Additional training opportunities in team science could support the degree to which professionals in CSD engage in collaborative research.

RESULTS

- 48% Reported serving on an interdisciplinary research team; 57% reported relatively few co-authors (0-3), only 20% publishing with larger co-authorship teams (4-10)
- Though only 17% of respondents had engaged in team science training, a majority expressed positive beliefs and perceptions toward cross-disciplinary activities (83%)
- No significant group differences in the composite for the ten questions related to research orientation
- Female researchers ($M = 5.64, SD = 0.79$) indicated significantly lower psychological safety compared to male researchers ($M = 6.08, SD = 0.78; t(19.13) = 4.37, p = .05$)
- Faculty in non-academic and non-tenure track positions ($M = 5.26, SD = 0.95$) reported lower psychological safety than faculty in tenure-track positions ($M = 5.82, SD = 0.71; t(36.9) = 8.59, p = .006$)
- The rate of engagement in cross-disciplinary collaborative research was higher for participants with prior team science training ($M = 5.52, SD = 1.56$) than those without training ($M = 4.54, SD = 1.48; t(165) = -3.28, p < .001$)

DISCUSSION

- More research is needed to identify ways to improve the execution of cross-disciplinary research practices in CSD and vet the underlying causes of the disconnect between research values and current practices
- Major themes of open-ended responses suggest collaborative research efforts have a high pay off with much to offer scientists in CSD
- Due to group differences in psychological safety, additional efforts may be necessary to ensure that imbalances in the power structure of members are not allowed to dissuade members from actively contributing to team activities