The topic guide is designed to get a broad overview of network activities and members’ attitudes toward these activities and other members, and questions in the topic guide are not strictly linked to research (sub) questions. However, we hope that some of these questions would guide the discussion in a way that helps us to answer our research (sub) questions. Here we provide a list of research sub-questions and numbers of respective questions in the topic guide.

1. How does the hierarchical position of the organization’s representative within his/her organization affect the way other members of the network perceive this organization? (mainly questions 11 and 12 in the topic guide)

2. How does the hierarchical position of the organization’s representative within his/her organization affect the way s/he negotiates the contribution of her/his organization to the network and the benefits the organization would get from the network? If so, how? (mainly questions 6, 7, 10, and 12 in the topic guide)

3. How does the amount of resources controlled by the organization (regardless of its actual contribution to the network) affect the perception of the organization by other network members? (mainly questions 8 and 9 in the topic guide)

4. Does the amount of resources contributed by the organization to the network affect its perception by other network members? If so, how do participants justify that? (mainly questions 8 and 9 in the topic guide).

Since some interviews will be conducted with the translator, we might divide this topic guide into two and arrange two meetings. In this case, the first meeting will not include ‘decision-making’ section, and in the second meeting, the warm-up will be replaced with the question about the recent changes in the network. The order of questions may be changed or some questions skipped depending on the flow of the discussion. Questions marked with an asterisk (\*) will be asked during both interviews.

**Introductory and Informed Consent Script**[[1]](#footnote-1)**:**

[By that time, the researcher had already introduced herself during the presentation of the project to all network members and then once again when inviting people to participate in the study by phone or email. The informed consent form has been sent in advance via email so that the participant can read it carefully. Researcher brings two copies of the form to the interview. If the interview takes place without a translator, the researcher skips phrases in bold]

**Let me introduce my colleague, [name of the translator]. S/he will help us with translation from now on, so we do not miss anything because of the language barrier.**

As I mentioned when setting up this interview with you, I’m conducting an interview as a part of the project run by the University of Groningen in partnership with the Netwerk ZON.

We want to study SFSD as a successful example of stable collaboration between organizations and explore what the challenges for such collaboration are and what do you do to overcome them.

I am very glad that you are willing to share your experience as a member of *Sorgen Für, Sorgen Dass* project. Before we start the interview, there are a few quick things I’d like to tell you about the process, so you know what to expect.

This interview should last an hour and a half maximum, but if at any point you need us to move quickly or you need to end it, please just let me know. Participating in this interview is voluntary, so you can choose to stop at any point that you need to, or to skip any question that you don’t feel comfortable answering.

I would like to make an audio record of our talk, so I can focus on the discussion and check the audio later if I miss something. My supervisor (Dr. Liesbet Heyse) and I will be the only persons who has access to this record, and I will not share it with anyone. Would that be ok? If you do not feel comfortable with that, I can make hand-written notes instead, which is also fine with me.

In terms of what we’ll do with the information you share, after the meeting I transcribe the audio [or make detailed notes if the participant refused to have a record] and remove all information that can be used to identify you: your name, position, name of your organization, location, name of colleagues you are working with and any other information that is unique to you. Only after that I may share this information with other members of the research team or include quotations to articles in scientific journals or the dissertation I will write about the network. I want to mention that although Netwerk ZON is a partner of the research, we will never share non-anonymized data with anyone from Netwerk ZON. Also, if you tell us some information about other members of the network, we will never mention that we get this information from you or your organization. **The same applies to [name of the translator].**

However, I can only use the information you will share with me if I have your consent to do so. Did you have a chance to read the informed consent form that I’d sent you? [if not -- ask the participant to read it]. If you want to participate and do not mind me to have an audio record and use anonymized quotations, please, tick the first three boxes on the left hand in the form. Let me remind you, that you can always stop the interview or withdraw from participation: it will have no consequences, and other members of the research team or I will disclose this decision to anyone. In case you do not want to participate anymore, I can also erase all the information you have ever shared with me.

Before we get started, do you have any questions about what I’ve just shared with you, or what participating in this interview involves?

[the researcher answers any questions the participant has]

Great, then we can go ahead and get started!

**Warm-up:**

The questions in ‘warm-up’ sections are aimed to start interview smoothly (participant always know what to answer to these ‘easy’ questions), learn more about the participant and tailor the main questions to his/her experience.

Question 1 may show that the participant has joined his/her organization later than the organization had joined SFSD network, and then the interviewer skip the question #6.

Questions 2 and 3 aim to locate participant within the hierarchy of his/her own organization. During the data analysis, it will help to compare across participants of the same status. For example, two people who occupy the same position (e.g., nurses) can vary in the type of tasks and the level of independence they have. It may happen because of differences in national legislation, organizational structure, etc. All these differences are important for the understanding of the context and should be accounted for.

Answer to the question 4 should give a brief understanding of whether the participant joined SFSD proactively or has been appointed as a representative by the manager. This distinction would help to see if there any patterns of cooperative behaviour among those who joined proactively or have been told to do so. We would also see whether proactive participation and motivation somehow related to one’s hierarchical position: intuitively, those who have more autonomy in decision-making in general would often join SFSD proactively and thus may be more active in network-related activities.

1. When have you joined the organization?

2. What is your position in this organization now?

3. What kind of duties do you perform on a daily basis?

4. When have you joined the Sorgen für, sorgen dass network?

Probes: why have you joined it? What are your duties there? Have they changed since you joined the network?

**Organization’s involvement in SFSD**

Questions 5-7 help to start a discussion about how people within an organization decide what to contribute to the network and how to negotiate the benefits. Background information: organizations that constitute the network vary from nursing homes to local governmental agencies, and it predetermines their differences in input and outcomes. For example, a hospital can contribute by providing internship opportunities for students (an extremely valuable resource), and receives in return only intangible goods: e.g., reputation and information about potential partners. At the same time, the vocational school that benefits from these internship positions can have a minimum or no obligations to contribute to SFSD. Thus, this discussion may also help us to get participants’ perception of ‘fairness’ of exchange, whether it is basedon equity or equality principles, and explore any patterns among organizations with high/low input/output.

5. What your organization does in the network?

Probes: How was this over time?

6. Do you know how the decision to participate in the Network was made in the organization?

If so - probes: who did initially propose to make [the organization’s contribution]? Was it negotiated? If so, could you walk me through this process?

7. What do you get out of this network?

Probes: what do you get as a person and what does your organization get? Are your expectations fulfilled?

**Other organizations in the network**

Questions in this sections are aimed to facilitate the discussion about how the participant perceive other members in the network (research sub-questions 3 and 4). Apart from that, we want to explore the way people make their judgements about other organizations in the network. In theory, there are two ways of how people attribute influence/power to their partners: 1) based on characteristics of the organization (type and amount of resources controlled by this organization); 2) based on characteristics of the person who represents this organization (education, status, etc.). Roughly speaking, social exchange theory relies on the first scenario as a default behavioral assumption (evaluating an organization as a partner), while psychological research on attribution relies on the second one (evaluating a representative as a person). We want to explore what way would be more salient in this context and whether or not it is related to the generalized character of the exchange.

8. What do others do in the network?

9. Which organizations or people do you find the most crucial for the network to continue its functioning? Why?

Probes: are there any organizations or people whose withdrawal would ruin or especially negatively affect the network? Why? Could you recall any crucial moments in the network? Why do you think they were crucial? Could you walk me through what happened?

**Decision-making within and between organizations:**

Questions in this section are mainly linked to the research sub-questions 1 and 2. Our very preliminary assumption is that one’s position in the organization may spill over one’s way of participating in network activities and the way this person is perceived by others. E.g., in a network event a teacher may be limited in his/her ability to make decisions at the spot because must get an approval from his director. Thus, his ability to actively participate may be limited compared to another representative (e.g., the director of another school), even though they represent otherwise identical institutions. Alternatively, network members can implement various strategies to buffer these status differences (e.g., sending agenda in advance or initiating separate meetings with managers).

10. What type of network meetings or other activities do you participate in?

Probe: What types of issues are usually discussed during these meetings? How are these types of meetings different from each other? Could you give me an example? How do you prepare to these meetings? With whom do you talk about the meeting?

11. Can you recall the last time the decision had to be made in the network?

Probes: Can you walk me through the decision-making process? Who was present? What was it about? What had been decided? What was your role?

12. Can you recall the (another) discussion of any issues that were ambiguous or controversial?

Probes: Can you walk me through the decision-making process? Who did validate the final decision? Why? What do you think about that?

**Cool down**:

The question 13 is aimed to broader our understanding of the context and link some network features to external factors (e.g., a new donor required more frequent reports, and it led to more often meetings).

The question 14 is a more straightforward follow-up to the questions 7 and 9. Although the participant can perceive the internal distribution of network’s payoffs as (un)fair, s/he may be at the same time (un)satisfied with the overall network effectiveness. Moreover, talking about the performance allow us to unpack whether all network members agree on what is the network’s goal.

13. What are the major changes that happened to the network since you had joined it?

Probes: Goals? Participants? Organizational structure?

14. What do you think about the network's performance in general?

15.\* Is there is anything else you want to mention?

16.\* Are you fine with me using all the information you shared with me today?

1. The part of the script has been adapted from TEGA's (Technology Enabled Girl Ambassadors) online course. The course is available at: https://courses.edx.org/courses/course-v1:MITx+EC.745X+1T2018/course/ [↑](#footnote-ref-1)