Supplemental material

for 'From self-tracking to self-expertise: The production of self-related knowledge by doing personal science', published in *Public Understanding of Science*, DOI: 10.1177/0963662519888757

Nils B. Heyen, Fraunhofer ISI

1. Interview guide

The interviews with self-trackers were conducted as non-standardised, qualitative in-depth interviews. That means that only three rough thematic blocks were determined and definitely addressed in each interview. Within these blocks, not every single question mentioned in the guide below was explicitly asked. Rather, the conversation followed quite naturally the focal points that the interviewees set in their own statements and answers. However, the interviewer made sure that all key issues of each thematic block had been covered at the end of the whole conversation.

A) Type of knowledge

1) What are you currently tracking?
2) Did you track anything in the past, but later stopped it? Why?
3) Let's take a concrete example:
   - How did it come about that you started this self-tracking activity or project?
   - What was your approach?
   - How did/does the data collection and analysis work?
   - What have the results told you, until now? What conclusions have you drawn?
   - Based on that, did you change your behaviour in one way or the other?
   - How would you characterise the insights or knowledge you gained?
   - How, if applicable, has your perception of yourself or your body changed?
   - To what extent do you trust in your data, analysis, and conclusions?

B) Role of science

4) Let's keep focusing on your concrete tracking example:
   - In what way, if any, is science relevant for your self-tracking?

- In what way, if any, has scientific knowledge played a role?
- In what way, if any, have scientific methods been applied?
- How important are scientific quality criteria for your self-tracking? *[e.g., reliability, validity, objectivity]*

5) In general, in what way is science relevant for your other self-tracking activities?
6) Have you ever discussed your tracking activities with a professional scientist or researcher? *[Or doctor?]* If yes, what was it like?

C) Networking, communication and knowledge exchange

7) Again considering your example:
   - With whom did you talk about it? *[With your doctor?]*
   - Is it relevant for you only or also for others?
   - Have you ever presented it in public?
   - If yes, how would you characterise the discussions?
8) How are you connected to the QS community?
9) How important are your tracking peers to you? To what extent do you learn from your tracking peers?
10) Do you think that you have a specific reputation within the QS community? Do you know others who are known for a specific theme or approach? Do you aspire to gain reputation within the community?

2. Sequential analysis: guiding principles of interpretation

The transcribed interviews with self-trackers were systematically analysed using the method of *objective hermeneutics* as one type of sequential analysis (for details see Maiwald, 2005: section 4.2; online available at: http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/21/45). The following list of guiding principles of interpretation is not to be misunderstood as complete or sufficient instruction to apply the method in a proper way (for that purpose see, e.g., Wernet, 2000, cited in Maiwald, 2005). At best, it can give a rough impression of the approach's 'spirit'. The list represents more or less the compilation of general 'regulative maxims' of sequential analysis by Maiwald (2005: paragraphs 5-6), added by some more specific principles of objective hermeneutics (Wernet, 2000, cited in Maiwald, 2005).

- The empirical material or data to be analysed should not be processed beforehand (i.e. paraphrased, arranged, classified etc.).

- According to the principle of *sequentiality*, meaning structures should be discovered following the line of the actual interaction process. This means not only proceeding "line-by-line" but to discover the way the actions and reactions are selectively "linked together".

- In addition, the interpretation should be, to a large extent, a *text immanent interpretation*. That means that the text or data is not to be subsumed under preconceived theories about the interaction process considered. It also implies that interaction sequences should not be interpreted with recourse to sequences occurring later in the text.

- Adding to that, the principle of *context independence* means that previous knowledge about the specific context or case, which has not been gained from the analysis itself, may only be included after a context-independent explication of meaning.

- Furthermore, according to the principle of *literalism*, the material or text to be analysed is to be taken literally and in this sense "seriously", even in the case of possible contradictions or supposed (speaking) errors.

- The principle of *extensiveness* requires the consideration of all text elements, including those that may seem unimportant or irrelevant at first glance. It also refers to the formation of alternative readings, which should also be extensive, i.e. as exhaustive as possible.

- However, the principle of *sparingness* requires that only those (alternative) readings are considered for the aspired reconstruction of meaning structures that do not need any long-winded additional assumptions and that are actually covered by the concrete utterance(s) at hand.