Speaker 0: So, thank you so much for coming and for taking the time to be part of our focus group discussion. Our aim of this focus group discussion is twofold. We would like to identify first things that you find difficult in research processes and research publishing. And then we would like to talk about ways in which, how a tool would need to look like for you to enhance, make your practices more effective, and make the publishing at the end nicer. I would like to talk about this a bit more, and how can we present things for different audiences. But the end goal for today is to come up with something that then; a lot of the times, we have all heard of OSF, reflexivity practices, all of these things. But often they feel like they're an add-on. They don't enhance our quality of work. They don't streamline our processes. They all seem to be something we have to do at the end of the work we already do. Our goal here is to find ways to make modular thinking in the research process and in the publishing process into something that is not an add-on. So we want to know from you, as someone who has done research, who has published and written, or has written for publications, very different to writing a course paper, as we know, right? So you are our experts in this process. And we would like to brainstorm together with you on how we could achieve something that would be practical as well as beneficial. So I have prepared a few different ways of thinking about this. And we will pick up on what we talked already before, because we covered a lot of these things.

Alright, so first we would like to identify a few things that you would feel hinder your practice. If you think about the research process as it is, what kind of barriers are there for you that would prevent you from presenting your research processes transparently to others? Barriers in the sense of if you would want to, for example, have reflexivity in there. If you think about reflexivity, probably already when you start with research idea, discussions, all of these things, what would prevent you from sharing that with other researchers throughout the publication process, for example?

Speaker 1: I couldn't get the question, actually. Sorry.

Speaker 0: It's all good. We're here for a while already. So thinking about the research stages that we identified before, right? And how to be reflective about our personality as researchers in it. If you wanted to be transparent about that in the paper, what would prevent you from doing that? Or do you feel like you can give it adequate space at the moment in the paper?

Speaker 1: By transparency you mean that reflecting on various processes that one went through in collecting data or like for example talking to a colleague and then presenting it as it is in the paper. Are you talking about that?

Speaker 0: I think right now more on reflexivity as a reflective practice for researchers on our positionality. So transparency on who we are, how we affect our work.

Speaker 2: So who we are as persons and the kind of values and ideas and biases, everything that we carry.

Speaker 0: For example, yeah.

Speaker 2: You're seeing how does that affect or translate into our research, but then what hinders showing that to the audience?

Speaker 0: Yeah. Do you feel that that's the case?

Speaker 2: Ah interesting. Well, as far as I understand, I think there are many aspects of my thought process. For beginning, I don't know if by the end of what I end up writing on the paper and by the end of the time when I finalize that, okay, I am satisfied with what I've written now and this can go ahead. I think there are a lot of ideas that get lost in transition. And I don't think that I also keep track of what I was thinking, even though that might be very useful and propelling in the journey of thinking towards coming to an idea and be satisfied with it. Yeah, I think I end up losing a lot. Because it's all here [tips on head], not really writing all of that. If I were to be writing, maybe I could have had you know, smaller notes. Yeah, and I think at the end, probably I also feel that the process is, I'm not sure if my audience is interested in the process, but rather in the outcome. And it also depends.

So giving you a very, very small example of a very recent thing, just returned from a paper presentation and put in a lot of effort to write a ten page paper that I had to present within half an hour.

And it was extremely focused. We were part of the research group and what is expected of us was already told to us. And they were just given four points, you have to ensure that everything is done and nothing here and there. So I think when those things are pre-decided and when I know that in the kind of setting I am, I think that's what is the focus. And if I go astray, maybe what I'm really trying to say will not be even paid attention to. I'm not like that, because I've done a lot of hard work for my research. Eventually, the result becomes important, rather than the process. And I don't feel that in the entire research process, who I am as a person or what I have, or what constitutes my thought process is probably not as important for my audience to know.

Maybe if they do, I think I will be much more comfortable to tell them about this after I feel confident about my publication or the kind of data that I'm putting out there or whatever analysis or whatever I'm putting out there. I think then if I see that my audience is really interested, then they can know the other aspects and maybe I can bring them forth later

in formative writing.

Speaker 0: So you feel that for you there's two ways, like on one hand you feel the need to present yourself in a specific light, but you also feel like you would like to share some processes, but you don't feel like you have the tools to do so?

Speaker 2: Maybe, yeah, in a way, as in from a practical point of view, how much am I able to keep track of how I'm thinking or what I'm thinking. Maybe yes, I do not have tools for it. I use very simple tools, just like writing on a paper. And many a times it happens that I am making many, many side notes. So I scribble limitlessly on a paper. And I am not really going back to those smaller notes. But those smaller notes are my main thought processes. And I'm not really paying attention to it. Eventually, I'm jumping onto something else. So yeah, I think maybe the lack of a tool over there is maybe preventing me.

Speaker 0: Do you think that also like maybe a structured approach to collect, to record these thought processes could also help? So it doesn't have to be a tool, but it could also be a technique?

Speaker 2: Yeah, that would be goo. I'm not aware of anything of that sort right now.

So the most familiar method for me to ‘be loud in my thinking’ is to either discuss my thought processes with my colleagues or to write down just the way I'm thinking. But as I said, I'm not very efficient when I'm writing it down because I'm not picking up the semantics. I'm only picking up the main parts of it. That's how it unfolds for me.

Speaker 0: How is it for you?

Speaker 1: Actually, when she was talking about various things, I was thinking that how do... Like, we have to contextualize the writing itself between institutions. You were writing in a university setup, you were writing for a journal, you were writing for an NGO, you were writing for a funding agency, and writing changes. And how do you present also changes. And most of these spaces do not allow, except for certain disciplines, where for example psychology or psychoanalysis, where the self of the writer becomes important. But apart from that, I don't think that any discipline allows for that kind of a space for a personal bias or... In fact, bias has been, as far as I have read, biases are not good for research, isn't it? Positivist research mostly talks about it. So, it is how impersonal, for even in anthropology, like, when you are in the field, you can write about your own... Meloni Vesky fiasco happened only when his diary came out, isn't it? So that was the platform we were talking about. As XXX was talking, how many things that we write in our diaries ultimately do not translate into paper. But if those thoughts are made public, what happens? And this is where again the question of ethic committee and academic ethics and everything comes into picture. So I don't know... I don't know that I want to write or not because I have never thought; because I am part of that structure. I have been trained in that structure. I have been stopped so many times to transgress that line that my mind does not think about it. The first line of work is to defend, to be circumcised by the idea that there are laws around it. So where you can put your data, what you can write, what you cannot write, where you can write, all those things come into picture. So it is a very complex question that you are asking basically for me to answer. So I don't think that there is any easy answer. But one thing that I can say that most of these institutional spaces where this creative writing, so-called creative writing happens, does not allow creativity or spaces for creativity. Because creativity comes from very personal space. Even data is how they are analyzed and presented. There are anthropologists I have read who write like a novel and they are criticized by mainstream anthropologists that it is not academic enough. Or what about the idea of literature itself? Writing in literature is so psychoanalytic. But the psychoanalysis discipline will never accept that. So I'm just trying to say that there are difficulties. Now you have to be a rebellion in order to change things. So if that is the case, the point of rebellion is this piece, I think, which allows for your personal biases and your personality to come into writing. Otherwise, I don't think that the current platforms allow it.

Speaker 0: So it's more of a systemic issue for you?

Speaker 1: Yeah.

Speaker 0: Could it be that if we create a space, for example, that would allow for that, what would you like it to look like? Are there certain... We talked about it not being too limited in what it allows you to do, right? So how would that look like? Creative space that would allow for this reflection?

Speaker 1: I think it would be very interesting because it would not just talk about the linearity that we talked about in the beginning. It will tell a person who is looking at it that okay, the research is with the answers, the simple answer that we are looking for is not so simple. Okay, so you have to go into; that person will be able to see my biases in there, that person will be able to contextualize me as well as the researcher. Like, okay, who is this person? Where are the biases? The position where I can be criticized, I cannot hide within the arguments or literature or anywhere. So I will be more open to criticism as well. Okay, so... I don't know how that space will work, but I think that it will allow the reader to peep into the mind of the writer itself. That's how the person is thinking. And perhaps also teach how to think. Because currently, if I read a paper, it teaches me how to structure. It gives me, for example, when you give this task of looking at things [exercise in the workshop], what I did was very interesting. If you see this.

Speaker 0: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Mine looked the same.

Speaker 1: Yeah, exactly. So I'm just putting, I'm reading and I'm putting a note here. Okay, what is happening? What is the flow? But it isn't telling me that what is interacting with what. For example, how someone came with the idea that three hundred undergraduates only. Why not preschool kids? Why not the kids who are staying at home? What kind of issues are there? Why only Brazil? Why do you choose Brazil? So there are a lot of issues that are there and I know any serious academician will certainly question these things and it will be answered. But yet, what happened? What was the emotional content of the research itself? Because when we are in field, we are not like... For us, as in ethnographers, when we go into the field and we interact with people, we go through a lot of emotional aspects, emotional turmoil as well. So those are... Perhaps find a line or two in the forward or in the... wherever. So I think that this... If there is a platform, it will allow people to learn how to do research.

This taught me a lot actually, the whole exercise itself. It enabled me to think, these were the processes that I used to do but I had never thought from this perspective.

Speaker 0: Yeah, it allows for a bit of a structured approach to it while at the same time giving flexibility to it.

Speaker 1: Yeah.

Speaker 2: Yeah.

Speaker 0: I identify two thought processes and I resonate with them myself, right? Just before we started here, I had a conversation with a colleague of mine about, I will have a conversation with you now, right? But that I will have the conversation with you already will have an impact on the conversation we have. And we thought about this this morning as well, right? I stood in front of my room, I was like, what do I want to wear today? That already would make an impact. If I'd come in a suit, we would have a completely different conversation. And I agree with you that there is a need for a space maybe in both our writing and in our teachings. So if we think of this in a way of... So we talked a lot about making this [mind map of the research process created during the workshop] visible in writing, right? It would definitely require a different writing style. A bit more of a, yeah, what would you call that? You [Speaker 1] call it creative? What would creative look like?

Speaker 1: I know a few people will call it a hippie style.

Speaker 0: Okay?

Speaker 1: Because you are not following rules, you are trying to break the stereotypes. You are trying to be more mobile in your writing, which doesn't suit academic writing because then there is no standard. How do you standardize the writing? What is accepted as academic writing, what is accepted as serious scientific writing? Then it becomes very difficult, how to control. And I agree with one fact that there are; there are a lot of things that will happen in the process that will be accepted as writing. But then I don't believe that anything is trash because trash comes - as you said that if you would have worn something else or if you thought something it would impact. So everything is impacting the other. So if we are that minute and...

So now I would reformulate what I was saying. I think then in that case one has to be very meticulous. One has to be more involved, more engaged in one's research that you are able to observe everything that is happening.

Speaker 2: Yeah.

Speaker 1: Obviously you will not be able to. It is beyond human capacity. No one can do that. But I think to the best maximum possible state in which you can engage in a particular data or engage with a certain study topic will become very, very interesting, I think. It will be very, very interesting. But only I say ‘hippie’ because it will act as an amoeba. It won't have any form, any shape. It will just move on. And then… The biggest problem with institutions is to control. How do you control things? So I think that thinking of that, because I was also talking to Speaker 2 just a few minutes before it started, that okay, if there are platforms where such kind of things could be put, how would the ethical; this university ethics committee will actually think about it? Because we are writing things that ethics committee would not like us to write because of the safety of the identity, for example, you gave us the [consent] form. What about our identity? If you write such things, then you anonymize, which has been a practice in different disciplines for a very, very long time. So I think this is a very interesting idea, which needs a lot of thought. I think it should happen. But then there are a lot of things that are coming to my mind. Till the time the university itself becomes ‘hippie’, this ‘hippie’ culture is very difficult to come into practice.

Speaker 0: And so in a teaching, we also talked about teaching, in a second, what would you like in this regard to be taught?

Speaker 1: I have been a person who has always wanted to know the process. So we teach content of discipline, but we don't teach how to learn through writing, think through writing basically. And this is the process actually. Why can't be this the first thing that is taught to any undergraduate? Okay, how to think graphically, because we are more inclined to learn through classifications and, so… We have been always; I have been listening in my; I did Masters in Philosophy. So, we were taught different things and it was an interdisciplinary thing. And we were taught about how over-determination works. And we were taught about asamlaja at a little bit. So, these terms are very fascinating. Okay, but what does it actually mean?

What does interdisciplinary mean? Is it like one discipline comes and talks to another discipline where they maintain the disciplinary boundaries. Okay, so if I'm an anthropologist and I'm going to talk to a natural scientist, like Anna Singh did in her book ‘Mushroom at the End of the World’, where she's talking with these scientists who are tailing foresters and scientists in Japan and everything, and they are coming and talking about a particular thing, which is a mushroom. Now my point is that, do they break their disciplinary boundaries? Do they start thinking: de-centering human and then thinking about other objects that are there in the environment? So these are very, very important aspects that are almost missing in the process of training future researchers. Because again, it needs a lot of involvement, I think, a lot of creativity …

Speaker 2: Yeah.

Speaker 1: … which I think is a difficult task to do. So I'm not saying that the people are lazy. I'm just saying that they, again; so what questions are being asked here? Do we have space for this, what I'm asking right now. Is also that, in teaching also, because I'm not a teacher, so I don't know what kind of spaces a teacher has, what kind of work pressure that teacher has. So all those things have come into play. So every subjectivity, every ontology, defines and determines what kind of processes will be there. And they also learn to know at every strata that how; to even a graduate student when learns this, perhaps when that graduate student becomes a professor, will have a very different take on how to teach also.

Speaker 0: Yeah, we talked about how I had to create this for myself. What are your [Speaker 2] feelings on that?

Speaker 2: On teaching?

Speaker 0: Or on the difference between the structural approach for, let's say, full-fledged academics and the teaching parts?

Speaker 2: I actually quite resonate to what Speaker 1 is saying because we often discuss a lot of these things. We know you work together and that's a benefit of doing it.

And I think that somewhat facilitates to our process. Constantly discussing what we are doing, but then just taking a pause and going to the background [and asking ourselves]: Ok, where did this come from? What's going on over here?

And we also engage in all that spiral because those thoughts are not linear at all. We are constantly spiraling from here to there. And there's so many ifs and buts in the entire process.

But so yeah, I think right there, tapping that, tapping all those confused unfinished set of thoughts, and giving way for them to, you know, wander. I think, I find that very facilitating. And… it just struck me! So you've written Research Process over there [mind map of research process created during the workshop with participants in the exercises], and there's all that beautiful interaction with everything. But anybody, in any place where a single research methodology is mentioned, it never looks like that. It's just step one, step two, step three and step hundred, but it never really says that: okay, it's fine to have a pre-analysis in your mind and then in the end be open to prove yourself wrong.

Yeah, I think those things really work. for me because I do believe that whenever I wrote in a form that was not defined by anybody, I think those were one of my best works. It has never been published anywhere. It was not meant to be published, but as a writer, as an author of whatever I had written, I felt that: okay, I'm satisfied with this. And I feel that I've done justice to it, because what I think reflects there, even though it is structured, but it is I who have designed the structure. And I'm not really fitting into something else that was given to me.

I'm not saying this in an antagonistic way. It does not have to be against all the structures all the time. But even though those structures should be open enough, to encompass places where people digress. And in research, I think people need to be digressing, need to be rendering, only then we come to a point and say: okay, this is right. Or you can, at the end of the day say: oh, this is bullshit, I need to do something else. So I think that makes sense to me, yeah.

Speaker 0: So if we think of this as a, so we would like, okay, so we're a small group, so I will just myself as well a little bit, because I fully agree with you. I think this, how can we also talk about things that don't work, right, is so important. And I had a colleague who would actually write her master thesis as a poem. And she was very lucky. She worked with XXX. And [they] allowed her to submit it like that, as a master thesis. But I always wondered if there is a... How would, for me personally, a platform or apublication need to look like to allow me to make these things available to other people on a very practical kind of way. Because on the one hand, I know myself to be someone who, well, I like to think about this [pointing to the mind map], but when I have to write it, I'm all over the place, right? So I would need something that would allow me to, well, keep myself contained in a way, right? But if you think of it as a ‘what would?’ and we have tools to do that nowadays. You just write out your end goal and stick it on the wall and that's it. And we are taught to keep our paper small so that we can make a clear argument for it. But if we now think of it like how would a paper need to look like or like the writing process, what kind of tools would it need for us very practically to allow for a bit of creativity, in a way. We also talked about templates from publishing houses, which I think might be a good starting point to think about this, that give us clear structures. You have a title page, you have a, here is your introduction, here's your methodology, here's your results, here is your discussion, conclusion done. So we have very clear structures that help us focus things. But if we now want to create a template for creativity, that would allow for creativity. Because also, if I sit in front of a white page, I never start. So there needs to be some prompt for me. If you think about a prompt that would allow for creativity and reflexivity, do you think you have some ideas based on what we just talked about? That would give, for example, space for your reflective processes when you talk to each other or something like that?

Speaker 1: Can I make a comment? A quick comment before we start talking about that. You talked about those templates that these big publishing houses give. I have this question, actually. I'm asking because you're a person who publishes and also my question is that what is the purpose of publicational research, number one. And number two, and this is a very activist mode of asking the question, which is that the more world is getting chaotic, because in past ten years I have seen more chaos than any kind of organization, in my country as well, and in the world as well. What does this structured and even stricter rules of everything actually. Publication has become very stricter and, again, the argument is given that, okay to to reduce the chaos, but it is not actually helping out in any way. So the first fundamental question is that if the general public cannot relate to what we are publishing, what is the point of publishing it? Because ultimately, if it is for a close quarter, that people in academia can only read it and then build it, it is as if we are creating our own food and consuming it to survive. And they are just workers who are giving us food to eat. So my ethical dilemma is there. My ethical dilemma is not what data should go and what data should not go. This is not addressed and that's why in the previous part also what I said was around this only. We are much talking about the structure and this and that and the ethic. But ultimately, where these data should go. These data are further simplified by media people. News channels or popular sites, Twitter for that matter, they quote data from academia. As if for a common man, the data needs to be translated. So I think that academia has also forgotten how to write simple. Now, that was the only point because of which it came to my mind. It is a pent-up kind of a thing for me.

Speaker 0: No, no, I fully agree with that. So, when I go home to my family in Germany, I have to not only translate my work from one language to another, but also make it digestible, right? Because I think we have a tendency or let me put it this way, I am very much in my research, right, so I think in the theories and concepts that I use in my work to explain myself, plant personhood, but I had to explain it to XXX now. But for me, and if I talk to you about plant personhood, or of a place, you know what I'm talking about. So for you, I don't have to explain that. So I think for one, an issue between academia and the public would be that, that we are used to thinking in concepts and we think we know what they mean when we talk about it. But in two days, we might figure out that my understanding of place-personhood might be very different from yours, right? So there is that. I also agree that there is a disconnect between the public- if we can call it that- and academia, right? I did research with First Nation people in Canada. And I wasn't sure if I wanted, should do this work, let's put it this way, if I'm the person to do this work. And so I talked to a friend of mine who is a First Nation, I was like, if I want to do this work, what's required? Or like, what are your opinions, just very broadly, to me doing this work? And one of the main things that he said and that have stuck with me is that a lot of scientists come to a community, do the work and disappear and never come back. The people open their minds and hearts for them and never get anything out of it. What he advised me to do was create work that then can be used by the people you do research with. In this case, my solution to this problem was, I created an interactive tool where I fed all my data into and then the organization that I gave it to, and it was their data after all, they could use that platform and to see for themselves what my results were, what my questions could lead to, and come to their own conclusions. I, of course, also was like, this is my paper. Please feel free to read it and read my conclusions and agree or disagree with them how you please. But you can also use this tool and get other things out of my data, your data technically. So that was my way of approaching this problem, trying to bridge the gap between, well, what do I do science for and the people I do it for and the stuff that I write. Because at the same time, the way we write has developed not for no reason, there, because I need to read other papers to develop my theories, to explain the world. Because I'm just one human and the way I think is, well, one brain only. So I need to use the work, the brains of others to come to great conclusions. Well, to some conclusions, whether they be great or not. So for me, that would be the conundrum, right, where I see it. Like, how can I, on the one hand, produce knowledge that is useful for academics in a way that then is also consumable for them, but also reach the people that I do research with. What form can my work take that could satisfy both? Would you have an idea for that, now that I talked so much about what I think? If you think of like, if this is important for us, to make our work shareable across platform or like for different audiences. And I would raise the question of language here as well. Right, because you probably have to, your participants speak multiple languages besides English, I suppose.

Speaker 1: There are a lot of other languages.

Speaker 0: Yeah, right. So there's of course also like that.

Speaker 2: Yeah. But I mean, fortunately, because of our research, and the way it was designed, it was actually helpful for us to be with the community that we're supposed to study and learn the language.

So now we speak the languages that we speak. And I mean, the common tongue, of course, they have their own specialized languages because these are tribal groups.

And that we are not really well versed with because they are no written scripts of the languages. They are only spoken dialects.

Speaker 0 [36:39]: Okay, that makes it, of course, much more difficult.

Speaker 2: Yes, it's much more difficult, but that's not... In my case, it's not the first language of communication. But I speak the common tongue that people now speak, I think, now for many decades. So I think the communication barriers are not as much, and they can be filled up with many different things.

And yes, of course, because the kind of research we are a part of, it is designed in a way that we can, of course, after we have specific results, and now we consider them concrete enough to be shared with different stakeholders in the picture, including the community that we study. There are many spaces to share those things with them. And I think in the due course of writing and completing the PhD, if one wills, of course, we can definitely be in touch with them, that we are even right now, and to basically submit this entire collection of data to them. But of course, there are many questions that further arise from them.

Because it's not a literate community. What do they do?

How do they perceive the data?

Speaker 0: How do they share knowledge to begin with?

Speaker 2: How do they share knowledge? Because their knowledge systems and the way that they share it are very different than our formalized ways and formalized structures. Maybe there are many ways in which things can be done. I'm not aware of them right now. But a few obvious ways of going back to them, being in touch with them, to constantly tell them what have we done with the data. Because while the time, while the collection of data was going on, they were always curious as to what are you going to do with it? Are you going to teach this somewhere else? So I try giving them as many satisfactory answers as I can. Of course, it's not enough always, but there's always scope for going back and continue sharing.

Speaker 0: So a continuous way of sharing the work you do would help to create a closer connection to your participants?

Speaker 2: Yeah.

Speaker 0: So then thinking about this modular way of publishing, if we apply this to publishing itself, the idea is that you can technically make everything a module and then visible and findable on this platform that we will talk about in a second. And so it could also mean you can do that for each research step, for example, or thoughts, right? And you can create a little video, recording, writing, whatever it is, while you do it. And that could be then shareable to participants in that way, facilitate a closer connection with them. Right?

Speaker 2: Yeah, it's possible.

Speaker 1: I was thinking very interestingly when Speaker 2 was talking about certain aspects, that in the community people would ask me that if you were recording those videos, would you put it on YouTube? They like listening and seeing themselves. So I think that I do not need to represent them at all. They know how to represent themselves. It is only a certain way of them being educated in technology, perhaps, which doesn't need language. If you create an account and you teach them how to... It's just a five-minute thing, because they know how to use mobile now. So they can use those things on smartphones. Because that gives them a reflection of who they are. That gives them meaning, reinforces their own meaning, in a sense. Now when you say, for example, here, as you say, if I'm able to put in a video, and then I'm able to put in a kind of a photograph, and then I write a short note somewhere, okay, So, these are certain things. So, it can't be just writing or photograph or video or audio. It has to be a collaboration of all the senses. Obviously, we can touch, we cannot touch and smell and all those things. But then... But right now, for example, I see the way these food shows. So there is a show called ‘Chef's Table’. When you see it, you can imagine what the food is. So that, you cannot smell. Interestingly, it is a medium that needs all your senses. You cannot smell it, you cannot touch it, you cannot taste it. You can just see what is happening. And you can listen and interpret what is happening. So I think what we best, what we can do at this point of time is to create that life very lightly. Even in educating, for example, you talked about teaching. Why the teaching has to be always about reading? Why in the same lecture, the same reading cannot have videos and pictures and photos and everything? It can become a very interactive thing, as this board is [pointing to the mind map]. So, I think one has to be more radical in thought process than teaching has.

Speaker 0: That would make writing a paper then also quite an interesting challenge, right? Because then we have suddenly all the media to our disposal to use.

Speaker 1: But I'm saying that it will decenter the idea of writing as well. So, for example, I'm a good researcher, but I don't know how to write. Okay. I can research a subject well and then I can present it well, but when you ask me to organize it as a paper, academic paper, it will be difficult for me perhaps. But if you ask me to give a, create a presentation, which again, it has been reduced to presentation. PPTs are as if they are attachment, prosthetic to the writing. So what if there is a medium which is neither presentation nor paper, but you are able to say what you want to say. For example, you talked about your friend writing the whole thesis in poems. My friend also did that. But how many universities and institutions are there that will allow that? So again, time and again it becomes very important for me to talk about institutions and structures because we are dependent on funders for funds. They will ask to happen things in a certain way. Data has to be recorded in a certain way. We had a discussion just a few days back on where to store the data, how to store the data and all that. And then NWO has its own processes to do that. I don't know. I'm just trying to bring more food for thought. I'm not trying to say that things are not important or anything, but what I'm trying to say is that things are complicated and it is important that we're engaging here on those questions.

Speaker 0: I agree. I very much agree. Yeah. Thank you for sharing. If it would be okay with you, I'll try to quickly summarize what we talked about so far and then we can move on to the last step of the day, which is the platform and then I will release you. You have been very patient with me and have shown great energy. So from what I understand now is something that you would like to see more would be a way of for once bringing research closely to the people we research with and do so in a timely manner and in a maybe alternative way that is not only writing, right? So being able to present research in smaller chunks maybe ,in a different choice of language, in a different choice of medium that makes it accessible, would be important to you. The same applies for your teaching. Thinking about how we do these things in teaching would also greatly benefit us. And thinking on our own reflective practices, how can we capture the magnitude of our thoughts in a way that allows us to write it down, store this, in a way, and then make it useful for our own writing or presenting practices, right? Would be how I would summarize it now.

Speaker 2: Yeah.

Speaker 0: Okay, thank you so very much for taking part in this focus group discussion. This will be part of two papers probably, one on modular thinking in research and writing, and lastly, one on barriers, how to adopt it, what can we identify, because, right, we talk about it, I sent this email out to many people and many people have been interested but how can we make it so that people would actually use it?

Why do scientists not use all of the great tools we already have? And so that will be our second paper for the end. If you are interested in the results, I will be happy to share them afterwards. There will also be a second follow-up survey in four weeks. If you are okay, consent with it, I will share the survey with you on a bit more of a long-term kind of thinking, because this was a long day, and maybe some thoughts come up that we haven't talked about yet. Thank you so much.