

	<b>Participants / Discipline</b>	<b>Problem Definition</b>	<b>Research Style</b>	<b>Presentation of Findings</b>	<b>Examples from EHH Research</b>
<b>Multidisciplinary</b>	Two or more disciplines	Same question but different paradigm <u>OR</u> different but related questions	“Parallel play” Combines rather than integrates different expertises.	Separate publications by participants from each discipline	The THESEUS approach (Zanuttigh, 2011)
<b>Interdisciplinary</b>	Two or more distinct academic fields	Described / defined in language of at least two fields, using multiple models or intersecting models	Drawn from more than one, with multiple data sources and varying analysis of same data, Some integration demonstrated.	Shared publications, with language intelligible to all involved fields	The ADAPTE project (Romero-Lankao et al., 2012)
<b>Transdisciplinary</b>	Two or more distinct academic fields	Stated in new language or theory that is broader than any one discipline.	Fully synthesized methods and ideas, which may result in creation of new conceptual frameworks.	Shared publications, probably using at least some new language developed for translation across traditional lines	(Mutero et al., 2004)

**Table 1:** Characteristics of Multidisciplinary, Interdisciplinary, and Transdisciplinary Research in Environment and Human Health (adapted from Aboelela et al., 2007)

	<b>Positivism</b> <i>“Hard science” researchers</i>	<b>Postpositivism</b> <i>A modified form of postpositivism</i>	<b>Interpretive</b> <i>Gain understanding by interpreting subject perceptions</i>
<b>Basic Beliefs of Alternative Inquiry Paradigms</b>			
<b>Ontology</b> <i>The worldviews and assumptions in which</i>	Belief in a single identifiable reality. Reality can be measured and studied.	Recognize that nature can never be fully understood. There is a single reality, but we cannot be	Assumes that reality as we know it is constructed in an intersubjective manner through

<i>researchers operate in their search for new knowledge</i> (Schwandt, 2007)		able to fully understand what it is or how to get at it.	the meanings and understandings developed socially and experientially.
<b>Epistemology</b> <i>The relationship between the researcher and that being researched.</i>	Belief in objectivity. There is no reason to interact with who or what we study.	Assume we can only approximate nature. Interaction with research subjects should be kept to a minimum.	Research findings are the creation of the process of interaction between researcher and researched.
<b>Nature of knowledge</b> <i>How researchers view the knowledge that is generated.</i>	Evidence is provided to support a hypothesis, which can be generalized to form laws.	There is a single, correct truth, which may have multiple hidden values and variables that prevent ever fully knowing the answer.	The belief that people construct their own knowledge of reality and meanings based on their interactions with surroundings.
<b>Methodology</b> <i>What is the process of research?</i>	Belief in the scientific method and falsification principle. Value data produced by studies that can be replicated.	There is an attempt to ask more questions than positivists because of the unknown variables involved in research.	Rely heavily on naturalistic methods (interviewing, observation, analysis of existing texts).
<b>Goodness or quality criteria.</b> <i>How researchers judge the quality of inquiry</i>	Rigorous data produced through scientific method.	Statistical confidence level and objectivity in data produced.	Intersubjective agreement and reasoning reached through dialogue, shared conversation and construction.

**Table 2:** Themes of Knowledge. Adapted from Lincoln, Lynham & Guba (2011). We acknowledge that other paradigms do exist (e.g. Critical Paradigm, Participatory Paradigm), but due to space limitations we focus in this paper on the three most prominent.