Changes made to project S_temp2017 after expert review:

Reviewer #1 Comments (how they were addressed is in the following bullet point)

In all, my major concerns lie with some of the espoused underpinnings of the project. First, sociology seems to be an espoused underlying concept, but I read little that is actually sociological in nature. Most of what you're doing is still at the individual or psychological level – cognition, learning. Most of the methods seem directed in a psychological fashion. Even though there are methods that could be sociological in nature (focus groups, network analysis), I still think you're dealing with psychology and not sociology.

- The term psychological was added to the title as well as to each of the objectives. The writing team agrees with the reviewer that much of what we suggest is psychological in nature. However, we hesitate to remove the sociological verbiage completely as we believe individual psychology impacts the sociological conversation and the adoption decision-making process that ultimately leads to global decisions, especially those in the political realm.

The second is a caution. You use cognitive styles and learning styles somewhat interchangeably. I think you'll want to ensure you've teased out those pieces well as there are some who have serious concerns about learning styles, depending on how they are operationalized. It would be helpful to build a stronger case on why we would expect relationships or interactions between learning or cognitive styles and decision making related to your objectives.

- Verbiage was added to delineate between cognitive style and learning style and to build a stronger case as to why we believe the two are related but individual concepts and should be tested as such. The development of the theoretical model will assist in this delineation.

Reviewer #2 Comments

TITLE: I would recommend that the authors consider strengthening the TITLE of this proposal, specifically the word "UNDERSTANDING." Although this project appears to be foundational in its approach, which would entail "discovery" of findings not yet researched, I question whether "understanding" is a strong enough verb, if the project moves forward. The authors should consider finding another verb that better describes what they are trying to accomplish.

- The title was changed to "Exploring the Psychological and Sociological Dimensions…" to insinuate the discovery of new information.

LITERATURE REVIEW ON CULTURE: I believe this needs to be strengthened. The authors spend considerable space in the proposal to describe decision making and problem solving, but there is little space provided about CULTURE and what is meant by culture. (Yes, there is a lengthy citation list of previous research on *culture*, but I think the authors may wish to provide some balance in the literature review narrative on "culture.")

- Further description of culture was added to the Introduction and literature review to bring in verbiage from the citations rather than just having them included.
- Reasoning behind the need for culture as a part of the project was added including increased urbanization and the differences in social structures due to immigration and ethnic/racial diversity increasing across the U.S.
- A paragraph was added to define culture and provide justification for inclusion of culture in the project.

NEW TECHNOLOGIES AND PRACTICES: Several times, the authors mention "new technologies and practices" (including the first objective), but it would be helpful if the authors provided an example of what they mean. There are many different technologies and practices. Do the authors have in mind any specific ones that this proposal will address?

- Examples of new technologies and practices were included throughout where this is mentioned to give the reader an understanding of some of the areas of inquiry in non-formal settings.
- A paragraph was added in the related, current and previous work section to highlight a specific example of a technology adoption in formal education.

OUTREACH PLAN: I found this to be the portion of the proposal which may need strengthening. The authors mention more about "outreach" in the METHODS section than they do in the OUTREACH PLAN. (Examples: Describing that findings will be presented at conferences and via extension publications or journal articles.) I would recommend that the authors consider addressing "outreach" more in the OUTREACH PLAN section. Also, I would encourage the authors to consider thinking beyond a "traditional" *academic* outreach plan (journal articles, extension publications, academic paper presentations). I believe this project could benefit from an outreach plan that encompasses perhaps curriculum or a website that could present some of the findings/recommendations from this project for more of a lay audience.

- Details on how the project will result in strategic multi-state curriculum was added.
- Details about the website were included in the outreach plan rather than in just the timeline, as well as shared resources and data, to show how the collaborative project will add to the whole rather than each faculty member working as individuals.

Reviewer #3 Comments

The reviewer noted the intent to determine "how cognitive style impacts undergraduate students . . . ." Why not graduate students, as well? They are more likely to hold leadership positions sooner and, thus, be positioned to influence their respective organizations in directions the research points toward.

- Graduate students were added as a population of interest to address this concern.

I wonder about the appropriateness of "focus group interviews" versus personal interviews on issues and related views involving "culture." Some members "self-silencing" depending on the composition of such groups and the issues raised appears likely.

- Key informant interviews were added in addition to focus group interviews to ensure both approaches are included and will make for a more comfortable working/sharing environment for those that may be uncomfortable sharing in a group setting.