Successful Interdisciplinary Work Questionnaire
===

Introduction

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our study of interdisciplinary collaborations. The questionnaire below seeks to gather your reflections and experience with the Successful Societies group. We ask you to please address each question with candor and in detail. Completing the questions should take between 35 and 45 minutes of your time. Again, many thanks for your insights.

Questionnaire

1. Your involvement with the successful societies group

1.1 How did you **become involved** with this group and **what motivates** you to participate in it?
►

1.2. How would you describe **the intellectual purpose** of this group— e.g. what the group seek to accomplish, the problem space it examines, the research questions it privileges, etc.?
►

1.3. How does your **own research connect** with the groups' overall intellectual agenda?
►

1.4. **How central** is the group's work agenda to your **own interests and professional goals** and commitments? Has your research agenda been affected by your involvement in the group? If so how? How committed are you to the shared agenda?
►

1.5. What do you view as **your role** (consciously adopted or de facto emerging) and **contributions** (conceptual, inter-personal, political, epistemic) to further the groups' agenda?
►

2. The group at work

2.1. How would you describe the **interactions among members** of the group (e.g. frequency, style, effectiveness)? Based on your involvement with this group over time, can you identify visible changes in interaction? Please explain
►

2.2. What are the group's **expectations** regarding patterns of interaction outside the meetings, productivity, and impact? How were these expectations set?
►

2.3. In your opinion what are indicators of a **successful collaboration** among the members of this group? What are the indicators of **unsuccessful collaborations**? Please illustrate with examples.
►

2.4. What are the most important **factors facilitating social and intellectual exchange** within the group? What limits such exchange? Please discuss intellectual, social, and institutional factors if possible.

►

3. Integrating disciplinary perspectives

3.1. How does the group decide *which disciplinary* or *expert perspectives* must inform this work? Please illustrate with examples.
►

3.2. Consider *key ideas, theories, methods or specializations* that have best contributed to advancing the group's work. What role did they play, how did they leverage the group's understanding?
►

3.3. What do members of the group do to *integrate disciplinary perspectives*? Could you point out *moments* in which the integration of perspectives took place productively –yielding a *new insight*, (e.g. a more comprehensive account, a better explanation a more powerful way to inform policy?) Please explain.
►

3.4. What kinds of *obstacles* has the group found to integrate perspectives productively? Could you point out *moments* in which the integration of perspectives proved difficult to reach?
►

4. Supporting and sustaining interdisciplinary work?

4.1. What role do the group *leaders* play in fostering productive interdisciplinary exchange and what challenges do they confront?
►

4.2. In your opinion, what are the *foundation's expectations* for the group(e.g. standards, patterns of interaction, research culture, productivity)? In your experience, how do these expectations contribute to or hinder the group's capacity to collaborate and integrate perspectives?
►

4.3 What are your reactions to the way that *[foundation]* sets up a research program and influences the group's interactions and its direction? What do you think is most productive in [foundation's] strategy for creating and managing research group? What is most problematic?
►

4.4 Would you like to share any thoughts on the role and functioning of the *advisory committee*?
►

5.   Additional reflections

5.1. Below please include any additional reflections to shed light on the nature of *successful (or unsuccessful) interdisciplinary collaborations*.
►

TOWARD A CODING SYSTEM AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA FIRST LEVEL ANALYSIS-

SI   SOCIAL - INTERACTIVE DIMENSION

SI.1 ENGAGING THE PLATFORM

SI.1.1. Stories of involvement

This category captures informants' narratives about how they became involved in the network. It captures the process of recruitment from the "recruited's" perspective. Process by which informants joined the network, the criteria for which they believe they were invited, and the challenges or difficulties they confronted in the recruitment process. Special attention is paid to prior social networks, subject's positioning as architect or invited participant in the network.

SI.1.2. Motivation/incentives

Captures participants' views of what made the network appealing. For instance informants mention the quality of scholars, the possibility to address questions that are larger than their own discipline or social network in their department would have allowed, the complementarity of perspectives provided by other disciplines in the group, intellectual stimulation, funding. Special attention it paid to participants descriptions of competing incentives (e.g. interesting meetings vs travel) and how they weigh pros and cons of participation. Coding may overlap with SI11

SI.1.3 Research connection self - group

Captures accounts of the relationship between individual research and the group's agenda as well as the ways in which individual research agenda has been transformed or modified by group participation. Informants may situate their own research in the larger context of the group's agenda. Attention is also paid to moments in which personal research and group agenda may be in tension.

SI.1.4 Emotional dimension

Captures claims that express passion for ideas, and feelings associated to group membership and participation, the maintenance of sense of self and references to deep personal links among scholars. Special attention is paid to (a) emotional salience as guiding scholars' attention to particular topics (*This is a topic I am passionate about*), and ideas and (b) emotional bond to others as establishing tacit mutual accountability systems (*I am thrilled to have the chance to work with others*) (c) emotional preservation of self concept (*Working in this group makes me feel good about myself*).

SI1.5 Selection of participants.

This code examines the process of recruitment and selection of participants from the recruiter's perspective. It addresses examples and criteria for inclusion /exclusion of presenters as members the group- expertise, thinking and communicative styles. It also includes the process by which recruiters weigh and select particular members into the group.

SI.2 THE GROUP AT WORK –SUSTAINING THE PLATFORM

SI.2.1 Roles people play on the SCP

Captures roles ascribed to self and other members of the group. Addresses participants' views of what they or others contribute to the overall functioning of the group toward its goals. E.g. disciplinary contributions, maintaining a relevant, synthesizing, meta-reflection. If roles people play are associated with disciplinary description we will also code it as CE 24.

SI.2.2 Climate/dynamics/culture
Captures references to the overall atmosphere of work and collaboration. For example climate might be seen as "respectful," "welcoming" "intellectually honest," "exciting," "stimulating," "tense," "presumptuous."

SI.2.3 Expectations by group
Addresses the tacit or explicit expectations set forth by leaders, by researchers themselves. Expectations may relate to productivity, collegiality, intellectual opened, respect. Some expectations may be formal: e.g. produce a report mid term. If participants address expectations by foundations code solely under foundation

SI.2.4 Leaders
Under this category we will code all reference to leaders in the group: their behaviors, the qualities participants associate to effective leaders, the obstacles and challenges they face. Informants may describe leadership style and behaviors or be leaders themselves. Tensions between "group push" and "leader's pull" can also be coded here.

SI.3 GROUP GROWTH – PLATFORM OVER TIME

SI.3.1 Group learning
Addressed informants' accounts of how the group has evolved over time. Particular attention is given to: how group moved beyond polite pseudo community. How the social relationships in the group (alliances and affiliations change over time) how participants build a common ground for dialogue, growing disputes and tensions, what group skills or competencies are developed and key moments of turning point in the history of the group.

SI.3.2 Successful collaborations (markers)
Addresses perceived markers of success in interdisciplinary collaborations. For example: collaborative products (quantity and quality of output); impact on members' minds/research; the advancement of new frameworks integrative framework; and transformed relationships among members

SI.3.3 Unsuccessful collaborations (markers)
Conversely this category captures markers of lack of success. E.g. Inability to innovate, minds unchanged, challenge of communication, pseudo-community, spinning wheels, dilettantism.

SI.3.4 Facilitating factors
This category captures a series of factors that make successful collaborations possible. Factors may range from quality of scholars, to group climate, to artifacts on which scholars focus their activities (analyzing examples, co writing a book, developing a website). Other artifacts may include common shared experiences that serve as anchors for further conversations, as well as graphic of verbal representations of an integrated problems space. Sometimes overlapping with CE 3.3. (Factors enabling integration), this category is more comprehensive in addressing factors supporting collaborations (not just integration of knowledge fields)

SI 34 B Informal (outside of group) facilitating factors
This code captures interactions that are of a social type, dinners, walks, etc. that may or not contribute to building relationships among members of group.

SI.3.5 Obstacles to Successful ID
Conversely, this category addresses perceived obstacles to successful collaborations: e.g. dispositions, behaviors, infrastructure, failed activities, premature graphics.

SI.4. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT – ENABLING AND GUIDING WORK ON THE PLATFORM

SI.4.1 Foundation
This category includes all references to the role of foundations in SCP. The may range from setting conditions: (material resources, setting climate, social network, symbolic resources); to setting standards and expectations: (productivity, patterns of interaction); to the constraints and contexts in which foundations operate themselves (Canadian academy, co-funder's demands) and the ways in which such roles influence their role in SCP.

COGNITIVE -EPISTEMIC DIMENSIONS

This dimension focuses primarily on the content of the work carried out on the platform. Overlaps (and therefore co-coding) across the social and cognitive dimensions are to be expected.

CE. 1 INTELLECTUAL PURPOSE- FOCUSING EFFORTS ON PLATFORM

CE.1.1 Problem framing
This category captures participants' articulation of the problem under study by the group. It captures core and subsidiary problems or research questions an projects. It also captures informants' reflection about the nature and adequacy of the framing of the problem as well as agreements and disagreements about it in the group. *Special attention is paid here to the construct of optimal ambiguity in framing.*

CE.1.2 Intellectual purpose / outcome expectations
This category highlights the goals pursued by the group. Goals may vary and multiple goals may coexist. For instance," to develop better diagnostic tools able to draw on social relations to predict health outcomes, to explain the mechanisms by which social interactions and experiences "get into one's skin" to inform policy. *Special attention is paid to how these purposes operate as standards or guides against which other decisions on the platform are made—selecting participants, weighing input.*

CE.1.3. Process of definition
This category captures informant's accounts of the process by which topics and purposes are defined, the negotiations involved, the tensions and difficulties the group encountered. It includes, for instance, the core concepts that helped define a theme (biological embedding) as well as the process by which a group decides to divide the core them into more manageable research questions.

CE. 2. DISCIPLINARY GROUNDING

CE.2.1 Relevant disciplines selection process and criteria
This category captures all references to the process by which disciplinary experts/perspectives are considered, weighed and included in or excluded from the platform. It captures participants' reflections about the adequacy of expertise represented in the group.

CE. 2.2. Key disciplinary contributions
Captures participants' views of concepts constructs theories methods in particular disciplines. Participants may refer to particular levels of analysis contributed by a discipline or the specific ways in

which the discipline contributes to the overall purpose of the work (offering a mechanism, unpacking a category, de-essentializing culture).

CE.2.3. Disciplinary conflicts and barriers

This code includes claims about the ways in which disciplinary discourses and epistemologies may become an obstacle to communication. It includes tension among disciplinary perspectives vis-à-vis values and commitments.

CE 2.4 Characterizations of disciplinary modes of thinking and styles

This code captures participants' descriptions of disciplinary ways of thinking, interests, points of view in general terms. Meta-disciplinary description of how disciplinarians go about knowledge construction. If disciplinary description is associated to roles people play we will also code it as SI 2.1.

CE 3 INTEGRATION

CE.3.1 Point/moment/object of integration (example, issue) or lack of integration

This category captures informant's characterization of constructs or situations in which a productive integration of disciplines took place. Informants may refer to a discussion where the idea of culture as toolkit was presented enabling psychologists to operationalize the role of culture in human development as the development of competencies. They may point to an emerging conceptual framework (e.g. SS9) that serves as a map of the collective problem space.

CE.3.2 Leverage of integration

This category captures informants' references to the advantage or added value of integrating perspectives. Subjects may refer to how, by integrating perspectives, they can explain the mechanisms by which a phenomenon occurs, or correct/ Correct – expand a prior belief, offer a more comprehensive account of a problem, or a more effective solution—Note that this category may overlap in content with the intellectual purpose of ID work. Double code if necessary

CE.3.3 Socio-cognitive factors enabling or hindering integration

This category captures any statement in which social and cognitive forces are visibly jointly at play to support integration of disciplines: How a disposition to hear all voices enables X to share a construct that became essential to cross disciplinary boundaries. Sometimes overlapping with S.I.3.4. This category refers exclusively to factors supporting disciplinary integration

CE.3.4. Qualities of resulting integration

This category addresses participants' characterization of the outcomes of integrative work. It captures informant's references to the tentative and provisional nature of frameworks or results, their generative power, their more or less shared and co-constructed nature.

CE 4 VALIDATION/QUALITY OF OUTPUT

41. This code includes proxy-measures of validation such as productivity acceptance by prestigious funding or publications sources, recognition in the field.

4.2. This codes epistemic measures of quality (output satisfied aspirations about the kind of knowledge scientists were seeking, quality of the disciplinary contributions is highlighted, innovation, generativity).

4.3 This category captures participants' descriptions for the challenges and processes and strategies to determine the quality of output. Participants may describe the difficulties of IDR assessment, they may outline processes internal peer review, adventurous submissions to a journal as the strategies used to test the quality of the work.