So I answered the survey thinking about a piece of work that I did in the past, in the recent past, not the data related work that I do now, which is a bit more complex. So I think it's easier if I just stick with the project that I talked to you about in the survey if that's okay with you. So, in terms of methods, I'm never entirely sure what's in scope when people ask about methods, but basically, for this project, it was my PhD project and I was using semi-structured, participant-focused inquiry. So it was influenced by grounded theory, epistemologically, but it wasn't grounded theory. I was just thinking about that method of building theory from the data as I went forward, and yeah, the actual method was, as I say, participant focused semi structured interviews. There was some observation as well, but that wasn't the main focus of the data gathering, that was supplementary.

I used NVivo.

So, I was thinking about grounded theory, and I was thinking about how you build theory from data. So basically, what I first did was I did descriptive coding in the first round. And so, I basically followed Lynn Richards's guidance in her book about handling qualitative data, which made a lot of sense for my work. So descriptive coding was the first phase, and that's basically putting in the, identifying each case that I was talking about and identifying descriptive information and adding that to the cases and thinking very carefully about what was important and respectful for me to gather from participants. I think if you, if you're trying to be respectful, of people's identity or their individuality, or maybe you're doing something sensitive, I wasn't working with sensitive questions. But I think it's good to only gather what you need. So I was very careful to not gather anything that I didn't consider necessary. So descriptive coding is, as you know, gender identity, age bracket, personal name, family name, unless they've chosen to be anonymous. I asked them the country they were currently based in, so I was looking at the four nations of the UK, so like, are you based in Scotland? Are you in Wales? Are you in England? or whatever. Also, I ask them whether they were formally trained or self taught. So my participants were artists. And whether you're trained or not, is an important disambiguator of people's practice in that community, so I asked them that. I also asked them the country in which they trained, if that was something that they had done. And then in my second phase, I did topic coding. So that's the really time-consuming stuff, you know, where you're going through the transcript and you're identifying the phrases and you're looking for the topics. And that's, that took me weeks and weeks and weeks and weeks and weeks. I had no idea how time-consuming that was until I did it. And the third phase for me was analytical coding. So I was trying to move up from the data. So again, following Richards's work about analytical coding. You're trying to move up from the data, you're trying to identify ideas across the dataset. So the different cases like what recurs across different cases. And then from that, I got some theories and ideas to work with. And once I had those theories, and I was thinking about, okay, moving up from what the participants actually said, what am I constructing from that? What am I extracting from that data? What were the ideas that I'm going to talk about in the thesis, because it was a PhD thesis. So yeah, I just followed Richards and did it that way. And it was participant focused, and I don't know if this is the right time to talk about that. But for me, it was really important. I was thinking about grounded theory, I read a little bit about it, and I thought this is a really nice way of respecting where people, meeting people where they are, meeting the participants where they are. And then I thought, Well, my department was unhappy with me trying to use a grounded theory approach. So I said, you know, what I'm going to do is be participant focused. So I'm going to allow the participants, or encourage the participants, because I'm not in charge, so I'm not allowing them - supporting them to lead me. I've got these questions I want to ask, so it's a semi-structured interview. And I want to cover those questions. But if they push back on those questions, that's fine. I know that I try, and describe that respectfully. And if they've got other things they think are more important to talk about then that's what we talk about. So that's how we've refined and defined the process going forward as the interviews commenced. I did 40 altogether, I used 37. And I went pretty far with the participant-focused [approach], the only thing I didn't include was, em, when I was sexually harassed during an interview. And I know women researchers face this a lot and it's not captured enough in the reporting. We get a lot of crap to deal with, and so I used that as a way of you know, I discounted people who did that. I thought, well, you know, that's too far for me. I'm going to make that decision as a researcher to not include that material. But everything else, if people said 'oh those questions don't work for me' or 'why are you asking me about this?' That all went into the thesis, that was fine. I just didn't put the harassment in.

So my work is interdisciplinary. So it doesn't sit in one discipline. So it was between [an art school] and [an interdisciplinary department focused on the social science of the Internet]. So they got money for a project and advertised and they said to me, what's your project? You know, define a project you want to do that will bring together these two disciplines, so creative arts on the one hand, and it depends how you define the [other department] because they're interdisciplinary already. For me, it was information science, and digital literacy. So those two areas - information science and digital literacy - plus the creative arts. So I work as an artist and a researcher. So I have studio experience, but I also have research experience. So for me, I was situating myself in these two areas of knowledge and translating case by case. So some people I spoke to in the art world were extremely technologically thoughtful and knowledgeable. And other artists had no idea what the hell I was talking about! And so it was about translating and tuning the language to make sure that I was getting the information that I needed from them and to do my best to ensure they understood the question and could give me a useful answer. So that's partly why the interviews were so long. Some of them were five hours long. That was my longest one, about five and a half hours, the shortest one was about 90 minutes. So they were quite intense experiences. It was a lot of fun. I loved it. I really loved it. I miss doing it.

When you say 'using', do you mean using somebody else's or creating it?

I see what you mean. I looked for, I did a dataset search with the help of the data librarian and tried to find data that was on my topic, and the nearest data resources I could find were ... [from] mixed methods, I would say. So they were UK government's statistical data with a narrative, textual narrative, about the creative industries. But there was nobody sharing or creating data that I could find directly talking to artists and gathering their experiences of working with digital information. So that's what I was asking them about. What the role of digital information in their practice is. So it wasn't digital artists. It was artists of all media, and painters, sculptors, you know, everybody, and I was asking them how they use information from the Internet. So it's a pretty specific interdisciplinary connection, you know, there's not many people working in this space. So, I have very limited experience of reusing somebody else's qual [data] in this project that I'm talking about. I did another project earlier than this where we were observing people doing information tasks. And we were a very small team. There were three of us, and we were interviewing people and then asking them to perform certain tasks and using other people's qual, very raw qual data, from that experience made me think a lot about how important it is to make your data transparently documented so that it is reusable. And then when I did my PhD, I got a chance to dig into this a bit more. And I started looking at the work from Golafshani, about how you constitute reliability and validity in qual work, and I was really pleased that somebody else looked at this in a lot of detail, you know, and she's put a lot of effort into thinking about how you make qual clear, valid, transparent, high quality and I loved her framework of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. I thought, this is really cool. Because some quant-focused people don't tend to get what qual is about, they don't seem to understand how difficult it is to do well. And in my current role, […] when we want to put a survey out, I say can you please send it to me and I'll make sure that you've got a good question flow, I'll check whether the questions makes sense so they're answerable, that they triangulate, you know that you're giving people the options they need to respond well, and that you're there to support them when they don't understand it. You know, these things are all really important for good quality qual, as you know. I don't know if that really answers the question, but you were, you're talking about comparing it to quant, that's my experience of comparing it to quant [methods], which is that we all know as qual researchers that quant work needs a certain set of knowledge to do well, but I find that some quant people don't seem to understand how rigorous qualitative work has to be, to be good quality.

I think it's only good quality research practice. I mean, if you're making work in any method or discipline that you don't want other people to scrutinize, then there's a problem, in my view. You know, you should be doing any research you do in the knowledge that somebody else can, and should, be looking at it. And so you should be documenting your decisions. You should be being as transparent as possible. You should be doing that wonderful thing people do in qual work, but not in quant, which is to document your biases and your positioning, so people know where you're coming from and what's important to you, and you know where you're starting from. I think open work is the only way that we improve as scientists and as researchers.

I mean, I mentioned in the survey that I had a slightly unusual situation. [Where I used to work], a lot of our work was training people on making your data open. And that was something that I spent my work life doing, and often listening to people saying “I've got an excuse”, And of course our line is always "as open as possible, as closed as necessary". And then when I went to my participant group, there's something specific about artists which is unusual and interesting, which is that everything they spend time on, they want their name on it. They're not interested in spending time on something that doesn't give them some publicity. They can't afford to be - most people in art are on or near the bread line in one way or another. And if they've given me one to five hours of their time, they want credit for that. So I actually got asked a couple times by participants, 'now, are you going to make sure that I'm identified?' Now, what I did, when I interview people, is, I always gave them the consent form beforehand. We have the conversation and then at the end they sign off because they know exactly what they've said and what they're happy making public and what they're not happy with. And this is to empower the participant to feel in control of what's being shared. Now, anybody I had who was even slightly worried about disclosure, I sent the text actually to everybody who participated anyway, other than the harassers, obviously. And I asked them to confirm what was - what they had said. And I drew their attention to the bits that they were being quoted directly. Now they told me all kinds of stuff in interviewS that they wouldn't want made public, things like legal problems, financial difficulties, relationship difficulties, and I just didn't record that. I made my own decision there. I was like, 'I'm not going to put this into the dataset because I want to make this open.' And no matter what, even if they tell me, 'I want to be identified', if this could cause some legal problems then I'm making a judgement call there and I'm willing to take responsibility for that judgement call. So anything that named individuals or companies or talked about something that I considered sensitive, I just didn't put the transcript and I told them this. I said, “I'm not going to put that bit in the transcript” and they're like, “Okay.” And so for me, I've done quite a heavy job in my view of taking out stuff that could be problematic but there was still an issue about making this dataset available because it named people, it identified individuals. Now I understand that policy should spend most of the time protecting people. I get that and I respect it and I used to teach it so I'm fully aware of what, what those reasons are. But still, if you're working in sensitive areas, you know, if you're talking about sexual behaviour, drug use, illegal activities, etc., then it's really important that these people can't be even accidentally identified. But when you have a participant group like artists who really want their name on everything, we run into a bit of a culture shock, you know, there's a clash. And so I haven't been able to find a way around this problem. And I've asked many people who are big names in the policy field. And they're like, 'Oh, that's interesting. I never thought about that.' And you think well, this is, this is partly why it's good to work with artists because they can bring in a different set of assumptions and desires to this work. So that was the problem I ran into. And it's an interesting problem. I love how it shows up a lot of stuff around data and the complexity of qual work. So I think it's a nice problem to have in a way but also it means that I'm an open data advocate and this particular dataset is not open and I feel weird about that. But then it's as open as possible, as closed as necessary. That's where I am with it. It's closed at the moment. Because I don't know how to solve this problem.

Not yet. And maybe what I should do is deposit it, but explain why - or attempt to - I can't just deposit it because I want to. I can maybe reach out to someone like UKDA and have a conversation with them about it. The conversations I've had so far have been with academic staff in that institution for that project, and also repository staff at that institution. But I'm not saying you know, it's anyone else's doing, it's my problem to solve, I'm just asking for advice on it. Yeah, it's funny, isn't it? It's like the opposite problem from usual.

Yeah, loads. Most, mostly cultural, I would say. The technical challenges are amenable to solution with a bit of focus and some funding, but it's the cultural challenges in my view that are [a] difficulty for example. A lot of people in the data policy field and data training field are very focused on training new researchers, junior researchers, and you know, like graduate students and so on, and of course, I understand and respect that is important. But if you're going to undergo training as a new researcher, as an early career researcher, as a graduate student, and you're getting all this really great training about open data, and how it's important and it's about high quality research and data sharing is a good thing and so on. And then you go back to your lab or your office and your supervisor's like, 'over my dead body', then what do you do? People have to listen to their PI, people have to listen to their supervisor, and the house style of how this is done. And I've worked in three different universities in different data-related teams and I've seen how people act and what resources are available. The house style is determined by the senior academics, the PIs, and people that set the policy in-house. So the cultural things are really important and pretty difficult. And also, there's a huge amount of misunderstanding about what open data actually is. And I feel like the message 'as open as possible, as closed as necessary', sometimes gets ignored [or is not well enough understood], and people try and over-characterize [data sharing], out of panic, out of fear, out of whatever it is, insecurity. And they try and - I've been in meetings where this has happened again and again - people say, Oh, but we can't afford to keep everything and I don't want to keep everything and where will I even put it and why have I got to pay for it and all this kind of stuff. And so there's still for me, there's a lack of fundamental understanding about what open data means and how we achieve it, and how we use it to make our research better, and the drivers and the benefits for it, the way that it increases your exposure in the community, the way that it makes your publications more frequently cited, the way that it makes you a better scientist because you're thinking as you go, 'right, how do I explain this to an intelligent, interested, *dis*interested colleague? How do I explain my biases, my process, the steps of analysis, how I got to my conclusions?' If you can set that out and share your data as part of that setting-out, then you're making a much more powerful statement than just publishing a paper. I don't think papers are the important bit of science at all. I think papers are a Class B output, to be honest. I think the data set is really important. And I think that the dataset and data papers about the dataset need to be a lot more commonplace. And I believe that we need to get out of this madness of the [academic] publishing industry and get on with proper science to be honest.

There's so many directions you could go with this. I mean, we need to attack it from all sides, don't we? We need to continue with training and advocacy. We need to make sure that the funders are very clear, whoever the funders might be, they're very clear that this needs to be funded and needs to be funded well. We need to set out the benefits of open research of all kinds, not just qual. I think I mean, I wish I could find some way to help other parts of the research community understand qual better. There's not some kind of death-match between qual and quant; the message for me is that you use the right tool for the job. And sometimes that tool is a quantitative method. And sometimes it's a qual method and the only good method is the one that fits the job you're trying to do. And I would love to know some way of sustaining and supporting and encouraging people working in qual and using qualitative methods better so that those ethical and bias related and positional pieces of work that qual make you do are more widely adopted. And I think that would help a lot with making the data more widely available, because qualitative researchers would feel more a part of the data conversation. There's still a tendency as far as I can see way too widely for people in qualitative areas - I mean areas that often use qualitative methods: humanities, arts and so on - to see themselves as outside that conversation about open data. And then they're not and they shouldn't be. This is not about making new laws for people or making their work more difficult. It's about fostering a sense of being colleagues and working together to improve each other's work and building trust in academia, which God knows it needs. So yeah, I think qual has a lot to offer. So I'd like to see the data coming out of qualitative work more widely available. And I'd like to see systematic support for that. But yeah, I don't know what the magic wands are other than support, training, cultural change, positive messaging, more work and evidence gathering about the benefits of this would be helpful.

Let me see if I've got anything here about ethical approval, because it's so long ago that I did it. I mean, we've talked a bit about this, that the ethical considerations for me were around 'how do I do justice to my participants' preferences?' And I've got a little bit here, which I'll read to you. It's a footnote in my methods chapter which I wanted to share with you: "As part of my commitment to validity I shared material where I'd named or quoted an artist with that artist at the end of the writing process. The most critical feedback I received in return was that I had not included as many quotes from them as they had hoped. This is an interesting example of how assumptions around ethics and consent in qualitative research do not always cater for all participant communities." So I think that's the main thing I have to say about that. I can send you that in an email if that's helpful.

Trying to think if there's any way that either supports or frustrates - I don't really see a relationship, maybe I'm just not seeing it. I don't see a direct relationship between the two. I mean it was participant-focused, I suppose. So what the participants wanted was for me to disclose their identities. So it's the same issue again. Going forward with a participant-focused approach gave me a lot of reason to share their names and to make that data available. They wanted as many people as possible to see them, to see their contributions, so I guess it was helpful, ultimately.

I really want to, and yeah, we've we've discussed the issue that's making me hesitant or - it's nothing to do with not wanting to do it, and I fully acknowledge the vulnerability of doing that, and I've made other smaller qualitative data sets available and shared them before but this feels more important. This is a bigger data set with more people impacted by it. And I want to do my best by them. And so there's a vulnerability there for me like “am I going to get this right? Am I going to make mistakes? Am I going to do something that I can't change?” And that for me, [it] has helped me a lot in my day to policy work, because going through the process yourself, you understand how it feels, you know, what the real support is and what the real challenges are. Yeah, so yeah, it's interesting. That is partly why I wanted to resolve it. And doing this interview has, you know, obviously reminded me that this is still on my to do list, to get in touch with, probably UKDA and ask them. I really need to make a decision and get it sorted out. Because what I want is for other people to see this data and to see it as a useful resource alongside the thesis and alongside the set of recommendations that I published. I feel like the data - I hope the data would be useful to other people working in this area, or even people who are just looking for good examples of interdisciplinary work, because there's, that's another sort of cultural issue. A lot of people still see everything in terms of disciplines. And it's very difficult to get interdisciplinary work funded and assessed properly. And advocating about how this can be done, I think can be done effectively through presenting an interdisciplinary dataset, along with its supporting materials. Yeah, so I'm very in favour of it, and I'm, I am working to get this problem solved and I feel kind of embarrassed that it's still hanging about but there we are. It's on my to do list.

I really wanted to, for the project that we've been talking about, and I did a data search. As we discussed earlier, I was really hoping somebody had done this work already so I didn't have to do it. And I challenged the assumption that if we're doing a PhD, we have to go out and gather data. I think that should be the activity of last resort. I think ideally, we reuse data that meets our needs and that is well described and that is interoperable across domains. So I was living in hope, but I wasn't massively surprised given the specificity of my work, and the interdisciplinary nature of the research questions, and the work that I was gonna be doing, I would have been amazed if somebody had done this already. There were, there were some people who had published in adjoining areas, but nobody had published exactly on this area. So there wasn't anybody that I could even follow up with individually and say, “Hey, do you have data on this study that you wrote?” So yeah, I'd be very likely to use it if it was available.

I always use UKDA stuff because I think what they do is excellent. And it's very high quality, it's well written. Naturally, their concern is mostly about protecting people's identity, and making sure that you have attended to the ethical questions around your data gathering. I found their guidance consistently high quality, that's where I go to be honest. Do you use any other resource? For advice? No, not really. I mean, I read a few textbooks about gathering and sharing qual data and I reflected on earlier work that I'd done about it. But if I want to feel I'm up to date, particularly with things around legislation and policy at the national level, I'm going to check somewhere authoritative like UKDA. I'm not going to rely on older work.

…well-described open datasets! That's what we need. Yeah I've heard that's an issue. Well described open datasets. And I think that - I'm not going to say all universities, because obviously I don't know that - but many universities, and research performing institutions in general, have an official position that they train everybody in how to handle data well, and in my experience, unfortunately, that's not actually true. So the training place is extremely important. And needs to be expanded. It needs to be funded, it needs to be more consistent across the research-producing sector. And it needs to be more up-to-date as well. I think that most people who work in training for open data are doing an amazing job. And, it's, you know, it can be a bit of a thankless task. Sometimes it's hard work, and I get it, and I think mostly what people are doing is very, very good quality. But I think often it's not funded enough. And so you have a voluntary course for, for example, the first year of PhDs. It's not mandatory. It's not assessed. It's not part of what you have to do. And yet it's absolutely critical to good research practice. So, why, in my first year of my PhD, I had to sit exams in a whole bunch of different stuff that was nothing to do with my project. And yet all the data training was voluntary. I don't get that. I think that the data training needs to be mandatory. And data librarians can't do it all. I mean, even the best data librarian in the world can't be there for every new researcher, every ECR, every other person who's looking for data [and do all the training as well]. Data librarians are so important, and they're underfunded as well. Everyone's underfunded in education. But I think the data question is not going to go away. So we need to take it more seriously.

Planning the project. Do you mean, how do you mean?

Specifically with reference to the Open Data aspect or the whole thing?

And I went in with a project plan at the interview stage, because that's the work I was doing before I did the PhD, I was a project manager. So I went in with a project plan that detailed my research questions. Why the questions were timely, how I was gonna get access to participants, the kind of questions I was going to ask them, what I was going to do with that data, and the things that I expected to be challenging and things I expected to be okay, and how I was going to handle those risks. So the Open Data aspect was baked in from that point, and that was at the point of application for the funds, not starting the project. And I guess they found something useful in getting a project plan instead of one of those, you know, statements where we're like, I'm interested in the such and such, of such and such. I was like, “this is the question. This is the research question. And this is how I'm going to answer the research question.” And my research question didn't change. I mean, there was pressure put on it at various points, but it didn't change, because I knew the project I wanted to do. I've already done a pilot version of it. So the earlier pilot was with a slightly different set of people. It was about musicians and performance artists. And I tackled the idea of sharing that data and naming people and I ran into the same problems with the ethics process for making people's identities available. So I knew, going into the PhD, that they would be, it'd be a question people would have. But I hoped given the kind of work I've been doing for the years before I started the PhD, that I would have the ability to answer those questions and reassure people that it was okay and I knew I was doing but of course, an institution has a sense of legal responsibility for what it’s students do. So I get there were still questions about the ethics of that, but those questions were in my application process. I mean, that's, that's where I started from. And then when I started doing the project, I just carried that project plan out so there weren't really any surprises and I went into the library and I did a data search with the data librarian and I talked to her about, you know, depositing stuff and how that works. So I raised those questions throughout the process. I'm not really sure how to answer this question other than to say that I was interested in this aspect of it all the way through.

I didn't know that for sure. Because I didn't want to make these assumptions, but I wasn't surprised when it happened.

Let me think. I think it definitely has an a big influence on how I wrote up, because you have to start writing up pretty early to get it done, in my opinion. Like I started in the first year, like tried to draft stuff. And if I had been doing another subject, for example, something sensitive, then I would have thought up, I'd have looked up ways to do anonymization and I would have started with you know, codes or some other anonymisation technique. I wouldn't have maybe gathered people's actual names, maybe if that had been the case, for example. But going into the data gathering, including the pilot phase, I was gathering people's names because I knew that as an artist myself that your name is important to your career. It's important to your work. So I guess it made those sort of quite fundamental impacts on how I went forward with the data gathering.

I suspected some of them but I was trying all the time to be very careful to not take too much of my own bias into the work. I was trying to not assume just because this is how it is for me that's not necessarily how it is for all artists.

Yeah, so it was a really interesting process for me of recognizing that and reflecting on it and going back and forward like, trying to - “oh right, of course they're gonna want to speak in their own studio because they're going to want to show me stuff because people are visual, and they're, they're gonna want to say here, it's this, and this, and this…”

…that kind of thing. But I tried to be open to whatever they wanted to do. And if somebody had said, I don't want my name on this study, then I'd have been like, that's absolutely fine. You know, that's, that's not a problem at all. I wouldn't have insisted on it.

I had one retraction, had one comment retracted, when I sent the material out to everybody. One person had sworn at one point in a very, you know, pithy, funny, charming way. And of course, I put it in because that's what she said. She said, I don't give a fuck about something, and everybody who read the text, loved it and said, “Oh, she sounds amazing. She's so funny. She's really clever. She's got these great ideas.” She's, you know, a very strong person. She's got a big personality and doing that interview was a lot of fun. But then when I sent her the text, just to make sure she was comfortable with it. She said, “Oh, please, can we take the swear out? Because I don't normally talk like that.” I know that's not true, but at the same time I had to respect that and I felt really sad because I love that quote. She was talking about being an older woman as an artist and how you’ve got to stop worrying about what people think, and I loved it, but she she kind of wanted me to change it and so I had to.

I don't know through experience on this project. I mean, I know where to go, to ask for help with locating these things. I did that part, the description of datasets is varied. So what I would like is for qual work to be well described, so that I don't have to go through the application and download process just to see if it's what I need. Yeah, I'd like to know that the description will be clear and will give me enough information that I know, this is the dataset that I need, and I'm going to be able to use it and the variables are going to be well described. You know the factors that are being investigated. I want to know that the method is going to be transparent. So this is why I'm interested in data description and access to things like codebooks, access to things like terminologies and vocabularies that people use - those things would help, so that I know if I'm looking up using term X, and I get returns for that search, that they're also about the same understanding of term x as one that I'm using, so I'm really interested in that part of work. I mean, it would be great to have that sense of confidence when you're looking through a database for datasets to use, that the description will be accurate and full and will use recognized terminology.

Yes, so in different parts of research, particularly this whole idea of everything being in domains, we have a lot of terms that we use within our - if we're working within one domain, which many researchers now don't - but that's another question. If you're working in one domain, there's a set agreement around what certain terms mean. I mean, a great example is 'open'. Now, we're both using the term 'open' here. And we're assuming a shared understanding of that term, but other people have different understandings of what open research is and what Open Data is and how open is open? And is it the same as FAIR? Is it the same as, you know, open science? So there's many terms in research that people assume they're talking about the same thing, and they're actually not. They're talking about different sets of assumptions or qualities. So one of the things I do in my current job is I work on a terminology for research data, and it's something that is an international project and we're trying to make sure that the community feeds into and this is one of the reasons I care about this is my own experience of trying to wade through data description thinking, “I don't know what this person means. They're using term x, but they're not using it in a way that makes sense to my understanding of term x. So is it worth me downloading this dataset? Is it about something completely different?” I mean, working in the areas that I worked in for the PhD, I was working with texts and with policy around information and documentation. And those terms have myriad definitions, you know, they're all highly contested - people in the information sciences space, you know, are very interested in defending their own definition of 'knowledge', their own definition of 'information', their own definition of 'data'. And this can go on forever when you're trying to wade through that literature. So I think the terminologies are really helpful if we start to use or are aware of those semantic artefacts we can better describe in an interoperable way, key terms to make sense across domains so that more people could find the datasets they're looking for and reuse them or at least know if they're reusable so that's why I'm working on this terminology to make sure that helps. And I can send you more about the terminology if you're interested. You're going to get so many emails. I do loads of these so I understand.

Yeah, it allows us to increase trust with each other. Not with academia in itself, but to build a sense that we're working together to make the world better as researchers. And you know, it's, we need to be able to work together more instead of always thinking about competition.

It's a lot easier. Yeah, I should have done this for the PhD. I typed everything out by hand and this was a real waste of time.

It's lots of work to do well, and this is what people don't see about qual when they don't do it. They don't see how much work is to do that quality description and attend to those issues in a careful way. It's so much work. So all credit to you for having done it in the first place. You know, it's a huge project.