and models work to conceptualize how individuals collaborate to bring about systemic change for some complex social issues. Each component has the concept of effective communication across disciplines, business sectors, cultures, and Society. Here, TDC steps to the forefront to engage the individuals towards action for the social innovation that will bring about the change achieved through collaborative co-design of the effort to innovate. Social innovation focuses on applying new ideas and approaches to social problems, creating lasting improvements in community well-being. Through TDC, stakeholders involved in social innovation initiatives can engage in more profound, meaningful dialogues, ensuring that solutions are practical, culturally relevant, and widely accepted.

5. THE SPECTRUM OF INVOLVEMENT

To attain social innovation, the engagement of individuals is critical, and it will rest upon the skills of TDC. As an educator for nearly 30 years, I have noticed it isn't easy to describe the right balance for listening and speaking in collaboration with students. I find they are not prepared to listen effectively. However, they also are not always prepared to contribute to a collaborative discussion to build something. I see some of these same issues within meetings as I work to collaboratively co-design systems to enact change.

In some cases, it is a lack of training, and in others, it is more about the sense that as the professor, principal investigator, subject-matter expert, or project lead, I am the one who should speak, act, or handle things. When I teach about leadership, I describe this hesitation as waiting for Superman- the one you know has all the answers and can handle any problem. It takes directed effort and deliberate TDC for me to disabuse people of this perspective explicitly. In scenarios where groups listen intently, I must facilitate the interaction to draw out their perspective with active listening techniques. In addition, I have to be patient in allowing each person's processing pace and engaging them to run their course. This balance is difficult for a diverse group of cultures, ages, experiences, and degrees of commitment by the members.

Returning to my class, I also find that students seek to be part of the conversation by guessing or adding opinions that are not substantiated. In this case, TDC provides tools to lead the speaker to learn the group's norms and improve their participation by providing an entry into the discussion and a set of standards for collaboration. This issue is less pronounced in working groups with researchers or educators, but other group dynamics and role issues arise.

Rather than outline each of these incremental steps, I will summarize a series of increasing degrees of collaboration within the group. Not everyone mindfully chooses a level of engagement. Still, as a TDC leader, you can recognize these levels and actively work to facilitate the movement of individuals toward a higher level of engagement with the process to enhance collaboration and increase engagement and, hopefully, productivity and success.

The above paragraphs mention If you have ever been to a meeting, you will recognize these three. Moreover, if you have ever reviewed materials on small group communication, the concept of roles will be familiar. Attendees show up and breathe the same air as you, maybe drink coffee and eat the doughnuts. There is little more to show they are part of what is happening. Sometimes, this is due to the one-directional nature of the meeting or communication, but in others, it is the person's choice. Moving up the engagement scale is participation, which means the individual does something. This can be as small as answering a poll or asking a question. This moves them to be an active part of the meeting. Finally, there is the adoption of one or more roles. At this point, the individual becomes part of the group and contributes to the function of goal attainment.

The following three aspects of higher engagement deal with the individual taking an active role. The first step is to have a voice. In this situation, TDC is useful because it can facilitate the opportunity for everyone to be heard. At the same time, it allows the leader to assist others to find their voice and be part of the collaboration. This idea of voice is fundamental in social innovation, especially when engaging with underserved populations or discussing social justice issues. Moving beyond voice is the idea of agency or an avenue for action-taking. Like voice, TDC allows a leader to facilitate individuals to seek their avenue to take action and join others to enact change for the system they find themselves within.

Moreover, the leader can utilize TDC to empower others to have a voice and agency within or beyond the collaborative change initiative for their desired outcomes. Lastly, at this level, there is actual responsibility. When engagement moves far enough in the group setting, the individual seeks to take on some responsibility for the initiative's success. At this point, the leader uses TDC tools to distribute leadership and empower the other members to take on more than just a role. They are providing a pathway for the individual to become a leader themselves. This aspect of engagement is essential for sustainability, growth, and expansion of the social innovation effort.

At the highest level of engagement with a social innovation initiative utilizing collaborative co-design, we have three simultaneous engagement degrees. These three are followership, leadership, and ownership. They exist together because the individual shifts between these different degrees of responsibility in a collaborative leadership model as the role changes with the given scenario.

In a setting where someone else is better suited to lead, the individual enacts followership skills to support the team and enhance the likelihood of success. Then, in other situations where different skills are needed, individuals with appropriate skills and expertise best suited for the scenario step up to the leadership role, taking responsibility for themselves and others to attain goals and be successful. Many types of engagement typically end here. The first set of three is individuals, the second set is groups, and the third is teams of leaders and followers. However, I added a third degree to the team, described as ownership. At this point, TDC is more than a tool for the leader or a skill for the follower. As part of ownership, TDC is an integrated concept that allows the individual to listen actively and speak with intercultural communication competence to enact collaboration across cultures, disciplines, and demographic groups. The level of engagement with the subject and project is so high they utilize the skills of ownership to facilitate TDC amongst individuals at all levels of engagement to promote them and act transformatively to empower them to follow a path towards higher engagement to develop the social innovation and further the overall cause and vision of the initiative. Ownership transcends leadership and competency, allowing the individual to use TDC to further everyone's progress without concern for their position. In the end, any person shifts among these levels of engagement based on various factors and parameters. Nonetheless, these degrees of engagement clearly show the degree of commitment and provide a rough guide for the types of TDC tools and skills that might be needed to move the social innovation forward with that person in the given scenario as they work collaboratively in the situation.

6. IMPLICATIONS

The implications of integrating transdisciplinary communication in the innovation process are profound. By breaking down silos and fostering a culture of collaboration and openness, TDC enables the creation of solutions that are more comprehensive, resilient, and adaptable to complex environments. This shift enhances the scope and quality of innovations and democratizes the process, involving a broader range of voices in the conception and implementation of solutions.

7. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Looking forward, the field of TDC should continue to evolve by adopting advanced technologies like semantic web 6.0, artificial intelligence, and machine learning to facilitate more profound, more productive collaborations [19], [20], [21], [22]. Additionally, future research should focus on developing metrics and models to quantify the impact of TDC on innovation processes and outcomes, providing a more precise roadmap for its implementation across various sectors.

8. CONCLUSIONS

As we conclude, it is clear that transdisciplinary communication is not just a supplementary aspect of innovation but a fundamental necessity. The future of disruptive innovation—capable of addressing the complex challenges of our time—relies on our ability to communicate and collaborate across disciplines effectively. As participants of IMCIC 2024, we are called to champion this approach, leveraging our diverse expertise to catalyze significant, sustainable change

9. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Sandy Chang and Cynthia Shafer for their unconditional support.

Peer Editor

Jeremy P. Reich, Assistant Director for Assessment and Accreditation.

Office of Institutional Effectiveness

New Jersey Institute of Technology

Non-blind Reviewer

Edgar Meritano

Department of Sciences and Arts for Design, Research and Knowledge

Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana

10. SOURCES

[1] M. Lennon, M. Zalabak, and L. Dajani, “Activating Collective Intelligence to Engineer Transdisciplinary Impacts,” in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC)*, Oct. 2020, pp. 2762–2769. doi: 10.1109/SMC42975.2020.9283085.

[2] G. Y. Mo, “Examining cross-disciplinary communication’s impact on multidisciplinary collaborations: implications for innovations,” *Information, Communication & Society*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 673–690, May 2016, doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2016.1139611.

[3] C. McPhee, M. Bliemel, and M. Van Der Bijl-Brouwer, “Editorial: Transdisciplinary Innovation (August 2018),” *TIM Review*, vol. 8, no. 8, pp. 3–6, Aug. 2018, doi: 10.22215/timreview/1173.

[4] M. Polk, “Transdisciplinary co-production: Designing and testing a transdisciplinary research framework for societal problem solving,” *Futures*, vol. 65, pp. 110–122, Jan. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.futures.2014.11.001.

[5] K. Dorst, “Mixing Practices to Create Transdisciplinary Innovation: A Design-Based Approach,” *TIM Review*, vol. 8, no. 8, pp. 60–65, Aug. 2018, doi: 10.22215/timreview/1179.

[6] P. H. Albuquerque and S. Albuquerque, “Social Implications of Technological Disruptions: A Transdisciplinary Cybernetics Science and Occupational Science Perspective,” in *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Ethics in Engineering, Science, and Technology (ETHICS)*, West Lafayette, IN, USA: IEEE, May 2023, pp. 1–5. doi: 10.1109/ETHICS57328.2023.10154939.

[7] J. Cowin, B. Oberer, and C. León, “Trans-Disciplinary Communication in the ChatGPT Age: A Systems Perspective [Conference paper],” in *Proceedings of the 17th International Multi-Conference on Society, Cybernetics and Informatics: IMSCI 2023*, N. Callaos, J. Horne, B. Sánchez, and M. Savoie, Eds., Orlando, Florida, United States: International Institute of Informatics and Cybernetics, Sep. 2023, pp. 138–144. doi: https://doi.org/10.54808/IMSCI2023.01.138.

[8] G. A. Moore, *Crossing the Chasm, Third Edition: Marketing and Selling Disruptive Products to Mainstream Customers*, 3ra Edición. Harper Business, 2014.

[9] H. Mintzberg, “We Need Both Networks and Communities,” *Harvard Business Review*, Oct. 05, 2015. Accessed: Oct. 11, 2020. [Online]. Available: https://hbr.org/2015/10/we-need-both-networks-and-communities

[10] C. Catana, I. Debremaeker, S. Szkola, and F. Williquet, *The Communities of Practice playbook: A playbook to collectively run and develop communities of practice*. Luxembourg: Publications Office, 2021. Accessed: Nov. 14, 2021. [Online]. Available: https://op.europa.eu/publication/manifestation_identifier/PUB_KJNA30466ENN

[11] E. Wenger-Trayner, B. Wenger-Trayner, P. Reid, and C. Bruderlein, *Communities of Practice within and Across Organizations: A guidebook*, 1st ed. Rua da Bela Vista 2, Sesimbra 2970-621, Portugal: Social Learning Lab, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.wenger-trayner.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/23-06-08-Community-Of-Practice-digital.pdf

[12] E. Wenger, *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity (First Edition)*, 1st ed. Cambridge University Press, 1998. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511803932.

[13] J. Kania and M. Kramer, “Collective Impact,” *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, p. 7, 2011.

[14] H. Preskill, M. Parkhurst, and J. Splansky Juster, “Guide to Evaluating Collective Impact: Learning and Evaluation in the Collective Impact Context.” Collective Impact Forum, 2014. [Online]. Available: https://www.fsg.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Guide_to_Evaluating_Collective_Impact_01.pdf

[15] NSF, “Collaborative Infrastructure,” NSF INCLUDES Shared Measures. Accessed: Oct. 30, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://networksharedmeasures.org/infrastructure.html

[16] S. Traill and K. Traphagen, “Assessing the Impacts of STEM Learning Ecosystems: Logic Model Template & Recommendations for Next Steps.” STEM Ecosystems, 2015. [Online]. Available: https://stemecosystems.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Assessing_Impact_Logic_Model_Template_STEM_Ecosystems_Final.pdf

[17] W. S. Bainbridge and M. C. Roco, *Handbook of Science and Technology Convergence*, 1st ed. 2016. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2016. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-07052-0.

[18] J. Lipuma, C. E. Yáñez León, and V. H. Guzmán Zarate, *Reflections on Communication, Collaboration, and Convergence: Strategic Models for STEM Education and Research [Mito Editorial]*, 1ra Edición. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Mito, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://digitalcommons.njit.edu/stemresources/37/

[19] V. Arora, *Artificial Intelligence in Schools: A Guide for Teachers, Administrators, and Technology Leaders*. Milton: Taylor and Francis, 2021. doi: 10.4324/9781003183235.

[20] Bruce M McLaren, Pengcheng Jiao, Amir H Alavi, and Fan Ouyang, *Artificial Intelligence in STEM Education: The Paradigmatic Shifts in Research, Education, and Technology*. in Chapman & Hall/CRC Artificial Intelligence and Robotics Series. CRC Press, 2022. doi: 10.1201/9781003181187.

[21] J. Cowin, B. Oberer, and C. León, “A Brave New World: AI as a Nascent Regime? [JSCI],” *JSCI*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 58–66, Sep. 2023, doi: https://doi.org/10.54808/JSCI.21.04.58.

[22] Ö. Önday, “Web 6.0: Journey From Web 1.0 To Web 6.0,” *JMM-102*, vol. 1, no. 1, p. 6, Dec. 2019.