

# **Appendix 1 Detailed Method**

## **Data Collection**

For the data collection by interviews, all respondents accepted our invitation email in which we provided background information on the research and they all agreed to the conditions of research ethics communicated beforehand. We continued to recruit respondents until no new knowledge was gained and no new codes were added to the codebook (Bowen, 2008). From all recruited respondents, the purposefully sampled respondents were of primary importance for the development of the themes, after which from the broader sampled respondents, on a secondary base, similarities and differences were coded and for the newly discovered items categories were added (Corley and Gioia, 2011; Patton, 2002).

From the sample we established three qualitative datasets: an interview, documentation and observation dataset. For the interview dataset, semi-structured interviews were used, guided by an interview protocol (Patton, 2002). To gather rich and in-depth data, the interview was initiated with closed knowledge-related questions and then moved to more open questions with prepared probes. The interviews were conducted in a face-to-face setting and in the native language of the respondents: English or Dutch. The researcher audio-recorded each interview and took notes during it. The length of the interviews ranged between one to two hours. All interviews were transcribed and the data anonymized, and allocated an alphabetical capital code. The transcripts were reviewed by the respondents and the fellow researchers. All transcripts and analysis are stored on a secure research database of the first author. The documentation for the second set was

gathered during the interviews and added to the documentation on the communities that had been pre-collected online. This documentation dataset was reviewed by two of the researchers and summarized in memo notes (Straus and Corbin, 1998; Miles and Huberman, 1994). The third set of observation data was gathered through semi-structured field notes supported by an observation guide that included: material aspects, e.g., workplaces, sites, products, promotional material and facilities, and the IT aspects of social media tools, systems and applications at the in-depth level of web-service screens used.

### **Data analysis**

The data analysis started with a line-by-line coding of the transcripts, the field notes and the documentation memos (Goia, 2021; Patton, 2002). Lines of quotes were tagged with a code – for the coding of (inter-)actions gerunds (“ing”) were preserved (Fereday and Muir-Cochrane, 2006). Then, through focused coding, the coded data was clustered and grouped into categories that shared similar characteristics. The codes that did not contribute to answering the research questions were left out from further analysis. The next activity of analysis involved theoretical coding, in which the categories were clustered into distinctive themes from the literature (Corley and Gioia, 2011; Fereday and Muir-Cochrane, 2006). Throughout this process, the first two authors analysed the data in the systematic process of coding, clustering and condensing them into patterns and concepts. The third author provided a sounding board for validating the codes on relevance for foresight practices (Corley and Gioia, 2011). All three authors collaborated on the sense-making of the categories and themes – the theorizing part and building logical chains of evidence – through multiple iterations, until all authors agreed fully on the final themes and categories

of the codebook (Goia, 2021; Corley and Gioia, 2011; Eisenhardt, 1989)). During this whole systematic process of aggregate code analysis, we used NVivo software V12.2.0. The coding tree was generated based on a predefined threshold for inclusion; there had to be more than five coded quotes from two respondents or more. We grouped the codes into categories and themes to elicit an in-depth understanding of the community and foresight characteristics. Multiple code indicators were collapsed into single constructs, and recurring activities, roles and interactions were analysed (Corley and Gioia, 2011; Fereday and Muir-Cochrane, 2006). Grounded on these results, the theoretical framework and the propositions were developed (Goia, 2021; Eisenhardt, 1989). These outcomes were discussed by all three authors in relation to the extant literature.