Appendix A. Literature review

Although the general research method of our literature review is straightforward, it was not a mechanical process; thus, several issues arose, which are detailed below. The research process was as follows:

1. Our review targeted research on conflicting values as a set of factors that impact inter-organisational information sharing (IOIS) in the public sector. The Digital Government Reference Library (DGRL, version 16.0), therefore, acted as a natural starting point to gain access to leading publications on the public sector. DGRL version 16.0 includes publications between 1981 and 2020.
2. A combination of search criteria was used when searching in DGRL; see Table A1. Search fields included title, abstract, and keywords. The leftmost column contains the search criteria used. The next three columns show the number of papers resulting from each search field. The rightmost column shows the total number of research papers, including duplicates. The use of multiple search queries resulted in a gross list of 190 research papers, including duplicates. After eliminating duplicates, we ended up with a net list of 119 potential papers.
3. The abstract of each paper was read, and an initial decision was made as to whether the research seemed related to IOIS in the public sector. We employed the following inclusion criteria: 1) paper is a journal paper (not editorial), conference paper, or a book chapter, 2) paper is written in English, 3) paper is peer-reviewed, and 4) paper focuses on social and/or organisational factors that impact on IOIS in the public sector. The result was twenty-nine papers included in the detailed analysis (step 4), eighty-seven papers excluded based on the inclusion criteria, and three paper in-accessible.
4. All selected papers were read in detail, using the classification model in Table A2. First, we analysed whether the papers addressed social/organisational factors regarding IOIS in the public sector. Second, we identified whether conflicting values or any similar rationality concept had been studied. Third, we identified whether the researchers had treated values as a coherent concept over time or whether the emphasis of different values was acknowledged. Fourth, we identified whether researchers employed a dynamic perspective where experiences of IOIS impact future IOIS. We also recognised cases where the researchers acknowledge time as important but did not include it in their analysis. Fifth, we investigated whether the analysis was based on empirical data, and finally, what kind of research method the authors claimed to have used.
5. We carried out backward searches ([Webster & Watson, 2002](#_ENREF_68)) using the reference lists in the papers we read. This allowed us to identify research on IOIS in the public sector published in outlets not included in DGRL. In total, we identified an additional thirty-nine potential papers by backward citation searching, papers that were added to step 3. The result was sixteen papers included in the detailed analysis (step 4), sixteen papers excluded based on the inclusion criteria, and seven paper in-accessible. In total, we analysed forth-five papers.

**Table A1.** Search criteria and search results

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Search criteria** | **Number of papers** | | | |
| **Title** | **Abstract** | **Keywords** | **Total** |
| ‘information sharing’ and ‘inter’ | 22 | 91 | 22 | 135 |
| ‘information sharing’ and ‘cross-boundary’ | 7 | 11 | 7 | 25 |
| ‘information sharing’ and ‘inter-agency’ | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 |
| ‘knowledge sharing’ and ‘inter’ | 0 | 18 | 0 | 18 |
| ‘knowledge sharing’ and ‘cross-boundary’ | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| ‘knowledge sharing’ and ‘inter-agency’ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Total sum including duplicates* | 32 | 126 | 32 | 190 |

**Table A2.** Detailed analysis

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author(s)** | **Social/**  **organisational factors** | **Rationality concept used** | **Rationality as coherent factor over time** | **Addressing rationality over time** | **Empirical paper** | **Research method** |
| [Akbulut et al. (2009)](#_ENREF_3) | Yes | Value1 | Yes | No | Yes | Case study |
| [Bellamy, 6, Raab, Warren, and Heeney (2008)](#_ENREF_7) | Yes2 | Value | Yes | No | Yes | Interviews |
| [Bigdeli et al. (2011)](#_ENREF_8) | Yes | Goal, objective, goal | Yes | No | Yes | Case study |
| [Bigdeli et al. (2013a)](#_ENREF_9) | Yes | Goal, objective, goal | Yes | No | Yes | Case study |
| [Alinaghi Ziaee Bigdeli, Muhammad Mustafa Kamal, and Sergio de Cesare (2013b)](#_ENREF_10) | Yes | - | n/a | Yes | No | Literature review |
| [Dawes et al. (2009)](#_ENREF_16) | Yes2 | Mission | Yes | NoAck | Yes | Action research |
| [Dawes and Pardo (2002)](#_ENREF_19) | Yes | Mission | Yes | No | Yes | Case study |
| [Dawes et al. (2011)](#_ENREF_17) | Yes | Culture, goal, interest | Yes | Yes | Yes | Case study |
| [Dawes et al. (2012)](#_ENREF_18) | Yes | Culture, goal, interest | Yes | Yes | Yes | Case study |
| [Drake et al. (2004)](#_ENREF_20) | Yes2 | Culture | Yes | NoAck | Yes | Case study |
| [Eom and Kim (2017)](#_ENREF_21) | Yes | - | n/a | No | Yes | Case study |
| [Fan and Zhang (2009)](#_ENREF_22) | Yes | - | n/a | No | Yes | Interviews |
| [Fan et al. (2014)](#_ENREF_23) | Yes | Goal1 | Yes | No | Yes | Survey |
| [Fedorowicz et al. (2007)](#_ENREF_24) | Yes | Objective1 | Yes | NoAck | Yes | Case study |
| [J R Gil-García, Schneider, Pardo, and Cresswell (2005)](#_ENREF_33) | Yes | Goal | Yes | No | Yes | Case study |
| [J Ramon Gil-Garcia et al. (2007)](#_ENREF_27) | Yes | Goal | Yes | No | Yes | Case study |
| [J. Ramón Gil-García, Guler, Pardo, and Burke (2010)](#_ENREF_30) | Yes | - | n/a | No | Yes | Case study |
| [J. Ramon Gil-Garcia et al. (2019)](#_ENREF_29) | Yes | Goal | Yes | NoAck | Yes | Case study |
| [J. Ramón Gil-García and Sayogo (2016)](#_ENREF_32) | Yes | Goal1 | Yes | No | Yes | Survey |
| [Karlsson et al. (2017)](#_ENREF_39) | Yes | - | n/a | Yes | Yes | Case study |
| [Lam (2005)](#_ENREF_40) | Yes | Objective | Yes | No | Yes | Case study |
| [Landsbergen and Wolken (2001)](#_ENREF_41) | Yes | - | n/a | No | Yes | Case study |
| [Lee and Rao (2007)](#_ENREF_44) | Yes | Norm1 | Yes | No | Yes | Survey |
| [Lips, O'Neill, and Eppel (2011)](#_ENREF_45) | Yes | - | n/a | No | Yes | Case study |
| [Luna-Reyes et al. (2007)](#_ENREF_46) | Yes2 | - | n/a | NoAck | Yes | Case study |
| [Navarrete, Gil-García, Mellouli, Pardo, and Scholl (2010)](#_ENREF_48) | Yes | - | n/a | No | No | Literature review |
| [Theresa A Pardo et al. (2008)](#_ENREF_52) | Yes | Goal, mission | Yes | No | Yes | Interviews |
| [Theresa A Pardo et al. (2009)](#_ENREF_50) | Yes | Goal | Yes | NoAck | Yes | Interviews |
| [Theresa A. Pardo, Sayogo, and Canestraro (2011)](#_ENREF_53) | Yes | Interest | Yes | No | Yes | Interviews |
| [Sayogo and Gil-García (2014)](#_ENREF_59) | Yes | Goal1 | Yes | No | Yes | Survey |
| [Sayogo and Gil-Garcia (2015)](#_ENREF_58) | Yes | - | n/a | No | Yes | Survey |
| [Sayogo et al. (2016)](#_ENREF_60) | Yes1 | Goal1 | Yes | No3 | Yes | Survey |
| [Sayogo et al. (2017)](#_ENREF_61) | Yes | - | n/a | No3 | Yes | Survey |
| [Schooley and Horan (2007)](#_ENREF_63) | Yes | Culture | Yes | No | Yes | Case study |
| [Urciuoli, Hintsa, and Ahokas (2013)](#_ENREF_64) | Yes | - | n/a | No | Yes | Literature review, survey |
| [Van Cauter, Snoeck, and Crompvoets (2015)](#_ENREF_65) | Yes | - | n/a | Yes | Yes | Interviews, focus groups |
| [Wastell, Kawalek, Langmead-Jones, and Ormerod (2004)](#_ENREF_67) | Yes | Culture | Yes | No | Yes | Action research |
| [Yang, Lo, and Shiang (2015)](#_ENREF_70) | Yes | - | n/a | No | Yes | Interviews |
| [Yang and Maxwell (2011)](#_ENREF_71) | Yes | Culture, interest, objective, value | Yes | No | No | Literature review |
| [Yang and Wu (2014)](#_ENREF_72) | Yes | Culture, value1 | Yes | NoAck | Yes | Case study |
| [Zhang, Cresswell, and Thompson (2002)](#_ENREF_73) | Yes | Goal, mission | Yes | No3 | Yes | Survey |
| [Zhang et al. (2005)](#_ENREF_75) | Yes | Goal, mission | Yes | No | Yes | Survey |
| [Zhang and Dawes (2006)](#_ENREF_74) | Yes | Goal, mission | Yes | Yes | Yes | Interviews, survey |
| [Zhang, Faerman, and Cresswell (2006)](#_ENREF_76) | Yes | - | n/a | Yes | Yes | Case study |
| [Zheng, Jiang, Yang, and Pardo (2008)](#_ENREF_77) | Yes | - | n/a | No | Yes | Case study |

*Notes: n/a, it is not possible to analyse the rationality concept because the paper does not include such a concept*

*1) Indirectly, the concept is part of another more generic concept*

*2)Not explicit focus, but give a contribution to research on social/organisational factors*

*3) Past experience is treated as a factor*

*Ack) The researchers acknowledge time as important but did not include it in their analysis*

Appendix B. Interview guide

Below we present the semi-interview protocol used during all the interviews in this study. Together with the interview protocol we give the rationale for why questions were included.

**Table B1.** Semi-structured interview questions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category of question** | **Question** | **Rationale** |
| General | What was your role in the advisory group? | Capturing the actor’s role in the local network |
| What was your organisations role in the advisory group? | Capturing the organisation’s role in the global network |
| Why did your organisation participate? | Capturing rationale, i.e., values |
| What mandate did you have? | Capturing rationale, i.e., values |
| Explorative | What was the purpose of the advisory group in your opinion? | Capturing the perceived overall rational of the advisory group, to identify difference between actors (if any) |
| How do you perceive the advisory group's pre-conditions for fulfilling its purpose? | Capturing view on conflicting rationale, i.e., values, if any |
| Who decided on what information to share? | Capturing who drove IOIS activities that were introduced into the local network |
| How would you describe the tensions that existed in the advisory group? How did they materialise? | Capturing view on conflicting rationale, i.e., values, if any |
| Did you see any alternative way of sharing information? | Capturing rationale, i.e., values |
| In what way, if any, did you take actions to alter the way information was shared? | Capturing IOIS activities that were introduced into the local network |
| Focus-minded questions | [Referring to specific information shared/not shared], why was this an important aspect for your organisation? | Capturing rationale, i.e., values, related to IOIS activity identified from the meeting protocols or previous interview question |
| [Referring to a specific IOIS activity], why was this an important aspect for your organisation? | Capturing rationale, i.e., values, related to IOIS activity identified from the meeting protocols or previous interview question |
| How did you use [referring to information shared]? | Capturing consequence for the actor to fulfil their role in the local network |
| How did [referring to a specific decision to share/not to share] information affect your work? | Capturing consequence for the actor to fulfil their role in the local network |