



COMMENT



<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03634-w>

OPEN

Finding joy, creativity and meaning through unusual interdisciplinary collaborations

CUCo*

Academics are increasingly calling for and asked to, work in interdisciplinary teams to address pressing social-ecological challenges. However, there are significant barriers to pursuing interdisciplinary collaborations within current university structures. Taking the first two years of our Centre for Unusual Collaborations (CUCo) as a case study of setting up a space for exploration and experimentation, we discuss how unusual interdisciplinary collaborations had unexpected effects, beyond the potential for societal impact. Most surprisingly, we found the CUCo model offered a welcome opportunity to break away from the productivism and competition that is common in academia while stimulating exploration of our own disciplines. This often led to an expansion of ideas and deepened understanding in ways that sparked joy, curiosity, creativity and meaning. We discuss how academic culture currently hampers collaboration: key roadblocks are identified, specifically rewards and recognition, the lack of spaces for trust-building, and competence and skills that are not geared towards collaboration. We present lessons learned in overcoming roadblocks to stimulate research across disciplinary lines and explain how unusual interdisciplinary collaborations provide opportunities for opening and deepening research lines, and how they can be fun and meaningful. We argue that, at a moment when academia faces growing rates of burnout and stress, such collaborations are fundamental.

*A list of authors and their affiliations appears at the end of the paper. ✉email: corinne.lamain@wur.nl

Centring unusualness in academia

Interdisciplinary research is widely recognised as crucial for addressing the complexity of the urgencies we face (Rylance, 2015; Danermark, 2019). Also, academics, especially those at the early- or mid-career stages, increasingly wish to engage with interdisciplinarity (Spence et al., 2024). The motivations for this across this group differ but include personal interests, expanding capabilities, a longing to collaborate and the willingness to ‘solve problems’ (ibid). Consequently, calls for interdisciplinary research are growing, from the side of funders, universities, as well as academics. Despite this, barriers continue to restrict academics from actually doing so: the requirements of academic career paths, the difficulty of integrating diverging epistemological traditions, discipline-based institutional arrangements, and the practicalities of collaborating (Müller and Kaltenbrunner, 2019; Daniel et al., 2022; Carolan, 2024). Given this, we ask: what happens when early- and mid-stage academics are given the autonomy and budget to (re)design interdisciplinary research collaborations?

In our case, it led to the fostering of *unusual* interdisciplinary research and experimenting with collaboration, creativity and freedom in science. We understand ‘unusual’ here as bringing together combinations of disciplines that are unexpected and do not commonly collaborate. In this meeting, none of the knowledge fields is assumed to have priority over another (Danermark, 2019). This requires an openness and a sense of humility that is not commonly practiced in academia. Meeting vastly different ontological and epistemological traditions—from across the entire spectrum from positivism to constructivism—and aiming to achieve knowledge integration tends to shake the bases of knowing. It creates new patterns of thinking, enhancing imagination and through that opening and deepening research lines. Unusualness also relates to research topics that are wild, in exploratory stages, distinct from existing initiatives and that would not be easily funded elsewhere. Lastly, unusualness is about encounters in which the process of collaboration is taken seriously, not just as a means to an end, but as a way to meet other humans who share an interest and are keen to explore this together. This can be given shape through experimentation, for example with art-based methods, to acquaint, understand and empathise with others (Messer, 2012) Fig. 1. While these practices are growing, they remain quite uncommon in academia (MacLeod, 2018).



Fig. 1 A musical session for improving collaboration at the opening of CUCo's Nest. At CUCo this is offered as integrated interdisciplinary research requires a distinct set of competencies and collaborative, arts-based and imaginative tools, methods and approaches. Photo credits: Caspar Schoevaars.

Establishing the centre for unusual collaborations. In 2019, a group of mid-career academics from a broad range of disciplines, together with some university colleagues, established the Centre for Unusual Collaborations (CUCo). We, the authors of this paper, were brought together as representatives of the Young Academics¹ from four academic institutes in The Netherlands: Eindhoven University of Technology, Wageningen University & Research, Utrecht University, and University Medical Center Utrecht. The Boards of those four institutes pooled funding from which CUCo emerged as a networking, training, funding and lobbying body dedicated to experimenting with, and increasing the space for, unusual research collaborations². When given the assignment of doing something together that we could not do apart, we started with a deep desire to challenge barriers we had experienced as early-career academics. We aimed to tackle issues we encountered with funding schemes that we had submitted to ourselves. We shared concerns about the ethics associated with the time and budget implications, as well as the competitive environment the schemes create in academia. We committed ourselves to the uneasiness that comes from learning while doing. These values are exemplified by our logo: an octopus. For this we drew inspiration from Donna Haraway's call for tentacular thinking: tentacle, from the Latin *tentaculum*, meaning “feeler,” and tentare, meaning “to feel” and “to try” (Haraway, 2016).

While the scientific results seem promising, perhaps the most unexpected outcome has been that in challenging the neoliberal/efficiency/productivist logic of academia and collaborating in unusual ways, we reconnected with science in new and exciting ways. This sparked new curiosity, joy, enthusiasm and a sense of freedom that was not being fostered in other aspects of our work. This is not a trivial result at a moment when academic staff report heavy levels of stress and burnout (Woolston, 2020) and when research concluded that ‘the dominant features in the university work environment do not foster and/or sustain workplace joy’ (Whitset et al., 2024, p.6). We call this unexpected reconnection ‘collateral happiness’³.

In what follows, we recount how at CUCo we have experimented with setting up funding schemes and support mechanisms to achieve unusual interdisciplinarity. After introducing the novel mechanisms we have set up, we elaborate on three roadblocks that we encountered in setting up this new initiative; rewards and recognition, the lack of spaces for trust-building, and competencies that are not geared towards collaboration. We share strategies we have been trialling to overcome these roadblocks. We conclude with targeted recommendations for funders and universities that aim to fund and support unusual interdisciplinary research.

CUCo: From competition to collaboration

CUCo was started by an interdisciplinary group so as to support groups of mid-career academics to engage with interdisciplinarity. We acknowledge the problematic nature of defining interdisciplinary research, as it assumes a demarcation of disciplines, and accordingly, when boundaries between those would be crossed, that does not actually exist (Sugimoto and Weingart, 2015). In the setup of CUCo we have pragmatically chosen an understanding that refers to the combination of different academic disciplines in addressing questions and problems that are too broad or complex to be dealt with adequately by a single discipline. It brings together the approaches, ways of thinking, and methods of different disciplines with the goal of integrating these to construct more comprehensive understandings (Repko and Szostak, 2021). In addition, we understand it as a (highly complex) knowledge integration process leading to a result in which ‘the sum is bigger than the individual parts’

(Danermark, 2019; Leydesdorff and Ivanova, 2021). In addition, what travels across disciplines goes beyond methods and concepts, but stretches to include virtues, norms, metaphors (Bod et al., 2019). In our perspective this may be stretched to include contributions that are beyond the descriptions of knowledge production, to include the physical, material and emotional experiences of those *partaking in the process*.

The choice for interdisciplinarity was partly based on the situation of CUCo as part of an alliance between four universities with distinct research profiles: a medical centre, a technical university, a life sciences university oriented towards food and agriculture, and a broad university covering disciplines across the social sciences, the humanities and STEM. The alliance was set up to enable the complementarity of the profiles to better address the larger societal challenges. CUCo's budget (€6 M for the period 2020–2023) was made available to the Young Academies by the alliance institutes to stimulate research by mid-career academics across domains. After several months of interaction, CUCo was proposed as a space in which new research ideas could emerge across these institutes, without too many expectations and hindrances in the way. Interdisciplinarity was a logical fit for increasing this cross-institutional collaboration. There was also the sentiment that we wanted to get *interdisciplinarity* right, that is, to learn to work together as academics, before expanding to *transdisciplinary* collaborations with actors outside academia.

However, at CUCo, the freedom of early and mid-career academics is foregrounded, meaning that there is no demand to directly and clearly contribute to societal issues. Academics can work on what they deem relevant; rough ideas and explorations are also invited. In a sense, this is a return to the 'trickle-down' model of science, as promoted by the Bush consensus, that stipulated that the best science comes from letting scientists do science without relating to policy (Frodeman, 2016). This freedom is sought in teams, rather than in individual trajectories, so as to stimulate the joy and meaning that comes from working with others and getting to know them.

To counter issues we had encountered ourselves with acquiring grants, we designed a funding scheme based on collaboration, initially aimed at the exploration and formation of new teams. Newly formed teams were invited to develop early-stage ideas into unusual projects. This was achieved through a two-stage funding process: small ('Spark') grants (initial financial support of €9000 to start building committed project teams), which became prerequisites to applying for the larger ('Unusual Collaborations') grants (funding of between €k180-300 to take a Spark idea further). In 2020–2022 1.1 M Euro was spent each year. Teams can acquire three years of UCo funding after the Spark year. In the period 2020–2022, nine Spark teams have been initiated, involving a total number of 48 early and mid-career academics. A similar number of Unusual Collaborations teams were running in different stages, involving 52 academics. Spark grants respond to the recognition that team-building requires time and resources that should be directly funded. Key evaluation criteria for the grants focus on team composition (i.e., the unusualness of the team's disciplinary composition) as well as societal relevance and innovation. Consider, for example, one team named *Defeating Chronic Pain*⁴ that re-analysed datasets from the pain centre of the Utrecht medical centre and developed "unusual" patient questionnaires to replace previous (disciplinary/medical) ones. This led to the discovery of previously unknown subtypes of chronic pain patients which opened new insights into possible treatments. Another example is the *Power of One* team⁵ studied 'the unheard and unseen' in workplaces, hospitals and neighbourhoods. Their work has identified multi-faceted barriers that prevent individuals from making their needs and views known, namely practical, personal, relational, socio-cultural, and



Fig. 2 Participants to a Spark symposium pitching research ideas to find team members around a rough research idea. Newly formed teams were invited to develop early-stage ideas into unusual projects. Photo credits: Caspar Schoevaars.

assumption-driven barriers. Stories on the collaborative process of both these teams are given at the end of section 'Roadblocks to funding unusual interdisciplinarity' (Fig. 2).

Roadblocks to funding unusual interdisciplinarity

While, overall, we consider CUCo to be a success, we have experienced a number of challenges that are yet to be overcome.

Roadblock 1: Rewards and recognition. Dominant reward structures in academia for long emphasise disciplinary, specialised and individualistic career tracks (Leahey, 2007)⁶. Rewards and recognition systems continue to lean heavily on the quantity of (high impact) publications, granting acquired and relatively short timelines, with emphasis on visibility and specialisation (Müller and Kaltenbrunner, 2019; Spence et al., 2024). Suggestions to address this are specifically aiming for increasing flexibility and adaptivity within career paths, acknowledging the additional time it takes to achieve output (Carolan, 2024). Calls are also made for additional career paths for those specialising in knowledge integration, that should be part of research teams as 'Integration and Implementation Specialists' (Bammer, 2012) or 'integrators' (Hoffmann et al., 2022). In addition, roles are foreseen for those operating within boundary spaces across institutional disciplinary zones, so as to connect people and synthesise ideas (Hendren and Ku, 2019). Within the Dutch context, several universities are implementing recognition and reward schemes that go beyond disciplinary work based on high-impact citations, but that rather honour the team effort, as well as output that is generated towards achieving 'impact'⁷. Despite these new schemes offering more potential for crossing disciplinary domains, they continue not to adequately reward the *timelines* of interdisciplinary projects and the *effort it takes to organise a collaborative process*. In that way, the integrative roles outlined above fall outside the scope of these frameworks.

Even when funded by CUCo, early and mid-career academics found it difficult to actually make time for interdisciplinary projects. For some, the funding was inadequate to really 'buy' research time. The aim of the funding schemes was for mid-career academics to really come together and share their own expertise, thus not delegating it to PhD researchers. In many cases, given the highly experimental nature of the research, time spent on these projects was not valued by supervisors and those deciding on promotions. This in turn led to academics doing this work on top of their already loaded schedules. This means that in practice, academics involved in projects funded by CUCo

typically accept that the time spent on these collaborations will not yield the same return in terms of high-impact publications (at least in the short term). However, not all early-career researchers might feel safe enough in their career tracks to afford the risk of such collaborations. Our experiences led us to conclude that academics need support from their institutions to be able to commit adequate time to interdisciplinary work, and that collaborative and experimental work needs to be recognised and rewarded on its own terms.

Roadblock 2: Funding trust-building and interdisciplinary collaboration. It has been argued that ‘working successfully across scientific disciplines and public sectors on socially relevant issues can itself be a Grand Challenge’ (De Grandis and Efstathiou, 2016, p. 4). Interdisciplinary collaborations demand that researchers get to know each other and each other’s disciplines and associated epistemologies and skill sets, to build trust, find common ground and understand each other’s motivations to join the collaboration (Müller and Kaltenbrunner, 2019; Cross, et al., 2022; Carolan, 2024). A recognised challenge in collaborative processes is communication: members of teams ‘do not speak the same language’. Building on Boon and Van Baalen (2019), at CUCo we understand the language itself not as the key problem, rather it is a symptom of holding different epistemologies and values. This often leads to difficulties in interpreting and truly integrating different types of knowledge, methods and results. Investing time for deep listening and understanding, before embarking on the actual collaborative project is key, and yet this process is rarely accounted for in funding schemes. Further, trust and empathy are fragile and might be at risk of breaking under pressure, especially in the early stages of a project. Hence, funding schemes should be minimally output-dependent and forgiving of failure to deliver.

At CUCo we addressed this through the ‘Spark’ grants dedicated to funding this phase of creating interdisciplinary collaborations. Through these grants, we offer some reward and support for academics who invested their time in establishing common ground. If the team members realise they are not able to reach common ground to collaborate, stopping a project is an option. Though this is often considered a ‘failure’, to CUCo this is an acceptable outcome that also produces important insights. This aligns with an explicit ambition to steer away from the productivist pressures of academia, by ensuring ample time for teams to get to know each other, explore ideas and develop collaborative processes, without having to immediately focus on output. Two teams (one Spark and one UCo) have chosen this option. Each of those declared having found the time spent on the project very useful: exploring a topic and finding it does not work avoided these teams entering into longer trajectories that may not have borne fruit. In addition to awarding grants, CUCo offers a physical ‘home base’, dubbed the CUCo’s Nest. This is a space where project teams can meet and find training and support, where workshops are hosted that address pressing barriers within academia and networking events where new ideas can be explored.

Roadblock 3: Competencies, tools and approaches. Integrated interdisciplinary research requires a distinct set of competencies and collaborative, arts-based and imaginative tools, methods and approaches (Pearson et al., 2018; Kawa et al., 2021; Cross et al., 2022). Bringing together a group of motivated experts from different fields does not lead to knowledge integration automatically (Sassen-van Meer et al., 2023). Interdisciplinarity is a scientific field in its own right, with a growing body of literature that can usefully inform practice (Frodeman, 2010; Repko and Szostak, 2021), yet most academics receive limited training in how to ‘do’

interdisciplinary research. There is increasing attention to the need to educate students and teachers on specific competencies and attitudes required for conducting meta-reflection on *how* knowledge is produced in the research process (Boon and Van Baalen, 2019). Yet, for *researchers* who participate in interdisciplinary projects, such training is rarely offered. We believe that the attitude that is required for such projects to be conducted successfully—humbleness, patience, appreciation of other knowledge, trusting team members—and associated skills—e.g., deep listening, using metaphors—are in fact neglected across universities which continue to focus on domain-specific cognitive skills (MacLeod, 2018), critical attitudes towards peers, high time-efficiency, and bringing knowledge instead of co-creating it. Though there is increasing attention and support for specialised roles within interdisciplinary teams, such as the ‘Integration and Implementation Science specialist’ or the ‘integrator’ (Bammer, 2012; Hoffmann et al., 2022), and a call for more institutionalised roles as the ‘Interdisciplinary Executive Scientist’ (Hendren and Ku, 2019), we argue that a basic level of training is needed for all that participate in interdisciplinary collaborations. Academia commonly trains skills that are aimed at individual achievements and competition, that not only hinder the openness in attitude required to integrate knowledge fields, but also facilitate knowledge extraction and epistemic injustices (Triyanti et al., 2024). Unlearning these skills opens up the space for wonder, humility and openness, which can contribute to more humane collaborations that bring joy and enthusiasm, as we hear repeatedly from those participating in CUCo (de Vrieze, 2022).

Building on the literature on interdisciplinary research (Wiegant, 2020; Repko and Szostak, 2021), at CUCo we now offer training on these practical and meta-level aspects (de Vrieze et al., 2022). This training is in fact the first stage of the Spark granting scheme so that all Spark teams include members that have strengthened competencies. We believe this should be an integral part of research funding and should be offered to those already part of interdisciplinary research.

Reflections on the roadblocks as experienced by two of the Unusual Collaborations teams, that have completed the Spark and UCo granting:

Case 1: Defeating Chronic Pain⁸

One of the factors that contributed to the success of our team was having the time and funding without strict deadlines and set outputs, allowing more time for the collaborative process. The explicit focus on the process resulted in a deeper understanding of each other’s disciplines and increased trust among team members. This is different from most *multidisciplinary* collaborations in which content and deliverables are prioritised, and time pressure to deliver reduces risk-taking and creativity. The training and mentorship offered by the Centre for Unusual Collaborations made a difference in our project. For example, at the start, we noticed the reflex to immediately discuss research content details. This effectively meant that the psychologist, lifestyle scientist, materials engineer and linguist could not join the conversation. It was really because of the training we had at CUCo that we realised that we needed to take a step back. Through creative exercises, which also sparked joy, we were able to deepen our understanding and intensify our collaboration, which has been a big part of our success in terms of outcomes. At the time of writing, we have completed our first empirical study where we combined insights and instruments from several disciplines in a novel manner. For integration to happen, discussions on the integration and the collaborative process should be part of every meeting. We have seen there is a tendency to split up into small groups, with people from closely related disciplines, to do ‘subprojects’ or write disciplinary grants as spin-offs. While this is not to be discouraged, there is a risk that the team splits up, or

that the team reverts to being a *multidisciplinary* research team, creating disciplinary output under the same thematic umbrella.

Case 2: Power of One: Towards the Representation of Unheard and Unseen Individuals in the Hospital, Workplace and Neighbourhood⁹

The Power of One (PO1) project aimed to find ways to empower individuals who appeared to fall between the cracks of society, in a sense that they have an intersecting complexity of social problems or belong to marginalised groups. We focused on clinical trials in an academic hospital testing new medications and treatments (UMC-Utrecht) and the LHBQTQI+ community in the workplace. The PO1 team members were from very different academic backgrounds (i.e., social psychologists, industrial designers, cultural historians, cell biologists, methodologists, data privacy experts, and language researchers), providing the project with a rich knowledge base. We learned from each other and greatly appreciated the knowledge all brought in, and collectively made decisions on where to move the project. In the clinical trials project, this meant that we took the approach to investigate the barriers to why marginalised individuals are under-represented in clinical research, from the patient perspective and from the caregiver perspective, before diving into practical solutions. This thorough approach yielded a new narrative research tool that empowers patients (by steering them via narrative examples, presented via a weblink, to make more informed decisions on their medical care) while they are in the waiting room before their appointments with caregivers. We believe that the trust that was built and the broad background of the team members who collaborated on the Power-of-One project made the project a success.

Conclusions and recommendations

Doing interdisciplinarity differently does not just produce novel scientific insights, it can also contribute to ‘collateral happiness’ for early and mid-career academics. In seeking to address the tension between increased calls for interdisciplinarity and structural barriers to actually doing so, we established the Centre for Unusual Collaborations. In this paper, we shared our experiences and the roadblocks we encountered.

Despite the barriers we needed to overcome, and are still overcoming, establishing and participating in CUCo has been a transformative experience. Many of us engaging in CUCo, either in its Board or its projects, have had to actively challenge our disciplinary mindset and biases, including the limits and benefits of our own science. This has led to opportunities to import valuable knowledge, methods and concepts from other disciplines to our own. It has also provoked new meaning and curiosity in research.

Looking back at the process of setting up CUCo, we see that the main incentive to work in CUCo-funded projects is intrinsic motivation and curiosity to look and work across and beyond disciplinary boundaries. In addition, we are actively creating a culture in which failing is part of the learning process and stopping projects is accepted, as an alternative to continue investing in work that will not yield results. We see great enthusiasm for collaboration rather than competition: the majority of the team members of Spark and UCo teams have referred to being part of the grants as a positive contribution in terms of their experienced meaning, excitement and joy. Mid-career academics have expressed to us that through CUCo they are “reinventing themselves as researchers”, that it is “a treat”, and that they “would have left academia if it were not for CUCo” (in progress conversations with UCo teams in 2022). This re-encounter with core values and valued emotions, which we refer to as “collateral happiness”, has been a welcome and unexpected outcome of this process. This is a contribution that has often been overlooked but is key to ensuring a healthy and fulfilling workplace (Whitsed et al., 2024).

It is in this spirit, and based on our concrete efforts to overcome the roadblocks described above, that we put forward the following recommendations for funding bodies and universities. With these, we aim to contribute to better support for interdisciplinary researchers, not only as a way to enhance societal impact but, importantly, to facilitate creativity, meaning and well-being across academia.

Recommendations for Rewards and recognition (Roadblock 1)

For funders

Apply assessment criteria that appreciate the specifics of interdisciplinary research, including the removal of quantity of high-impact papers and reward the effort that goes into collaborative processes. Support early and mid-career academics in negotiation processes for freeing up time when receiving grants and make agreements on this with universities.

Allow budget for hiring support staff to take over tasks of academics when executing a project. And ensure that these tasks are actually relieving the recipients.

For universities

Annual progress conversations that guide promotion choices should include criteria that are flexible and defined in collaboration between the academic and the superiors.

Criteria should take into account reduced output over a longer period, the value of collaboration, more facilitative leadership styles, recognition of the work that goes into the collaborative process.

Offer institutional grant support that advocates for young researchers and with a commitment to protecting research time.

Recommendations for Funding trust-building and interdisciplinary collaboration (Roadblock 2)

For funders

Experiment with novel funding mechanisms to reduce competition and favour collaboration, e.g. by involving academics from across disciplines in the design of funding programmes, using lottery as the selection method. Organise smaller, flexible experimental grants to help build unusual teams, that allow for budget to be spent on trust-building, and allow for output to emerge later in the process. Stimulate reporting of failure, and encourage teams to stop the work if it is not leading to results, without repercussions. Support reporting via creative and diverse methods to communicate results, as well as experiences on a meta-level about the collaboration itself, and make these accessible beyond academia.

Allow space in the budget for artists and communications experts to support this work.

For universities

Insert flexibility into work streams that allow time for small, higher-risk, high-time investment collaborations.

Make spaces available for an open exchange around academic culture and productivist tendencies, and take action on the concerns raised.

Take the responsibility to reduce productivist tendencies at the expense of innovative and quality science.

Organise training and support for creative methods and research communication.

Engage artists and communication professionals structurally and equitably, for example in a pool that researchers can turn to when seeking support or advice.

Recommendations for Competence and skills (Roadblock 3)

Include training to acquire the competencies and attitudes that are needed for achieving knowledge integration, or encourage universities to do so. Include a budget for the facilitation of collaborative processes, e.g. by process coaching, where (self-)reflection is centralised. Encourage the use of creative methods to enhance trust-building and mutual understanding, such as visualisation, games, imaginative exercises and the use of glossaries to define terms in the different disciplines

Offer training to acquire the competencies and attitudes that are needed for achieving knowledge integration

Set up a pool of process coaches to support collaborative processes

Idem as 'for funders'

Data availability

All data are available in the main text.

Received: 7 May 2024; Accepted: 21 August 2024;

Published online: 07 September 2024

Notes

- 1 A young academy is a select group of young researchers who work to connect different disciplines within the university, exchange critical perspectives on academia, policy, and society, and strive to improve the academic climate of the university, particularly for early-career researchers.
- 2 Importantly, not all of the members of the group had secure positions, but the majority did and having job security also supported our ability to take risks. We recognise that the situation is not the same for all, especially not for early-career academics.
- 3 The term 'collateral happiness' as used in this paper is not meant as a contribution to the vast body of knowledge on 'happiness'. We appreciate and honour the existing literature on the topic, but in this piece, the use of the term is intended to be metaphorical.
- 4 The Chronic Pain team includes an expert in host-microbe interactomics, an expert in consumption and healthy lifestyles, a linguist, a psychologist, a veterinarian with expertise in anaesthesiology, a neuroscientist, a neuro-immunologist a medical doctor and a mechanical engineer
- 5 The Power of One team includes anthropologists, an organisational psychologist, an immunologist, an applied statistician, a social scientist working on consumption and lifestyle, a linguist, industrial design engineers and literary historians
- 6 Leahy also finds that this affects female academics particularly negatively, as they are often less specialised, leading to lower productivity and thus visibility, resulting in turn in lower salaries
- 7 See for example the TRIPLE model developed by Utrecht University: Utrecht University Recognition and Rewards Vision (2023) https://www.uu.nl/sites/default/files/UU%20Vision%20Recognition%20and%20Rewards_2023.pdf
- 8 See for more information: <https://unusualcollaborations.ewuu.nl/unusual-collaborations/ipop-nl/>
- 9 See for more information: <https://unusualcollaborations.ewuu.nl/unusual-collaborations/the-power-of-one/>

References

- Bammer G (2012) Disciplining interdisciplinarity: integration and implementation sciences for researching complex real-world problems. ANU Press, Canberra
- Bod R, van Dongen, ten Hagen SL, Karstens B, Mojét E (2019) The flow of cognitive goods: a historiographical framework for the study of epistemic transfer. *Isis* 110(3):483–496
- Boon M, Van Baalen S (2019) Epistemology for interdisciplinary research—shifting philosophical paradigms of science. *Eur J Philos Sci* 9:16

- Carolan M (2024) Do universities support solutions-oriented collaborative research? Constraints to wicked problems scholarship in higher education. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun* 11:382
- Cross J, Jablonski B, Schipanski M (2022) 15—Inquiry within, between, and beyond disciplines. In: Peters C, Thilmany D (eds.). *Food systems modeling*. Academic Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts (USA), pp. 327–348
- Danermark B (2019) Applied interdisciplinary research: a critical realist perspective. *J Crit Realism* 18(4):368–382
- Daniel KL, McConnell M, Schuchardt A, Peffer ME (2022) Challenges facing interdisciplinary researchers: Findings from a professional development workshop. *PLoS ONE* 17(4):1–16
- Frodeman R (2016) Interdisciplinarity, grand challenges, and the future of knowledge. *Stud Hist Philos Sci Part C: Stud Hist Philos Biol Biomed Sci* 56:108–110
- Frodeman R (ed.) (2010) *The Oxford handbook of interdisciplinarity*. Oxford University Press, Oxford
- De Grandis G, Efstathiou S (2016) Introduction—grand challenges and small steps. *Stud Hist Philos Sci Part C: Stud Hist Philos Biol Biomed Sci* 56:39–47
- Haraway DJ (2016) *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Duke University Press
- Hendren CO, Ku ST (2019) The interdisciplinary executive scientist: connecting scientific ideas, resources and people. In: Hall K, Vogel A, Croyle R (eds.). *Strategies for team science success*. Springer, Cham. pp. 363–374
- Hoffmann S, Deutsch L, Klein JT et al. (2022) Integrate the integrators! A call for establishing academic careers for integration experts. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun* 9:147
- Kawa NC, Arceño MA, Goeckner R et al. (2021) Training wicked scientists for a world of wicked problems. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun* 8:189
- Leahy E (2007) Not by productivity alone: How visibility and specialization contribute to academic earnings. *Am Sociol Rev* 72(4):533–561
- Leydesdorff L, Ivanova I (2021) The measurement of “interdisciplinarity” and “synergy” in scientific and extra-scientific collaborations. *J Assoc Inf Sci Technol* 72(4):387–402
- MacLeod M (2018) What makes interdisciplinarity difficult? Some consequences of domain specificity in interdisciplinary practice. *Synthese* 195:697–720
- Messer J (2012) *Practicing interdisciplinarity*. Text 14:1–11
- Müller R, Kaltenbrunner W (2019) Re-disciplining academic careers? Interdisciplinary Practice and Career Development in a Swedish Environmental Sciences Research Center. *Minerva* 57:479–499
- Pearson KR, Backman M, Grenni S, Moriggi A, Pisters S, de Vrieze A (2018) *Arts-based methods for transformative engagement: a toolkit*. SUSPLACE Innovation Training Network: Wageningen, The Netherlands
- Repko AF, Szostak, R (2021) *Interdisciplinary research: process and theory*. 4th edn. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks (US)
- Rylance R (2015) Grant giving: global funders to focus on interdisciplinarity. *Nature* 525:313–315
- Sassen-van Meer J, Lamain C, van Gernerden F (2023) *Transdisciplinary research: If it's so important, why aren't we all doing it?* Available via AWTI newsletter, <https://unusualcollaborations.ewuu.nl/2023/06/15/transdisciplinary-research-if-its-so-important-why-arent-we-all-doing-it/>. Accessed 19 Aug 2024
- Spence N, Markauskaite L, McEwen C (2024) Why and how academics become interdisciplinary researchers early in their careers. *High Educ Res Dev* 43(6):1383–1398
- Sugimoto CR, Weingart S (2015) The kaleidoscope of disciplinarity. *J Documentation* 71(4):775–794
- Triyanti A, Lamain C, Duncan J, Student J (2024) Understanding exclusion, sharing benefits and building in reflection in transdisciplinary collaborations, Available via Integration and Implementation Insights <https://i2insights.org/2024/06/25/improving-transdisciplinary-collaborations/>. Accessed 19 Aug 2024
- de Vrieze (2022) 'Something you just have to experience': insights from the first run of the SPARK Interdisciplinary Research training', available via CUCo, <https://unusualcollaborations.ewuu.nl/2023/06/29/blog-something-you-just-have-to-experience-insights-from-the-first-run-of-the-spark-interdisciplinary-research-training/>. Accessed 19 Aug 2024
- de Vrieze A, Tiokhin L, Ormond M (2022) A training series for unusual collaborations, available via CUCo, <https://unusualcollaborations.ewuu.nl/2023/06/29/a-training-series-for-unusual-collaborations/>. Accessed 19 Aug 2024
- Whited C, Girardi A, Williams JP, Fitzgerald S (2024) Where has the joy gone? A qualitative exploration of academic university work during crisis and change. *High Educ Res Dev* 1–15 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/07294360.2024.2339836>
- Wiegant F (2020) Matrix with assessment rubrics of interdisciplinary learning goals & competencies, Available via Utrecht University https://www.uu.nl/sites/default/files/Bijlage%20-%20Matrix_Rubrics%20assessment%20interdisciplinary%20competencies-2020.pdf. Accessed 19 Aug 2024
- Woolston C (2020) Postdocs under pressure: 'Can I even do this any more?'. *Nature* 587:689–692

Acknowledgements

The authors have the right to use the images. CUCo event participants consented to the use of images taken during the events for external communication purposes. Photo credits: Caspar Schoevaars.

Author contributions

All authors enjoyed contributing equally to the manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Ethical approval

Ethical approval was not required as the study did not involve human participants.

Informed consent

Informed consent was not required as the study did not involve human participants.

Additional information

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to C. Lamain.

Reprints and permission information is available at <http://www.nature.com/reprints>

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License, which permits any non-commercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this licence to share adapted material derived from this article or parts of it. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

© The Author(s) 2024

CUCo

C. Lamain¹✉, S. Brugman², M. Boes³, C. Schoevaars⁴, D. Tetteroo⁵, M. D. Veldhuizen⁶, J. P. Wijnen⁷, D. Lakens⁸, F. Albronda⁹, S. Hofmann¹⁰, S. Knittel⁶ & J. Duncan⁹

¹Centre for Unusual Collaborations, Initiative of Alliance TU/e, WUR, UU, UMCU, Princetonlaan 8, 3584 CB Utrecht, The Netherlands. ²Host Microbe Interactomics, Animal Sciences Group, Wageningen University and Research, P.O. Box 338, 6700 AH Wageningen, The Netherlands. ³Center for Translational Immunology, Pediatrics Department, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht University, Lundlaan 6, 3584 EA Utrecht, The Netherlands. ⁴Program Interdisciplinary Education, O&O Department, Utrecht University, Heidelberglaan 8, Utrecht, The Netherlands. ⁵Future Everyday Group, Department of Industrial Design, Eindhoven University of Technology, Atlas 3 South, P.O. Box 513, 5600 MB Eindhoven, The Netherlands. ⁶Institute for Cultural Inquiry, Utrecht University, Muntstraat 2A, 3512 EV Utrecht, The Netherlands. ⁷High Field MR Research group, Centre for Image Sciences, University Medical Centre Utrecht, Heidelberglaan 100, Utrecht, The Netherlands. ⁸School of Innovation Sciences, Eindhoven University of Technology, Atlas 3.429, P.O. Box 513, 5600 MB Eindhoven, The Netherlands. ⁹Rural Sociology Group, Wageningen University and Research, P.O. Box 8130, 6700 EW Wageningen, The Netherlands. ¹⁰Bioengineering Bone Group, Department of Biomedical Engineering and Institute for Complex Molecular Systems (ICMS), Eindhoven University of Technology, P.O. Box 513, 5600 MB Eindhoven, The Netherlands. ✉email: corinne.lamain@wur.nl