

Studying the Practice of Cooperation and Collaboration Within an International Research Project on the Everyday Lives of Families

Francesco Arcidiacono

Published online: 25 September 2007
© Springer Science + Business Media, LLC 2007

Abstract The aim of this paper is to analyse the sociocultural dynamics underlying collaborative research. The article is based on an international collaborative project on the everyday lives of working families in Italy, Sweden and the USA. The aim of this paper is to show that collaborative research does not necessarily produce collaboration: this is possible only with very strong rules between partners. It proposes a distinction between collaboration and cooperation, and uses this distinction to examine intergroup and intragroup joint activity. Through the analysis of the communicative exchanges occurring between researchers, the paper highlights conditions in which cooperation can become fruitful collaboration.

Keywords Cooperation · Collaboration · Research practices

Over recent years research policy has focused upon ways in which bridges, as mentioned by Crossley (2000), can be built or strengthened across disciplinary boundaries and between theoretical and applied studies, policy and practice, and micro and macro levels of analysis. From this perspective, collaborative research has become central to production of knowledge in the social sciences.

The aim of the present paper is to analyze the modalities of collaborative research in and between groups working in an international project on the everyday lives of working families in three different countries. We distinguish two modalities of collaborative work: cooperation and collaboration.

F. Arcidiacono (✉)
Department of Developmental and Social Psychology, University of Rome “La Sapienza”,
Via dei Marsi, 78, 00185 Rome, Italy
e-mail: francesco.arcidiacono@uniroma1.it

Sociocultural Perspective and Discursive Processes of Collaboration

The theoretical framework that enables us to analyse collaborative research combines a sociocultural perspective on collaboration, and a discursive approach to communicative processes.

We know that sociocultural psychology provides an approach to study human actions: a central claim is that human action cannot be analyzed by reductive approaches that isolate individuals from the means, or cultural tools, by which they carry out an action (Wertsch 1998). How people talk, their problem-solving methods, the frames they use to represent and interpret phenomena must be understood as dynamic processes between the means people have at their disposal for accomplishing these mental activities and their unique use in specific interactions. In the sociocultural framework the study of the person and their means, or cultural tools, is based on the claim that actions, means, and goals are interconnected (Tuler 1998). As noted by Wertsch et al. (1996) “the goal of the sociocultural approach is to explicate the relationships between human action, on the one hand, and the cultural, institutional, and historical situations in which this action occurs, on the other” (p. 11). Sociocultural research characterises knowledge construction as a process of increasingly informed participation in the communities in which specific skills and understandings are employed, as noted by Edwards (2000) “knowledge is accordingly constructed dialectically in interaction with the cultural tools that mediate the knowledge in use in that community” (p. 198). Activity occurs within a system of social relationships (either these social relationships are evident in our interactions with others and/or in the tools we use and the intentions we have).

The second approach we consider is the study of discourse. A focus on discourse appears to be a relevant mean to study interactions between people, because it is involved in social and organizational change (Fairclough 2005). Research on organizational discourse encompasses various theoretical and methodological positions (Putnam and Fairhurst 2001). Distancing from more conventional work in organization studies we reject conceptions of organizations as structures in favour of conceptions of organization as an interactive accomplishment (Mumby and Clair 1997; Tsoukas and Chia 2002; Grant et al. 2004). The theoretical basis for this tendency comes from actor-network theory (Law 1994), ethnomethodology (Boden 1994), and Foucaultian post-structuralism (Reed 2000).

Within these frameworks we examine the work that research groups are doing together, considering their actions, the intended and unintended goals of the groups, the division of labour among participants, and the tools they use, in order to examine the conditions for collaboration and the rules which enable collaboration.

What is Cooperation? What is Collaboration?

The research project which we will analyse entails communication between teams from three different countries that include researchers with different perspectives. We propose that cooperating does not necessarily equate to collaborating *tout court*: therefore, a central question we consider is how cooperation becomes collaboration.

The terms ‘cooperation’ and ‘collaboration’ are often used interchangeably (Schmidt 1991; Ferber 1994). However, a possible distinction between them is offered by Roschelle and Teasley (1995): collaboration is defined as a synchronous, coordinated effort by persons or groups working together, while, cooperation is defined as individual completion of tasks aimed at a shared goal/result. If we consider the general goal, the task and the responsibility of each agent with respect to the global goal, we can say that cooperation concerns solving a problem that is common to several agents with a sharp division of labour, and that collaboration is the joint solving of a problem by several agents with less division of labour. In this sense, the main difference between cooperation and collaboration is at the level of the tasks that each agent must accomplish in the collective process to solve a problem. In cooperation, due to the division of labour, there clearly distinct local goals, while in collaboration the local teams share the same global goal.

Six distinctions between cooperation and collaboration can be made. First, people engaged in collaboration engage in similar actions, while people engaged in cooperation tend to engage in different actions. Second, people engaged in collaboration tend to share knowledge and expertise, while participants engaged in cooperation tend to have differential expertise. Third, people engaged in collaboration tend to have similar status, while in cooperation asymmetries in status are more likely. Fourth, in collaboration goals are mutually negotiated and shared, rather than assigned. Fifth, in collaboration continual interaction is necessary in order to maintain a joint negotiation of meaning. Finally, collaboration assumes that learning is collaborative, and that internalisation and appropriation of new knowledge proceeds through social interaction (Fox 1987). Bringing these considerations together, we can say that collaboration is “a coordinated, synchronous activity that is the result of a continued attempt to construct and maintain a shared conception of a problem” (Roschelle and Teasley 1995, p. 70).

One could suggest that cooperation is one step within a larger collaborating process. However, this leads to the question of exactly how closely researchers have to work together in order to constitute a scientific collaboration. To what extent should they exchange ideas on what steps to take next, what hypotheses to test, and how to relate their results to theoretical models? Katz and Martin (1997) suggest that research collaboration “has a very fuzzy or ill-defined border [...] perceptions regarding the precise location of the boundary of the collaboration may vary considerably across institutions, fields, sectors and countries as well as over time” (p. 8). Schrage (1990) describes collaboration as a “process of shared creation: two or more individuals with complementary skills interacting to create a shared understanding that none had previously possessed or could have come to on their own. Collaboration creates a shared meaning about a process, a product or event” (p. 40). For this reason, and for the matter of recognizing clear and shared collaborative work processes, it is important to identify the conditions that enable cooperation to transform into collaboration.

Besides distinguishing several different levels of collaborative research (group, institution, sector, nation) we need to recognize that cooperation/collaboration can occur at different levels. For simplicity, the prefixes “inter” and “intra” have been adopted to distinguish these levels. When two different teams focus on a common research goal, bringing their knowledge to the problem at hand, we have a situation

of intergroup collaborative research. Intragroup collaborative research takes place between individuals in the same research group, institution, sector or nation.

A General Description of the International Research Project

The collaborative research project we examine includes the Italian CELF¹ (University of Rome “La Sapienza”), the US CELF (University of California, Los Angeles) and the Swedish CELF (University of Linköping), and it is supported by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation (New York). This international intergroup research aims to examine what families say and do in everyday life. The methods used include: questionnaires and semi-structured interviews, mapping and photographing the families’ homes and belongings, tracking of family members’ activities, and video-recording of daily activities.

The main purpose of such an international comparative perspective on family life is that it can illuminate commonalities and differences in how working families handle the complex home and family demands across different cultures and reveal the unique working family patterns characteristic of each country. The research attempts to integrate perspectives from cultural and linguistic anthropology, ethnoarchaeology, psychology, and applied linguistics. Ethnographic data and full transcription of the video recorded interactions (Sacks et al. 1974) enabled in-depth case studies, discourse analysis (Potter and Wetherell 1987) and analyses of the pragmatics of language use (Duranti 1997). The specific attention on the pragmatic function of language has led the researchers to analyze the use of speech forms as evoking or establishing particular types of contexts, including the speaker’s stance or attitude, the social relations or relative status of the participants, and special attributes of particular individuals. One concern has been how family participants index cultural meanings through their use of grammar, discourse and interactional choices (Ochs 1992). Pursuing these research interests the joint effort of researchers with different approaches and expertise, the project has provided an understanding of how the families participating to the study arrange their everyday practices in the domestic setting and how they account for the choices they make. We know that the observation of behavior at home is very difficult to record and capture through conventional methodologies. As suggested by Arcidiacono and Pontecorvo (2004), diverse methods are needed in a multidimensional study of family life, and the data may be understood as *capta* in naturalistic settings, which allow in-depth analyses of the role assumed by the participant members of the observed families.²

The present author is a member of the Italian CELF group, and thus the subsequent analysis is presented from this perspective. The Italian research group is composed by faculty members (professors in Psychology and Anthropology), post-doctoral fellows, PhD students in Psychology, and a certain number of graduate,

¹Center on Everyday Lives of Families.

²The Italian and the Swedish unit collected a corpus of data of eight families, and the US group studied 32 families. The three centers have similar goals and criteria for the selection of participants: families were required to be dual-income, homeowners with a monthly mortgage or with a monthly rent and they had to have at least two children living at home, with at least one child between 8 and 12 years of age.

undergraduate, internship students in Psychology. Over time, the group was enriched with new members to reach its final size (about 20 people). Within the group, there is an inter-generational composition, inspired by an educational goal (introducing young people to the research activities) and the idea to develop an occasion of cooperation and collaboration at different levels of competence and expertise. The intragroup activity is based on weekly research meetings, and each session is devoted to discussing research questions, organizational aspects, administrative requests, and presentation of specific topics of interest concerning the project. Inside the group some topics of interest were selected, and each participant attends to one or more ongoing projects, carried out by several sub-groups. Each sub-group working together on a specific topic is organized in an autonomous way, with a presence of different levels of expertise (professors, post-doctoral fellows, doctoral and other students), with roles and responsibilities that apply not only to the scientific research activity, but also to issues of communication (relationship between our institution and the sustaining Foundation, families' contacts), and the organization of technological tools (server, data corpus organization, file transmission). On the other hand, there are also comparative projects done in association with the Swedish and American CELF groups. Thus, there has also been intergroup research collaboration.

Methodology: How Cooperation Can Become Collaboration?

To illustrate the different modalities of cooperation and collaboration within intergroup and intragroup research relationships we draw upon formal and informal communications between researchers participating in the international project. Turning our discourse analytic interests upon the project, we examine how the participants in this project try to make sense of their actions and construct collaborative relationships. We focus upon the communications circulating between the three sites focusing upon instances in which cooperation and collaboration are solicited, proposed and discussed at various levels of the research's organization (both intergroup and intragroup).

The opportunity for frequent interaction is likely to have a strong influence on the quality of intergroup collaboration. It is especially important during the initiation and planning stages of a project in order to turn pre-existing interests into common interests. A crucial point in collaborative research project is also the division of labour among participants. We know that in cooperation partners split the work, solve sub-tasks individually and then assemble the partial results into the final output, while in collaboration partners do the work together. In order to show the different communicative processes occurring between researchers (and then what comes out in terms of difficulties, conditions and processes), we proposed in the following part of the paper different sections of analysis, in order to assess:

- How do group members establish a collaborative contract?
- What activities are being performed as they communicate about a common task?
- How do group members interact? Does the group take a cooperative or collaborative approach to the task?

- How does collaborative work evolve through time?
- How can we characterize collaboration vs. cooperation in intra- and intergroup work?

From the Cooperation to the Collaboration: The Analysis of Research Practices

In the following we analyse communications and minutes from research meetings. We emphasise that in our collaborative research project a constant communication between members has been planned, to this end, face-to-face meetings among all the participants in the project have occurred, even if the intervals between these meetings have been considerable (once or twice a year). The meetings generated much dialogue and questions concerning how to proceed with the ethnographic observations, the analysis of data, and the common findings. Immediately after the meetings there were exchanges of ideas via email about how to address problems and possible topics within the team. When a topic of research or another aspect of potential collaboration is defined, the group have to organize and to plan the activities and the different steps in order to create a link with other aspects yet developed into the project. The distribution across institutions and researchers at the international levels allow us to examine how theoretical and methodological approaches from one cultural context translate into another. A general concern is to develop shared guidelines on how to interact, and to design a collaboration contract based on different roles, in order to scaffold productive interactions, monitor and regulate them. To further understand how this occurs, we focus on the need to build a clear direction in order to collaborate.

Establishing a Collaborative Contract

Due to difficulties encountered, the groups felt the need to outline guidelines for their work.³ These guidelines distinguish between specific research projects and broad thematic domains, in order to establish the *rights* of the co-authors over their co-generated ideas. In this way, the team created a general criterion to develop cooperative and/or collaborative work based on a common look on the data. Thus, for example, the team established that the access of any researcher to the data collected outside one's own group necessarily entailed collaboration: *only* if there was collaboration was possible to share data.

Other important points raised in the guidelines concerned: collaboration etiquette, adhesion to shared ideas, research time-planning, time allocated for communication, and keeping other researchers and the directors informed about the sub-projects. This kind of contract is extremely important during the organization of collaborative research, because it attempts to guarantee the conditions for successful collaboration. As an "official" document established by all the participants, it acted as a shared resource enabling collaboration because the researchers could keep in mind the

³The whole document is reported in the Appendix 1.

different steps they have to take, and the right way to face and to overcome the difficulties. It also provided a means for each participant to know the expectations of the other participants.

Communicative Activities

Regarding the activities that group members are performing when they communicate about a common task, analyses reveals that a lot of threads overlapped and were discussed simultaneously by researchers. The activities were classified according to their primary focus, or purpose, in the conversation. Different categories fit the data: social, logistical, technical, and conceptual. Social activities consisted of greetings and closings. Logistical activities addressed setting up discussion times, procedures for exchanging documents and establishing deadlines for completing the task. Technical activities concerned the use of the instruments, and data processing. Conceptual activities were those that directly addressed how to complete the assignment.

Cooperation or Collaboration?

Concerning the analysis of how group members interact and how they take a cooperative or collaborative approach to the task, we can consider the functional moves, in order to understand whether participants align with or challenge each other's contributions to the discourse. As its name would suggest, a functional move is literally the function or purpose served by a particular segment of the conversational discourse. Herring (1993) identified different functional moves such as inform, inquire, greet and react, and, in the present study, functional moves were considered as they emerged from the data.

At the level of the functional moves, of primary is how group members work together to reach an understanding about the content of the assignment itself, rather than how they discuss technical and logistical matters. The types of functional moves used by the group members shed light on how the participants interact as they pursue the collaboration. Functional moves such as agreeing, suggesting (rather than dictating), eliciting opinions from others, and offering to act (rather than directing) point to an environment of mutual respect created by the group. No functional move for explicit disagreement or challenge was found; however, there were functional moves used by the participants to express opposite points of view in an indirect way.

The final level of analysis was to identify any recurring pattern of functional moves related to negotiation or challenge and explanation. These recurring patterns were called sequences.

The Dynamics of Collaborative Work

On this basis we can propose an analysis of sequences which reveals decision-making sequences that incorporated the desired outcomes of mutual respect and clarification, but not the challenge. Within these sequences joint-knowledge building is clearly evident.

In the project on the everyday lives of US, Swedish and Italian families some of these steps have been followed: starting from informal contacts, above all by email,⁴ researchers have developed several of themes of interest, which generated various sub-projects involving people from at least two research sites. Sub-projects focused upon the idea of ‘family time’, the practices and ideologies of personal hygiene, extracurricular activities and house cleaning. One example of a sub-project concerned couples’ division of labour and the management of household activities in families. The first excerpt concerns the first step in this new collaborative project:

Excerpt 1. A first step in collaborative research: the new proposal idea

From: US CELF

Subject: hello and collaboration

Dear XXXX,

remember we discussed a collaboration regarding couples relationships?

We thought we could start communicating. But first I want to see if this sounds great for you. Best, XXXX

Excerpt 1 suggests the presence of both logistical (“remember we discussed...”) and conceptual (“we thought we could start...”) activities⁵ in the message and by this level the researcher produces some functional moves: suggesting a new proposal idea (the collaboration regarding couples’ relationships) and eliciting opinions from others (“I want to see if this sounds great for you”). In a general way, we could consider this message as a sequence characterizing the first step in collaboration (in the sense defined above), by which two or more researchers try to define the activities in working together.

In some instances new sub-projects developed out of pre-existing sub-projects which were expanded to include a cross-cultural perspective. The following excerpt proposes developing a sub-project into a cross-cultural comparison:

Excerpt 2. Proposal of collaborative research based on a previous research

From: US CELF

Subject: tracking data

Dear XXXX,

Regarding the frequency of space use (...) I would be very much interested in pursuing a collaborative cross-cultural analysis of how families use their home spaces (...) We are nearly finished with a paper (...) In this paper, we group activities into several categories that may be applicable/useful in your analysis of Italian family data (...). Cheers, XXXX

⁴In order to show some of these steps, a number of excerpts have been selected from email contacts among the researchers involved in the project. Each excerpt is indicative of specific aspects occurring in the cooperative/collaborative processes.

⁵For practical reasons, we don’t consider here the social activities, even if they are present in the selected excerpts. We think that this kind of activity could be analyzed specifically under a larger cultural perspective.

Excerpt 2 is a sequence explicating the researcher's own point of view ("I would be very much interested in..."), that suggests and offers some directions in order to analyze the data ("we group activities...may be applicable/useful in your analysis"): this is an example of collaborative work based on a previous research, in which there is the possibility to build a cooperation between teams, pursuing the same criteria of data analysis.

We underline that each sub-project has been provided by a joint analysis of the data. Using a shared data server, participants in a sub-group have been in the position to analyze all the data from the different sites and to exchange examples of family lives' interactions selected from the data files. Among the different methodologies used in this comparative project, researchers have planned to use certain data in order to pay a specific attention to the various topics. This interdependency can create tensions, as revealed in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 3. During collaborative research: "still need data!"

From: US CELF

Subject: still need data!

Dear XXXX,

thank you for the statistical studies on household. this will help and if you have anything more please send-the interview data is mostly about the children land since we are writing about parents right now we desperately need interview with the parents—anything—how was your last meeting? let us know please—thank you and we think that the paper could be really good.

In some cases, the individual completion of tasks (according to the notion of cooperation) is evident during the process of exchanging data information. In excerpt 3 a research team engages in logistical, technical and conceptual activities.

Specifically, they require their research partners to conduct more data collection, in order to continue their research. In this excerpt there is not only the need of data from the colleagues, but also the fact that cooperation and collaboration are processes found on two parties at least, in which the construction of a product is a joint result. The work done individually (by the autonomous work of each team) could be integrated in a common finding, considered as the best result ("we think that the paper could be very good"). This excerpt reveals a decision-making sequence, in which researchers incorporate the mutual respect and the desired outcomes.

Usually, each sub-project has been presented during the weekly meeting at the Centers and working papers have been produced, in order to plan one or more articles to be submitted. However, a certain number of difficulties have been found: to exchange information we need to translate the data into English, to visit other Centers to discuss the research, and to plan with accuracy when and how to write papers and to organize public presentations. All these aspects require a lot of time. The history of each sub-group is independent (in the sense that the researchers are autonomous during the work), but at the same time it influences the whole group that is based on the different ongoing projects. In the following excerpt we can see how

the communication based on logistical topics could be considered as an attempt to inform the members of the team about the activity to be done as a whole.

Excerpt 4. Intra-group general information and meeting's organization

From: ICELF Director

Subject: deadline and next meeting

Dear all,

you know that we are preparing the symposium on Sloan-related program (...)

I inform you that we will have a meeting next week in order to discuss about the ongoing projects and the popular book that we have to write asap. Swedish and US Director will be present in Rome for our meeting and, for these reasons, we have to plan a list of topics to discuss together.

Thank you, XXXX

The functional moves of suggesting and informing are assumed in excerpt 4 as a sequence of decision-making's organization: all the researchers have to consider the implications of participating in the project, such as scheduling meetings, discussing themes of interest and planning a list of topics to discuss together. In this way, the Director (as evident in the excerpt above) can prompt to play their own role in the team, in order to produce a collaborative work and to pursue one (or more) common goal(s).

Cooperation and Collaboration in Intragroup and Intergroup Collaborative Research

The last step of our analysis of collaborative processes in a large research project is related to the idea that there is knowledge production through collaborative research. In fact, the collaboration process could produce many interpretations of the data and each member of the group can offer their own point of view about various aspects of the everyday families' lives. In this sense, the results are the product of collective discussion among researchers, according to the idea of co-construction of knowledge. The traces and the voices of different collaborators are present in the products (working papers, articles, books, public presentations, meetings) to underline the multidisciplinary effort of the project. Within the research teams, there is a need to build and to share some directions, in order to construct a clear inter-group collaboration. The guidelines (see Appendix 1), already analysed, are meant to facilitate such collaboration. This need to share goals and rules is important when we try to use our theories to analyse the knowledge produced, and in order to understand the relationships between researchers and participant families. This relation appears as continuously redefined, as well as the relationships between the members of the group.

The data presented in this paper shows the different ways of directing cooperation and collaboration among researchers: if we consider excerpts 1 and 4 as examples of collaborative exchanges, we can underline that researchers have the need of suggesting and informing in both cases, even if in excerpt 1 there is a practice of eliciting the opinions of the other, and in excerpt 4 the sequence is characterized by a

Table 1 Functional moves of collaboration/cooperation \times intra-group/intergroup

	Cooperation	Collaboration
Intragroup	Exchange of data information	Suggestions
Intergroup	Decision-making	Decision-making
	Suggestions	Suggestions
	Offer of directions	Elicitation of opinions

decision-making request. Excerpts 2 and 3 refer to the cooperation processes: in the first case there are suggestions and the offer of directions by a part of the team, while in the second case there emerges a need of exchanging data and decision-making, with a reference also on technical aspects.

In order to synthesize the specificities of cooperation and collaboration (in terms of functional moves) and the similarity in intergroup and intragroup interactions we can refer to Table 1.

The functional moves we observed are in some cases exclusively a specific form of collaboration/cooperation, and in other cases they are distributed across the various levels. This representation will be a starting point in order to understand what actions or moves are expected in the interactions during collaborative research, even if we cannot generalize these observations at all. In some way, cooperation at the intragroup level requires both logistical (as well as technical) and conceptual activities, in order to exchange data information and to assure decision-making sequences for the next steps. The cooperation at the intergroup level is based on the need to offer direction, in order to work separately, but following a shared interest. Concerning intergroup collaboration, we note that participants are moving from the first level of cooperation (with the functional moves implied) to a second level of working together, in which they have to assure the decision-making process (as well as suggestions) in order to elicit the opinions that are requested to complete the task.

Conclusions: Lessons Learned

The present study aimed at illustrating the different modalities of cooperation and collaboration within inter- and intragroup research relationships. In order to answer to the main question of how does cooperation evolve into collaboration we tried to examine how the participants in this project try to construct collaborative relationships: for this reason, we analysed communicative exchanges between researchers involved in the project, focusing upon instances in which cooperation and collaboration are solicited, proposed and discussed through time at various levels of the research's organization. We underlined the need to consider how group members establish a collaborative contract, what activities are being performed as they communicate, how they interact and take a cooperative or collaborative approach, in order to understand the characters of collaboration versus cooperation in intra- and intergroup work.

The level of the analysis has been between the discursive perspective we referred in the theoretical part of the paper and a more general viewpoint: we tried to analyse

the data not exclusively in a *local* sense, strictly related to the discursive approach, but in a wider perspective, looking at the activities produced by participants in order to understand the dynamic ways by which partners interact in a cooperative and collaborative ways.

Regarding the data, the results illustrate how the analysis of the activities via electronic mails and other written documents can provide an initial view of how participants work together. We observed that the different aspects of the collaborative process considered in the paper could interact with each other and the findings provide the evidence that the groups took first a more cooperative approach (both at the intragroup and intergroup level), in that they divided the task for individual completion and subsequently they managed a collaboration in order to complete the different tasks. Among the functional moves, we found requesting and providing clarification, information and confirmation, a constant negotiation upon premises and constraints of the research process. The distribution of these functional moves across cooperative and collaborative processes is an interesting starting point to understand the expected moves that participants are making in a collaborative situation.

Furthermore, in the exploration of the collaborative work within a research group, we have to point out the implications and the suggestions that emerge from the analysis. By looking at the history of the groups' collaboration we suggest that a trusting relationship is essential for successful collaborative research, particularly when the researchers come from different cultural and national perspectives, as well as disciplinary ones. In a general sense, we recognize the importance of different qualities that positively affect the teamwork during a project (i.e. the assertiveness, the ability to express oneself clearly, to provide quick support, to frequently monitor the progress of the teams, to apply a supportive rather than directive management style, and to create a common ground for discussion for the young researchers and students). However, we have to underline that international research is costly in terms of time and resources (especially if research partners are not co-located), even if the researchers immensely benefit from learning about a new culture, and sharing the results.

Another point of discussion is related to the “educational” aim of the project: it represents an important part of the reflexive work upon the dynamics of collaboration. The members of the group are all involved in explicit sessions of “meta-analysis,” by which each researcher can offer important feedback to the group, in order to better understand the efficacy of the research work and the effects of this kind of collaboration. This is an opportunity to analyse the *scaffolding* constructed by the expert members of the group as support for the young people. However, this process of meta-analysis helps by identifying both adequate and inadequate aspects of collaboration. The particular nature of the examined collaborative research that includes a three site comparison needs a stronger effort for the future of the project, as compared to a dichotomous comparison: processes (and time) of communication, construction of hypothesis, design of the project and its guidelines, and agreement upon analytical tools and aims are more complex and

require more organizational and temporal stages; for these reasons the process of collaborative research requires a full engagement by all the researchers.

Interdisciplinary research is more than a sum of disciplines around a particular research project; it is a dialogue between disciplines and theories where each partner draws upon not only its own concepts, categories and ideas, but also upon those of the others in pursuing a shared theoretical and methodological development. For these complexities, there are still questions and issues to be addressed in order to set criteria for future collaborations and construct better models of collaborative research.

Appendix 1: Guidelines for the International Collaborative Enterprise

Distinction between Specific Research Projects and Broad Thematic Domains

The suggested guidelines concern collaboration on specific research projects in an effort to sustain strong working relationships across our respective research centers. Research projects involve specific analyses of particular pieces of data that yield insights. Alternatively, thematic domains are simply broad areas such as those depicted by the key terms in our activity logs (e.g. school, bedtime, conflict, discipline, emotion, health, play). Co-authors of research projects have proprietor rights over their co-generated ideas. In contrast, no researcher or group of researchers “owns” a thematic domain.

International Data Corpora

All data that have been collected in research centers outside one’s own university are to be used only in collaboration with researchers from those centers.

Collaboration Etiquette

When researchers commit to a collaborative project, they are expected to adhere to a research time line agreed upon by the collaborative team. Collaborators are expected to be available and communicate on a regular basis to assure project success. Collaborators are expected to inform other members of their research team when they intend to translate or expand upon the collaborative project. Once a collaborative project has been initiated, center directors need to be notified of the collaboration.

International Collaboration Citations and Acknowledgement

Consistent with established academic protocol, international collaborative presentations, working papers, and publications need to explicitly acknowledge in the body

of the text and through citation(s) topically relevant Sloan presentations, working papers, and publications.

Co-authorship on Publications and Working Papers

(a) International Collaborations Based on Prior Research of One or More Co-authors

When researchers working on a specific project in one center invite researchers in another center to join the project, the names of researcher(s) who initiated the project appear first. This order of co-authors assumes the topic of the project is sustained.

(b) International Collaborations Jointly Initiated

Co-authors are to jointly determine order of authors according to contribution.

(c) Translations of International Collaborative Research Papers

When a co-author translates a specific collaborative paper, the order of authorship is to be jointly determined by the co-authors and can take into account both the work of translation and new target audience of the paper.

(d) Outgrowths of International Collaborative Research Projects

A researcher who builds upon a previous specific collaborative project and takes it in a significantly new direction may be sole author.

Cross-Center Research Updates

For the Sloan conferences, CELF USA/Sweden/Italy all prepared lists of on-going projects in and across our research units. These lists are extremely informative. We propose that we send one another our lists of ongoing projects in the Fall and Spring of the years we are working together.

References

- Arcidiacono, F., & Pontecorvo, C. (2004). Più metodi per la pluridimensionalità della vita familiare. *Ricerche di Psicologia*, 27(3), 103–118.
- Boden, D. (1994). *The business of talk: Organizations in action*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Crossley, M. (2000). Bridging cultures and traditions in the reconceptualisation of comparative and international education. *Comparative Education*, 36(3), 319–332.
- Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, A. (2000). Looking at action research through the lenses of sociocultural psychology and activity theory. *Educational Action Research*, 8(1), 195–204.
- Fairclough, N. (2005). Discourse analysis in organization studies: The case for critical realism. *Organization Studies*, 26(6), 915–939.
- Ferber, J. (1994). Coopération réactive et émergence. *Revue Intellectica*, 2, 19–52.
- Fox, B. (1987). Interactional reconstruction in real-time language processing. *Cognitive Science*, 11(3), 365–387.
- Grant, D., Harvey, C., Oswick, C., & Putnam, L. (Eds.) (2004). *Handbook of organizational discourse*. London: Sage.
- Herring, S. C. (1993). Gender and democracy in computer-mediated communication. *The Electronic Journal of Communication*, 3(2), 1–29.
- Katz, S. J., & Martin, B. R. (1997). What is research collaboration? *Research Policy*, 26, 1–18.

- Law, J. (1994). *Organizing modernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mumby, D., & Clair, R. (1997). Organization discourse. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as structure and process: Discourse studies* (Vol 2). London: Sage.
- Ochs, E. (1992). Indexing gender. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon* (pp. 335–358). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Putnam, L., & Fairhurst, G. (2001). Discourse analysis in organizations: Issues and concerns. In F. M. Jablin & L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research and methods* (pp. 235–268). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Reed, M. (2000). In praise of duality and dualism: Rethinking agency and structure in organizational analysis. In S. Ackroyd & S. Fleetwood (Eds.), *Realist perspectives on management and organizations* (pp. 45–65). London: Routledge.
- Roschelle, J., & Teasley, S. D. (1995). The construction of shared knowledge in collaborative problem solving. In C. E. O'Malley (Ed.), *Computer-supported collaborative learning* (pp. 169–197). Berlin: Springer.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735.
- Schmidt, K. (1991). Cooperative work: A conceptual framework. In J. Rasmussen, B. Brehmer & J. Leplat (Eds.), *Distributed decision making: Cognitive models for cooperative work* (pp. 75–110). New York: Wiley.
- Schrage, M. (1990). *Shared minds: The new technologies of collaboration*. New York: Random House.
- Tsoukas, H., & Chia, R. (2002). On organizational becoming: Rethinking organizational change. *Organizations Science*, 13(5), 567–585.
- Tuler, S. (1998). Learning through participation. *Human Ecology Review*, 5(1), 58–60.
- Wertsch, J. (1998). *Mind as action*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wertsch, J., del Rio, P., & Alvarez, A. (Eds.) (1996). *Sociocultural studies of mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Francesco Arcidiacono is the Laboratory Director of the Italian Center on Everyday Lives of Families at the University of Rome “La Sapienza” (Italy). He teaches “Psychology of discursive interaction” and “Qualitative Methodologies” at the University of Neuchâtel (Switzerland). His main theoretical interest concerns the processes of socialization in the family context and argumentation in discursive interactions between people. He has published books on these theoretical and empirical works entitled “Ricerca osservativa e analisi qualitativa dell’interazione verbale” (Kappa, Rome, 2005), “Famiglie all’italiana” with C. Pontecorvo, (Cortina, Milan, 2007), and “Conflitti e interazione in famiglia” (Carocci, Rome, 2007).