File 20090623.0004: David Strudwick would like to be an interviewee.

Notes from lunch with Dr Chris Hinds:

- The department will not cut you off if you always look as if you're about to finish your DPhil. It is possible to finish a DPhil in  $3.5\,\mathrm{yr^{123}}$ . (I wonder what footnote commands with a space between them look like?<sup>4</sup> <sup>5</sup> <sup>6</sup>)
- It's fine to take more than 3 years, so long as you're always showing progress. If you ever completely stop showing progress, then yes, they'll kick you out.
- I described my research. He agreed that not enough failures get published. What are your source materials? I described my three case studies: one negative, one positive, and one experimental.
- We talked about different supervisor styles. A DPhil student needs to really drive his own research. The DPhil supervisor is more there as a resource than anything.
- We discussed the differences between US and UK doctoral programmes.
- He opined that my research plan sounds totally doable.
- Later, I talked with Grace de la Flor about my research. We talked about differences in supervisor styles between Dr Martin and Dr Jirotka (her supervisor). Grace is about a term ahead of me. Our assessors gave both of us kind of a hard time in our transfer vivas. Grace sympathises with being an old grey grad student. She wanted to know why I would move back. I explained that (a) I am out of funds, (b) the people I need to interview are in New York, Colorado, and Washington, D.C., and (c) I can't do those interviews remotely. I have to visit their sites. Why not just send Andrea and Miranda home? I can't. ATL doesn't want to leave Oxford either.

## References

- [1] R. M. Ritter. New Hart's Rules. Oxford University Press, 1 edition, 2005. (included in [?]).
- [2] Lynne Truss. Eats, Shoots & Leaves: The Zero Tolerance Approach to Punctuation. Profile, London, 2003.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>I couldn't use 'SI' here for some reason. I would like to use 'SI' to get nice cdot-style decimal points.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Does this (3.5 in plain text) or this (3.5 in math mode) or this (3.5 math mode with an explicit cdot) look better?

<sup>3</sup>Did LATEX separate the footnote numbers with commas? I put them in the source contiguously, with no spaces between them

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Let's find out.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>This is another footnote that was separated from the first one by a space. Did LATEX concatenate them for display?

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>By the way—and here's another test—this footnote was put outside the terminating punctuation mark on the preceding sentence. Does it look better than a footnote put before the terminating punctuation? See the *New Hart's Rules* [1] and *Eats, Shoots, and Leaves* [2] for the correct answer.