

1 Focus group no. 1, researcher group, Humanities-Historical, 2 December 2019

3
4
5 I1: Well, welcome everybody to our focus group. We should have been two people more but
6 I think it is the flu season, so people called in sick. But I'm glad that you could make it. And
7 we're really happy that you have taken the time to to come to this group. Ehm I think before
8 we start it will be good if we sign the consent forms, so we have all the bureaucracy
9 #00:05:38#

10
11 I2: We have the (unclear #00:05:40#) already #00:05:38#

12
13 P1: Oh great because I obviously forgot mine #00:05:47#

14
15 (papers are handed around) #00:05:58#

16
17 I2: Do you want one without a signature? #00:05:58#

18
19 P2: That would be good yes #00:06:03#

20
21 I2: We can just make a #00:06:03#

22
23 I1: Yeah we can do that during the break #00:06:26#

24
25 (unclear #00:06:28#) #00:06:28#

26
27 I1: And it's actually a quite new thing in [country] that we have to do it, in a written form,
28 yeah, normally oral consent is enough here, and eh but it's a European project so we have to
29 work with the same standards. And also when it comes to ethical approval of our projects,
30 we also have to send in an application this time, which is also not normal for a project like
31 this in [country]. But in other countries it is. But that's exactly what we are going to talk
32 about in here. Before we start with the questions, I would like to say just a few words about
33 our project, so you'll maybe know a little bit more about what it is we are doing. So our
34 project is called Standard Operating Procedures for Research Integrity, SOPs4RI. It's a
35 European project with 13 partners in 10 different countries, and it's led by project
36 [...anonymized...]. And uhm yeah it's a Horizon 2020 project, on that special programme
37 called Science with and for Society. And the overall goal of the whole thing is to promote
38 excellent research and a responsible research and integrity culture across European
39 research performing organizations and research funding organizations, and we are going to
40 use these RPOs and RFOs, so we have this double aim. So by research performing
41 organizations, we mean universities first and foremost, and with research funding
42 organizations we also work with them. The background for our project is that the European
43 Union in its next framework programme, Horizon Europe, which will take over in 2021, will
44 make it mandatory for all organizations to take part in that, to have a research integrity
45 promotion plan, and we are, in our project, working to eh to fill in content in these plans. So
46 to decide what topics should be covered in such a plan, and what tools can then be used to

promote research integrity within the different topics. So every organization has to make it clear in this plan how they will promote responsible research practices, how they will avoid (unclear #00:09:21#) practices. And we are building this tool box, which will be an online available toolbox that all European universities can use, and it's not that they are going to make exactly the same plan, but they will build their own plans, but we will define the topics that they will have to consider in such a plan, and we will provide the tools they can use for promoting research integrity. So this is what we are going to do, when we talk about the tools, we talk about two different kinds of standard operating procedures and guidelines. And to take guidelines first, here is an example of the guidelines. I think it is from COPE, COPE is the Committee on Publication Ethics, so a lot of the big journals are a part of this, they have made a lot of guidelines and SOPs, so this is just to give an example of what a guideline could look like. This is a guideline on how to handle authorship disputes, a guide for new researchers, who should be a co-author on the paper, who should just be in the acknowledgement and who shouldn't be mentioned at all. These things that can be tricky for all of us to handle. So that's an example of a guideline. We defined a guideline as a statement, or principles or issues to consider when performing a task. Something that aims to guide courses of action. Guidelines give directions that help users make decisions, and they may include checklists, things to consider when you're doing research. Then we look at a SOP, a Standard Operating Procedure, we then defined that as a...as a more detailed, a detailed written instruction that aims to achieve uniform actions step by step. SOPs proscribe specific actions, and they in this way liberate users from decision making, by ensuring that they follow a certain procedure, and they may come in the shape of a decision tree or -flow like this example here, which is from the Norwegian Clinical Research Infrastructure Network. And it's an example on how to handle data in clinical trials, and I know that this is far away from what you do, but it is also just an example to give an idea about, when you talk about SOPs, this could be a SOP, something more strict than guidelines. In our focus group study, which is part of this huge project, which has been going on for now a year, and will continue for three years, where we have so far identified topics in in, we have different work packages where we have a Delphi survey and interviews and a literature study to identify different topics, and we will now continue with these topics in a number of focus group interview, 32 overall. So this is the first, well they had one in [city] yesterday and one in [city] as well, and there will be 32 of them over all in Europe, where we are especially interested in learning how the different disciplines look at the topics we have identified so far and about the content of the tool box. So, this is why you are all from historical subjects, historical disciplines, here, and this is the perspective that we are going to talk about today. So practical issues, this will take between two and two and a half hours, and we will first start with some open questions, we have three topics that we would like to have your views on, before we then have a lunch break and then we have an exercise, where we're going to sort some more topics and then we end with, we would like to hear your feedback on how it has been to be part of this, and are there things we can do better in the next focus group. Focus group interview is also a different form of interview than what you normally encounter, so we won't ask as many questions as you're probably used to if you have done other interviews. We would like you to discuss things that we throw on the table, we will also take part in the conversation of course, I have background [... anonymized ...] So this is what we are going to do, everything here is of course confidential. We record it as you can see, and we will transcribe the interviews, which will be used in a completely anonymous form, and everything that comes out of the project outside the research group

will be anonymized completely. So you can speak freely, and it is not that I think that this is particularly controversial, but you know, don't feel that you have to hold anything back. So that's it I think from me. Any question to this? To the set up? #00:15:39#

P1: Yeah, maybe you'll get into that, but I need, I would like to know more about WHY this responsible- eh no research integrity, yeah, so eh what is behind it? Is it to make everything comparable? Is it a tool for competitive-, for competition? Or is it more to make European research comparable and equal or? #00:16:10#

I1: So, the sad background is that we have had a number of scandals, research integrity scandals, research misconduct cases, and we normally refer to them as FFPs, Fabrication Falsification and Plagiarism. These are the very severe forms of misconduct, but we also have a big grey area that we call QRPs, Questionable Research Practices, and they are sort of in between FFPs and responsible conduct of research. And we know that these, they take, they mean a lot more, very few people are involved in the heavy forms of misconduct, but a lot of us from time to time find ourselves in these other ones. So that's kind of the background, and we know that, that's also what they call a replication, reproducibility crisis in science right now, where many studies, especially in psychology, medicine, they haven't been able to reproduce them. So up to 70-80 percent of the studies that have been done couldn't be reproduced by other groups, which is of course a problem for us in science. So the crisis in science, that's how we refer to it, is the background of the whole project. And therefore the European Union has said, very wisely, "we need to do some things about research integrity". And they have a number of projects. [... anonymized ...]

I1: And that's also what we are going to talk about here today in what ways you could do your research better or with more integrity. That's the main focus. But departing from your practice, what it is you do when you do your research. Before we switch, maybe we should just take a little name round. I can start, I'm I1, and I work here at [... anonymized ...] #00:20:18#

P3: [...anonymized...],

I1: [...anonymized...], And then I was away from here for some years, and then I came back and have been here [... anonymized ...] And I work with issues related to research integrity, but now all my time is taken by this project only. And then I also have a little or do some work with social theory. #00:20:50#

P3: I'm P3, I'm from [...anonymized...],

I2: My name is [name] and I'm [...anonymized...]. #00:22:11#

P1: I'm P1, I'm [...anonymized...]. So I've been all over Europe basically. And I work sort of, well not sort of, I work [... anonymized ...] #00:22:46#

P2: [...anonymized...] #00:22:46#

P1: [...anonymized...] #00:22:52#

141
142 P2: Not at all. So I'm [...anonymized...]. #00:23:42#
143
144 P3: Are you involved with [...anonymized...]? Haven't they just received an uhm #00:23:50#
145
146 P2: No, I'm not, I mean I've heard about it, [... anonymized ...]#00:23:56#
147
148 P3: Yes, but I think uhm [name], she she was the one who's PI on it? #00:24:04#
149
150 P2: Yes, exactly, yes. #00:24:12#
151
152 I2: So as I1 just mentioned, we are really interested in discussing with you, based in your
153 practice, your fields of research [different historical fields], which kinds of guidelines do you
154 see that could help you in your own roles, in terms of guidelines implemented or SOPs
155 implemented at the university level. So we would like to ask you, when you think about your
156 own research, your own work, do you think of any areas related to research integrity where
157 you think it would be beneficial to have more clear guidelines? If you have come across any
158 issues or yeah maybe, as I1 mentioned earlier, you have to, when you work, collaborate with
159 universities across Europe, how to collaborate when sometimes you don't have the same
160 standards, or it could be in research ethics, research integrity, education and so on. So there
161 is many topics, but #00:25:19#
162
163 P1: So this is, has come from having worked in different countries, ehm I so, I think what is
164 lacking, or I don't know whether it is lacking, but I feel the the sort of research integrity
165 standards are different from country to country, and I'm sometimes quite disturbed by the
166 strict standards in [country] where the plagiarizing standards are so high that I feel uhm that
167 it's actually not possible in humanities, where when you work, let's say with a text like [...
168 anonymized ...], a standard text, and you just look at one sentence, you can write seven
169 articles about that one sentence, but of course, but sometimes in [nationality] cases that
170 already counts as plagiarism. And that for example to me is just not feasible, because, you
171 know, yes you can write seven completely original articles on this one sentence, but of
172 course you always have to quote that same sentence, you of course always have to sort of, I
173 don't know, describe the background in the same way. So on the other hand I think it is
174 good to have, you know, quite high plagiarism standards, but to me that's seems, for the
175 humanities, especially when we work very closely with texts, almost impossible to not
176 plagiarize, you know. So that was one that really came out when I, when I read through the
177 guidelines, we I got them presented I thought "oh my God" (laugh), now I'm probably
178 plagiarizing, and I feel I don't. #00:26:59#
179
180 I1: Can I ask you, do you use parts of the same text again or is it just that you quote the
181 same places? #00:27:06#
182
183 P1: I quote the same places, but of course the thoughts that go, well you know, it's my brain,
184 you know, so I might write sentences twice that I don't copy and paste, but it's ME, right,
185 and they lead to different things, but I cannot say that I haven't used the same sentences in
186 different #00:27:26#
187

188 I1: It's the same reading of the same place in [... anonymized ...] #00:27:25#

189

190 P1: Exactly but with a different question for example, so there will always be sort of set ups
191 that might be very similar, you know, the questions that you pose on the text will be
192 different and so the result will be different. But some things, you have to explain them
193 otherwise your article doesn't make sense, so you have to explain them in a similar way, and
194 you know...And I'm sure I have sentences in uhm, the same sentences in various articles,
195 without the articles being about the same stuff. #00:28:07#

196

197 P2: [... anonymized ...]. So I didn't realize it was an issue in [country] that you were really not
198 supposed to do that [reusing things you have written yourself in other texts], [...
199 anonymized ...]. Uhm but as you say for anybody it is difficult, so the other day I was writing
200 something myself and I had an old text and I was working on something new, and I thought
201 "don't look at the old text, write a new text. This is brilliant what I've written" (all laugh) and
202 I looked at the old text, and the ideas were in there as well, you know, so I don't think you
203 can really avoid it. #00:29:17#

204

205 P1: But I can tell you where I learned, so last year, it was at the research year in [city], and
206 there we had this seminar about [nationality] research practices and uhm this guy from
207 theology came and explained it to us, the [nationality], the case, but that was also like "oh",
208 you know, he had the same thing, you know, he was a theologian and was working with the
209 same biblical passage for the last 20 years, right. So but that's interesting, so that there
210 might be a gap between sort of what's practice and what's, so what's rules and what's
211 practice, right. #00:29:56#

212

213 I2: You had a comment? #00:29:59#

214

215 P3: Yeah, I think I'll, I think it's a very, very good question, uhm and I think it's something
216 that...that we can spend days and days and days to discuss. Uhm I think my point of
217 departure would probably be to also sort of think about the guidelines and the standards we
218 have for natural sciences, technical sciences. Because, you mentioned it in your presentation
219 I1, you said something about reproducibility and you could also bring attention to
220 universalism, to communalism all these (unclear #00:30:39#) norms that we have from way
221 back. And we do this and we teach this when we teach theory of science...uhm but I think,
222 and we need to point to this, there's a very big difference between the humanities and the
223 way that we do science and the way that natural sciences do it. Sometimes there are
224 intersections, I think, for instance in your field, you might experience more intersections
225 uhm also in the way you publish your work, archeology and anthropology, in the general
226 term. But when you do stuff like, the things that I do and that you do, P1, very historical
227 stuff where you read old texts, lots of old texts, and you interpret and you analyze it, there is
228 something about the reproducibility that doesn't seem to work, because how do you
229 reproduce an analysis? How does some other researcher in another country reproduce the
230 exact same fact or scientific fact that I sort of analyzed my way into, sitting here in my office
231 in 2019. Uhm but that makes it any less of a scientific fact I don't think so, but it points to
232 the fact that there is something intrinsically different about the humanities than the natural
233 sciences and that the guide we have for science integrity and science standards needs to be
234 adjusted to that difference. #00:32:30#

235

236 I1: It's very interesting what you say about reproducibility in the humanities uhm I think, so,
237 but what's then...so if it can't be reproduced, and I think also that my experience is that's
238 tricky, but what then should we do as researchers to make it transparent, open, what we
239 have done? #00:33:01#

240

241 P2: Well, I'm actually, you're right to say a lot of archeological research is more like what
242 goes on in the hard sciences, uhm but what I do actually has much more roots in the
243 humanities. So I think I can relate more to what you're saying. Uhm but I would think the
244 differences or one difference is, in the hard sciences you would have an experiment that
245 nobody has seen, and you're giving a report of what you've done. Whereas it's harder the
246 things, I think, that we write, the thought process is going down the paper, so the
247 experiment, the closest thing we got to an experiment, is what's there on the page. So we
248 don't necessarily need the reproducibility I wouldn't think, because you are talking people
249 through your thought process. So I don't know if it's really that much of an issue.

250 #00:33:52#

251

252 P1: Because it was asked how to make it open, but it is exactly that it IS open that's the
253 whole idea of the humanities article or book, it is absolutely open. You have to, the whole
254 thing is, you have to, you know, you have to be able to trace my thought. I have to make
255 sure you understand what I'm thinking, and I that I have, you know, foot notes enough,
256 proof in that way to show you that I'm right. So the whole process of the humanities' article
257 is to make it, I mean it is open. So that, so I would absolutely agree with you, these are
258 different levels uhm that relate to the natural sciences and the humanities that are not
259 comparable probably. And, I mean, it touches onto something that we'll hear all over, and
260 because of this European project and the way funding is allocated, humanities is always
261 saying that it is so unfair or it is not, you know, because we are always held to standards that
262 have nothing to do with OUR practice. So it's fantastic that you say "okay, we talk to
263 humanities people, we talk to historians", but I think maybe that's one of the main issues
264 that needs to be reflected in some sort of report that we can't have one tool box maybe.

265 #00:35:10#

266

267 I1: That is also the idea that we make tools for different disciplines, so it's very important
268 what you say here, it's very important, we are all ears (laugh) #00:35:21#

269

270 P2: But the other issue would be, for the other kind of archeology, there is no reproducibility
271 because uhm a lot of it is excavation, you can only do that once. So I mean I have heard
272 about people sort of (unclear #00:35:33#) but nobody can go back and excavate the site
273 again, so that's a real problem. #00:35:39#

274

275 I1: How do you work with documentation then? How do you document, what you have
276 done? #00:35:41#

277

278 P2: Well, I don't work in the field, I have done, but there are, I mean, there are standards
279 you're supposed to maintain when you're working in the field, but you really have to take it
280 on the trust that the person who has carried out the excavation has done that. So when, I
281 mean, you mostly become aware about the excavation through the published reports, and

282 you've got no way of controlling what they've done in the field. So it can be an issue.

283 #00:36:07#

284

285 P3: I agree with the openness perspective, that's a central issue. But perhaps it could be
286 even on a more general level. What we do as historians on history related fields, we work
287 with sources, sources of different kinds. And that's really what makes the science integrity,
288 our approach to the sources. Because the interpretations of those sources, how, P1, you and
289 I, interpret [... anonymized ...] texts could be different, it would probably be the same, but it
290 could be different, but how do we come across the fact that those two answers are equally
291 justifiable. And that has to, are the use of the sources, there's an openness to that
292 description. And so there is a sort of methodology or lots of different methodologies, but it
293 has to deal with how we approach the historical sources, what we in [nationality] terms
294 called [local language] source criticism. #00:37:21#

295

296 P1: Where you critique the #00:37:22#

297

298 P3: Yeah #00:37:21#

299

300 P2: I suppose one way that is controlled is through the peer review process, but then we
301 have the problem that unlike in the hard sciences, it's so subjective. So I mean, I have had
302 very mean, unfair peer reviews, which have nothing to do with whether I've approached the
303 sources or material in a, you know, in a respectable way, but it's just purely personal, so
304 that's an issue of integrity I think in the humanities. #00:37:53#

305

306 P1: Exactly, that is so important because so uhm, I think on one hand it's very good to
307 emphasize once again that in the humanities, it's totally okay to have five different results,
308 you know, you want to have five different versions of the two, that's what it is all about and
309 nobody is right, well of course I think I am right, but you can't, right, and that's what it is
310 about do uhm. But I wanted to, sorry what did you just say? #00:38:29#

311

312 P2: The peer review #00:38:29#

313

314 P1: Yeah, the peer review and that's also so different from country to country. So you think
315 peer review is great, I always thought it was great, because I was educated in [country], but
316 then when I worked in [country], in [language]-speaking [country], then I got to know the
317 [nationality] and [nationality] system, they don't like it for example. They think actually the
318 articles get much better sort of care if we don't peer review, but if we just do a very intense
319 editing process, and for them, in a way, the time that goes in an editing process in a
320 [nationality] non-peer review journal might be actually sort of comparable with a peer
321 review, but they all have the problem that they are journals that don't count as peer
322 reviewed, so it doesn't count as much. I mean, I don't, I still don't know what I think about it,
323 but I think again here you have a problem with different research cultures and standards in
324 different countries, right. #00:39:30#

325

326 I1: Can I just ask, just to come back to the transparency thing, eh so you all agree that there
327 should be transparency in your work, like in all other scientific work, but how can we then
328 ensure that we have transparency in the historical subjects that you work with? So what is it

exactly that should be in there to create transparency? And if you think about the guidelines and the SOPs we talked about, could something like that, could you make guidelines or could you make a SOP that could capture what needs to be in there, what you need to do if you are a PhD student starting in the [field/subject] Department in your excellence centre and has his first article. So what should he do to make it transparent what he has done?

#00:40:34#

P3: I think that there are actually already plenty of guidelines doing that, but the most fundamental part would be to ensure that your reader can follow your analysis of your source. So that would mean a very descriptive uhm analysis and references of your of the way that you handle the sources, and I'm being vague about it, because you can handle your sources in a multitude of ways. You can do it in a conceptual historian way, you can do it contextualized, you can do it as a discourse analysis and those different ways of analyzing sources would be different, but on the most general level, the reader should be able to follow precisely uhm this specific source how do you handle that, what do you look for, how do you dissect it, how do you, what parts do you omit for example, because you have to select in a large (unclear #00:41:48#) of something. You have to do selections, so what selections have you included, what periods? I think there are a lot of guidelines out there already doing this. So if you have to make sort of a general description uhm it would be sort of that it is absolutely necessary that your reader can follow you chain of thought, your way through your sources, much like you said before, like this is the experiment unfolding

#00:42:30#

I2: Do you see this as a challenge when you review papers, or in your own, is it more (unclear #00:42:38#) #00:42:38#

P1: I personally, uhm no because, I mean because we train our students to reference secondary literature and primary literature. So, you know, as a historian when you are properly trained, you basically can't write a sentence without, like a footnote or you know at least three secondary works, right. So it's about referencing, but I wouldn't say, so when you have a contextual point that you make, sure you didn't come up with it, you can show where you can read about let's say Florence 19th century, right, and where you can read about that (unclear #00:43:13#) or something. So, but we train them, I wouldn't say, I mean I come across that in sort of undergrad. essays that they don't reference properly, but when they are accepted to a PhD programme, I mean I don't, I rarely come across under-footnoted, under-referenced articles, right. People are so aware that they have to quote what is out there. #00:43:44#

P2: But even this is subjective, when I think of ancient history then there are passages of ancient authors, Homer, Herodotus or something which is so well known that you can, you can cite them, you can talk about them without going into very much detail about what they say. But if it's an obscurer text, then you've got to be much more upfront about what's in it, because you can't expect the reader to have that knowledge. So even there, I mean, it comes with the experience of reading, you know "well this is a text that everybody's discussing, I don't need to treat it in the same way as one which is obscurer. So I think that makes it difficult to arrive at fixed rules for how we deal with this stuff. #00:44:21#

376 I2: But can you think of other areas where some fixed rules could ease your work or things
377 you experience as a challenge, if you look more broadly in you field? In terms of students or
378 PhDs? #00:44:36#

379

380 P2: It is also very important, I think, to acknowledge the works of your predecessors, and to
381 be responsible in the way you cite the secondary literature. I'm not sure how you would
382 formulate that, as a, as a rule #00:44:51#

383

384 I2: Citation practices #00:44:53#

385

386 P1: Yeah, citations practices #00:44:56#

387

388 I1: I guess where problems sometimes occur is when people read something, a text about
389 [reference to specific war] or something about how to understand that battle and what
390 happened, and then people start arguing that that wasn't really what happened, and so
391 when when do you then know that this is actually an okay reading or an okay
392 understanding? What does it take? I think that is kind of the problem. When do we have a,
393 when can we say that this is a scientific, this is not just a private opinion about the war, this
394 is actually a research based piece on the war. #00:45:45#

395

396 P2: And even if you're reading some piece of scholarship, have you understood the
397 argument properly? I was talking to a scholar in Oxford, he said all the time people were
398 citing his work, he said "I really like that, I really liked your argument there, but that's not
399 quite what I was saying" (all laugh). #00:46:03#

400

401 P1: I would, I mean, as simple as proper responsible referencing, so you know whether, so in
402 this case it would just be "author XY says the [reference to specific war] was about that, I
403 show you that it was about this. And I show it with these and these primary sources, by
404 looking at them in a new light", and if they make that argument so convincing that you can
405 follow it, with proper references from secondary plus primary literature, that would be for
406 us enough, you know. You can't just exclaim it, you can't just say this is like this, but if you
407 show it to me with enough evidence, and the evidence is in the sources, in the primary and
408 secondary sources properly quotes in footnotes or endnotes. I can't explain, this is sort of
409 how we get to, this is how we can understand whether something is academic or scientific
410 or just you know pop-literature or a newspaper article." #00:47:15#

411

412 P2: I think I'd also say that I don't experience generally that these things are a problem. I
413 think that there are some recognized codes of practice that people work within. And when
414 they don't, somebody quickly realizes and they're exposed and it happens so rarely, but you
415 do encounter it. And it just isn't accepted. #00:47:35#

416

417 I2: So the peer review process will sort of capture this or? #00:47:41#

418

419 P3: Yeah, both the peer review, but also when you read a book or an article and you
420 encounter a sentence or a phrase and you go "this can't be right", and if the references are
421 there you are able to follow the argument "okay we go to this source, and we look for this
422 direct point or argument and say "is this what is actually in here or would you interpret it in

a different manner?", then you can sort of build from there. So I think we also do the source criticism all the time when we read secondary literature. So we have, even though we have a peer review process when we submit articles, the peer review will continue with the scientific work way, way past that point. And that's how we know that it works, this reference system, because whenever the references are not there, we sort of cannot do anything with the material and we just have to exclude it. We cannot base that as a valid source of information. #00:48:51#

P1: But it is quite interesting, because, I mean, I also feel like it completely works, right. There's also some aspect of community shaming, like, you know who the scholars are and properly they are not part of the community anymore. But then what you just said in the beginning that seems to me maybe doesn't work always, right, about the person in your research community, who yeah...right, so yeah, I don't know, so in my practice and in my experience, I think it works very well, and I have nothing to complain, I would rather say "please don't give me more", you know, I can't have more rules, I think, because I think it works. But so #00:49:35#

P2: In ancient history, because we have such a limited body of evidence, and a lot of researchers usually go back old roads and do something a new way, rather than going into the archives starting something new. So scholarships growing and growing and growing, and it does happen that people only read the most recent articles and books. So there are cases where you'll find something maybe in the 80s and somebody cited a book from the 60s and that book was cited in the 90s, and everybody's only citing the book from the 90s. If you go back to the original book, you find well the author didn't quite say that or the evidence isn't as strong as they said. So maybe it could be a guideline to follow things back to the source. That's one thing I could think of. #00:50:21#

I2: And you also mentioned a thing about plagiarism and you mentioned the culture of publication, also salami slicing perhaps, slicing of articles. So do you feel a lack of guidelines in terms of, would it be help if you had a sort of guideline saying that (unclear #00:50:37#) is supposed to be only so different in the humanities, or is that just something you interpret in your community or? #00:50:46#

P1: Well I feel, as we said earlier, the rules are there, you know, it's just then finding that they sometimes don't get upheld, or sometimes I feel they are too strict. I thought they were too strict, and you said they are sometimes not upheld, but in general I have to say, I think they are there. I don't think we need more. Maybe you can convince me otherwise, but so far #00:51:13#

I1: We have no, we have no opinion about whether we need more or less #00:51:14#

P1: But I never thought "oh, we really need better standards for the integrity of research or plagiarism, I mean, they are there, the standards are there, and the community is usually quite, not forgiving if somebody is plagiarizing, it's something, you know, it's not a cavalier's thing, it's. So that's what I mean, what you said earlier also, the shaming in the community is something that works, so you can't do it #00:51:48#

470 I2: A type of policing #00:51:48#

471

472 P1: Yeah, first through the peer review process and then later on through the community
473 itself. #00:51:57#

474

475 P2: I would think that the main problem is that there is too much incentive, too much to be
476 gained, by getting away with it. So people will get judged, when they apply for jobs or
477 research funding, often not just on the quality of their work but on the quantity, and as long
478 as that's going to be the case, people have got a reason to cut corners. #00:52:23#

479

480 I1: And do you feel people cut corners? #00:52:26#

481

482 P2: Uhm sometimes yes #00:52:27#

483

484 I1: Yes, you gave an example in the beginning also, and that's an example of reusing the
485 same idea or the same? #00:52:35#

486

487 P2: Yes, yes. And much more than that to be honest. That's one example of the things going
488 on...And it sort of snowballs, because this person who's done that has an enormous list of
489 publication gets invited to guest lectures here, there and everywhere, and can carry on
490 recycling the same talks for new audiences, wins prizes, when people see they've got these
491 prizes, we'll give them some more prizes, they've got some money, we'll give them some
492 more money. And it really, well it works. And I don't know how many people within my field
493 that do this, and it does worry me that we might be heading in that direction. If someone
494 else wants to compete, they've got to play the game in the same way. And that, in ten years
495 time, it will be much more of a problem. #00:53:22#

496

497 I1: I just read that one of the heads of department in [university] #00:53:28#

498

499 P3: Yeah, I read that this morning #00:53:28#

500

501 I1: Yeah, you read that as well. It was, they are looking into his publications, apparently, he
502 does a publication a week, so he has a new article or book out every week. So, and this has
503 been going on for many years, and as he says, "what takes a PhD student six weeks to do, I
504 can do in six hours", and he is in [... anonymised ...], so it's also a different ball game, but
505 uhm I guess, as you say, this becomes the standard that all of us have to live up to, so yeah.
506 #00:54:06#

507

508 P3: I read that this morning, and I think that is something that the humanities should
509 actually embrace much more, the collective publications. Because we have not been
510 accustomed to that, because the nature of our field is individual, and we interpret these
511 sources on our own, and we lay it out there for the community to assess. Uhm, but that also
512 comes with a disadvantage, because we are not able to produce as many publications as
513 [name], who has 1400 something something publications, and I feel the same way, that he
514 even mentions this in the article as well, sometimes the publications I get, is because some
515 research group wants a scientific credibility for their work, and I need to review it, and I read
516 it through, and I'll be the final author. We don't have the same guide as you mentioned

517 before I1, where we have specific allocations for the first author, the second author and the
518 third and so so so, until the last author who's the head of department or something, we
519 don't have a system like that. And when I do collective publications, we are just listed
520 alphabetically, and it doesn't mean anything else than that, but when it's read into a broader
521 scientific community, it gains much more significance in terms of the other authors that are
522 listed. So I think it would be wise, if the humanities sort of brought their attention to these
523 collective publications, because we do the same, we have research units, where we review
524 each other's stuff and we make suggestions for articles, and I think it would be beneficial in
525 the end, if we started to include our colleagues and they started including us on collective
526 papers, but this means dramatic change of the entire (unclear #00:56:21#) to do that. Uhm
527 but I think it's worth a thought. #00:56:26#

528

529 P2: Well, I think collaboration, collective papers that can only be a good thing. I wouldn't
530 argue against that. But I think that, maybe it's old fashioned, but I think that anybody
531 credited as being an author on a paper should have written something. And I've heard
532 plenty of examples in in, you know, laboratory work, that isn't the case. So you have the
533 director of the lab who is first author on all of the articles and hasn't written anything, uhm
534 and that's another thing happening in my work of moment. Uhm and #00:56:59#

535

536 I1: So where people are on the papers even though they haven't #00:57:02#

537

538 P2: Haven't written anything. So padding in your CV with publications where other people
539 have done the work, uhm but you are in charge of these people, I mean, as you say, if you
540 review it, you discuss the ideas with them, you don't actually have to put words on paper,
541 but you actually have to contribute something, as a minimum. But it becomes very hard to
542 check, you know, you open up an enormous gray area there, where you can have directors
543 of institutes putting their names on articles they haven't written, uhm and that worries me.
544 #00:57:30#

545

546 P3: And I do agree completely that you have to contribute. But even if you put it like that,
547 you have to contribute to uh the scientific work to attach your name to the publication, you
548 can interpret that in as many ways as you want. Because reading it through and signing off
549 "this is okay", that could for some people be a contribution and for others. So it probably
550 needs to be more specific, like putting words down in paper, so then we are already on step
551 away from the mental inclusion of perspectives. #00:58:16#

552

553 P2: But would you be happy to have somebody included, as an author, on a paper if they
554 spend five minutes glancing through it, saying "yeah that's okay"? #00:58:22#

555

556 P3: No I wouldn't. But I think it is worth while to the humanities, the historical disciplines to
557 consider very seriously that we introduce the collective publication practice way more than
558 we have been doing. And then it would be beneficial to the entire field. #00:58:47#

559

560 P2: I think if we're going to do that, that's where we are really going to need some kind of
561 guidelines, because it's like opening a can of worms and #00:58:52#

562

563 P1: I mean I'm very conflicted about that, because I feel like this is what's going to happen,

564 but I think it's going to happen because we are all modelled now on exactly these lab
565 situations, and I'm too old fashioned for that. I mean, I see, and I think there is something
566 very great about writing together with a colleague, right, but I think it will actually make less
567 publications, because if two people really work together and write something in the
568 humanities, that must take longer, because it is a process of every sentence, you know. And
569 so, you know, it's wonderful and I think we should do it in the humanities, but I feel what's
570 going to happen, is my hunch, is more there's more machine of trying to publish more and
571 doing it more in this thing, like the centre head looks through it and puts their name on it. So
572 I have to say I'm very conflicted about that. And, you know, when I was, before sort of
573 (unclear #00:59:53#) our standards work, actually now that you said about this pressure to
574 publish, and people cutting corners, actually I know this as well. I just had, I was now in sort
575 of my [nationality], history of political thought world, that is quite old fashioned, but I know
576 this from various [nationality] research environments, and I think if we want, so that is
577 actually my big research integrity problem is publish or perish in European academia, that
578 it's really about just counting articles, and then sometimes the monograph just counts like
579 one article, you know, but there's spent ten years on the monograph, and so you don't write
580 that monograph anymore. And so, you know, ten years ago when I was a PhD student at
581 [university], my supervisor said "oh don't publish anything, before you have written your
582 PhD, please don't, it's", and now I can't tell my PhD students not to publish. I have to tell
583 them, they have to publish, all though I thought it was wonderful that I had a space where I
584 could just think about my PhD. And so, my, I really think that we are going into this...yeah
585 we just, we try to make everything sort of similar, and everything is sort of modelled on,
586 maybe even an imagined model of the lab, because I talk to scientists, at they said "well ten
587 years ago or 20 years ago there were very, I mean, we also would work individually". That's
588 also a very, apparently, new uh way of how natural sciences do work, but now it it's a
589 blueprint to get funding, you now, for the humanities, and I think that's the problem. And
590 really, it would be so much nicer, if we were allowed to write ONE great article a year, you
591 know, that would make an impact, but it's much better like to write three or four bits of not
592 so great articles. And I mean, but I don't know, so my problem is with the counting. I think
593 the counting, but I, don't ask me what I would substitute for that #01:02:01#

594
595 P2: Well, I think that quality should always be more important than the quantity #01:02:04#

596
597 P1: I agree, but how do you, you know, it's, of course that's how you do it, and if you have to
598 review 400 proposals, you count, right. But I I I want something where the quality counts
599 more than the quantity, but I, so I thinks that's what #01:02:21#

600
601 I2: So these publications criteria are they sort of, do you know what is expected of you, in
602 terms of how much to publish, where to publish or where are these demands coming from?
603 #01:02:38#

604
605 P1: Uhm #01:02:38#

606
607 I2: Is there something written down, or is it something you know from your contract or
608 where is it? #01:02:42#

609
610 P1: No, but if you want to have a permanent job, you can't, unless you are an [city]- or [city]-

611 like prince or princess, (all laugh), it's just clear that no one will hire you without lots of
612 publications. You just have to have it, so is the job market #01:02:58#
613
614 I1: So as I hear you, you uhm, so you, it would be nice if universities had a responsible way
615 of promoting people and hiring people that didn't look so much at the number of
616 publications, but looked more into the quality of the single publications. #01:03:23#
617
618 P2: I very much agree with that, because, I mean, I can think of plenty of scholars 20-30
619 years ago, whose books we're still reading. #01:03:31#
620
621 P1: Exactly, yeah #01:03:31#
622
623 P2: And I can think of scholars today that are turning in article after article and people aren't
624 reading them now, they certainly won't be reading them in 10 or 20 years time. #01:03:40#
625
626 P1: No exactly #01:03:42#
627
628 P2: And it would be very hard for those people 30 years ago, they would get a big shock to
629 see this #01:03:46#
630
631 P1: Yes, they would never (laughing). Like one of the most in my, you know, in [...
632 anonymized author in the field ...], doesn't even have a PhD, I mean, right? So of course, I'm
633 not saying we should move back to that, right. But, and it's just, it's still possible, you know,
634 people who get hired in [city] and [city] with one or two articles and nothing else, that's
635 possible there, but I don't think it's possible in a European, in the other, in the European job
636 market, you know. #01:04:18#
637
638 P2: What about once you have a fixed job, I'm not in that situation, so I'm really conscious I
639 need to publish to try to get a job. Do you have some people controlling how much you
640 publish once you're there, established? #01:04:31#
641
642 P3: There, I mean, there are institutional standards for how much you need #01:04:35#
643
644 P2: But are they really enforced or? #01:04:36#
645
646 P3: They do a three year review of your scientific publications, uhm to see if you meet the
647 standards. They don't do anything much of it uhm once you get reviewed, uhm and you are
648 only called into a meeting if you are below the standards. #01:04:55#
649
650 I1: What are the standards? #01:04:55#
651
652 P3: Two scientific publications a year #01:04:58#
653
654 P2: It's not that much, it's reasonable, it's fair #01:05:03#
655
656 I1: I mean they could be co-authored as well, couldn't they? They don't have to be single
657 authored, do they? #01:05:07#

658
659 P3: Uhm, I think if all your publications are co-authored, they would uhm amount to less.
660 But in our institute we have very very few that are below that #01:05:24#
661
662 P2: I mean that does seem a reasonable level, I mean, quite minimal really #01:05:29#
663
664 P3: Yeah, and I haven't heard of anybody ever who got fired on the basis of that, because
665 then you might be doing some other stuff, uhm #01:05:37#
666
667 I1: And I guess a book would count more than #01:05:40#
668
669 P3: Yes #01:05:40#
670
671 P1: Well that's good (all laugh) #01:05:42#
672
673 I1: So you can still write your monograph (laugh) #01:05:46#
674
675 P2: I would think, well it seems pretty good here in [city] once you've got a fixed job, but it's
676 a real pressure for early career researchers to get on the ladder. #01:06:00#
677
678 I1: I think it is very different here from department to department as well. We have
679 completely different standards here as well. I think that would also be how people would
680 think about it here maybe, but uhm once you then apply for a professorship or whatever
681 then there are other standards maybe, than those #01:06:25#
682
683 P3: And as P1 said before, it takes a really long time to do a good article in highly esteemed
684 journal. It takes a year to write a work like that. So it takes a long time, so I think two is
685 actually, uhm that's fair. #01:06:44#
686
687 P1: But I will say in [nationality] academia it was definitely more, I mean definitely. I think if
688 you only published two things a year...I mean again these are not standards that are written
689 down somewhere, but it's sort of, "do you want to get a job or not?", right. So the internal
690 pressure. So and yeah, it varies from country to country. #01:07:12#
691
692 I2: But could you make it more transparent or? #01:07:19#
693
694 P1: But would that help anything? That is my question though. I feel like as soon as you
695 implement standards, things can get even worse sort of...uhm I mean I don't know, but I feel
696 like as soon as you put rules down, like it doesn't generally make things less complicated, it
697 usually make them more complicated. Uhm but of course transparency...would of course,
698 well I don't know (some laugh), I just think "would that work in [nationality] academia?",
699 and I think, no people would still, well okay, you have to have two articles a year, but you
700 would still probably not get the job, unless you have published five or more a year. Right so
701 #01:08:07#
702
703 P2: Another thing I think it connects to uhm is uhm it doesn't only reward people who cut
704 corners, it rewards people who work too hard to an unhealthy degree. So I mean nobody

705 works within the 40 hours or whatever a week, but if people are gonna work 100 hours a
706 week, they are gonna get more publications, but they're neglecting their family, their
707 health...So it's you know, if you want to have more of a balance in your life it can be hard to
708 compete with people like that, and it's not good for anybody. #01:08:36#

709

710 P1: Exactly #01:08:37#

711

712 I1: I2, do we have any more of these fixed things? #01:08:42#

713

714 I2: No I think we wanted to draw it into some more specific topics and we already discussed
715 that transparency, and we would like to also discuss GDPR, that is very in right now at
716 [university], because all research in Europe has to comply with these new rules, and they've
717 been enforced in 2019, and and in a fairly strict way also in [country] and also here at
718 [university], and we were wondering whether you see some challenges in terms of fulfilling
719 these GDPR requirements? #01:09:20#

720

721 I1: Yeah, exactly #01:09:20#

722

723 I2: GDPR, it could be consent forms, it could be the way you're handling your data, the way
724 you store your data. #01:09:29#

725

726 I1: General data protection regulations. #01:09:31#

727

728 P2: Personal information #01:09:36#

729

730 I2: Yeah personal information, that's the key aspect of it #01:09:41#

731

732 P2: The actors I look at, they're all dead so (all laugh), I don't have any #01:09:46#

733

734 I1: I guess your guys are really dead (all laugh), you know, the ancient Greeks and
735 #01:09:51#

736

737 I2: There is also a matter of documentation, I think, in your field and I guess that's where you
738 would translate GDPR-rules, but you're not working with #01:10:00#

739

740 P2: I still don't understand the rules to be honest. But it was talked about a lot at work when
741 it was coming in, and people were getting quite worried because an archeological
742 excavation is very collaborative for instance, so they end up with enormous data about the
743 team of people who were working there, and they weren't sure what can we store, what
744 can't we keep in store. Uhm so that doesn't really affect me too much, but that that was the
745 main issue that was causing some worry. #01:10:25#

746

747 I2: Okay and is that handled now, or is people still? #01:10:28#

748

749 P2: People don't talk about it anymore, I think it's, I don't know, I think people have started
750 deleting emails more often, but generally carrying on pretty much as before and not
751 worrying too much, I think. #01:10:40#

752

753 I1: But do you think people know exactly what to do? #01:10:42#

754

755 P2: No, I don't think so, no. Because, well, we talked about it at meetings week after week
756 after week, and people kept having questions, and the administrators were being sent to
757 meetings to talk about it, and they would come back and say "well, we don't have answers
758 to these questions, we don't really know it, it's really confusing", and then it sort of just
759 fizzled out, so don't think that people understand it completely even know. #01:11:06#

760

761 P1: I just remembered in [country], uhm before I got this job here, I was thinking of applying
762 for sort of a scholarship, like or a project in [country], and I remember there was a thing.
763 There was this question about, how do you work with your data, how do you ensure data.
764 And I asked "what do I write?", and a colleague of mine did a similar application and said "I
765 only wrote in there, well 'I work with medieval, dead people'" (all laugh). So I mean, maybe
766 the thing is more like, how can you translate what you need from us there, because for us it
767 doesn't, you know, it doesn't make any, and I still haven't understood what it is about, right.
768 #01:11:51#

769

770 P3: It's only a student counselling it applies, because for research, it doesn't apply for the
771 things that I do. The counselling, well yeah I delete the emails, when we are having students
772 with mental health issues or whatever, yeah. #01:12:12#

773

774 I1: But as I hear it, it would be nice with clear guidelines, or "what is GDPR?", "what does it
775 mean for me working in this field?", and "what is it exactly I should do with my data, when I
776 have data that's included, yeah". Well it's the same for us, we also, what do we do? We start
777 deleting our old emails, and think like that, because it's basically about not having old data
778 lying around #01:12:52#

779

780 P2: Well, I think I have colleagues who have taken the approach that they delete everything,
781 but in my understanding, we don't need to do that. So if I get emails from a student saying "I
782 have missed class because" and then they tell me something personal, I will delete that, but
783 if they're emailing me saying "can I hand the essay in a week later?, you know, something
784 practical, I don't delete that. So I don't know whether if I'm following the guidelines
785 correctly, but (all laugh). #01:13:23#

786

787 I2: Maybe you should put that in #01:13:25#

788

789 I1: Yeah, we have it on tape now (all laugh) #01:13:27#

790

791 P1: Yeah exactly, guidelines also for the humanities, for all, for non-data-using #01:13:35#

792

793 I1: For fields that work with different data #01:13:38#

794

795 P1: Yes, exactly #01:13:41#

796

797 P3: A guide for "when do you not, whenever you do not need to consider GDPR" (all laugh).
798 #01:13:53#

799
800 I1: Could it be something like the SOP there, so, you know, if you #01:13:58#
801
802 P1: Yeah #01:13:58#
803
804 I1: If you looked at that one we had before, what was that called #01:14:04#
805
806 P3: The flow chart? #01:14:04#
807
808 I1: Yeah yeah, I was thinking, I don't know what happened, it doesn't look good (laugh)...
809 ...Uhm so if something like this. This is an example of a SOP. This was for the data when they
810 did clinical trials. But you could imagine something similar here, so if you had all disciplines,
811 from list, and then you could run through all of them, I mean, couldn't that be a relief for us,
812 so "okay, I'm one of those people there, so what do I need to do?" #01:14:52#
813
814 P1: Yes, that would be great. #01:14:50#
815
816 P3: Yes, could actually be, then you could just go through the forms "I don't need to do that.
817 I need to fill out this form" #01:15:00#
818
819 I1: Exactly, and then you know you're doing what you're supposed to #01:15:09#
820
821 P1: Absolutely, that would be fantastic #01:15:09#
822
823 I1: So that's a concrete example #01:15:13#
824
825 I2: Yeah, but we have one more topic, and I'm, we don't know if that's at all relevant for you,
826 but it is a topic of independence from commercial influences, you know, when working with
827 industrial, working with small and medium enterprises. We recently had a case here at the
828 university, I'm sure you know, the [...anonymized...] scandal #01:15:38#
829
830 P1: I don't #01:15:36#
831
832 I2: Okay, but you don't need to know, but it's just, it's a sort of recent topic that came up
833 (unclear #01:15:48#), but it's, is that something you experience in your research,
834 collaboration with industry #01:15:56#
835
836 P3: Not too many companies are interested in my (unclear #01:15:57#), but they should be
837 (all laugh) #01:16:02#
838
839 I1: I once read a book called [... anonymized ...] #01:16:06#
840
841 P1: Yeah exactly, [... anonymized ...] for women, for manager. No so I personally don't work
842 with a business, right. #01:16:18#
843
844 I1: You don't either? We've had some projects in the [department] where we work with
845 consultancy firms, but I don't know #01:16:26#

846

847 P3: Well, I've had students doing their master thesis with consultancy firms. And we even
848 had discussions with our head of the institute regarding how much extra work we can do
849 outside of the university as sort of a side job, and we have very wide possibilities. Basically
850 we can do whatever, in terms of extra talks and, and to gain an extra income, even though
851 it's one to one uhm, it's the same we say when we teach, or I don't know. #01:17:09#

852

853 I1: So you're allowed to take on extra jobs #01:17:12#

854

855 P3: Yes yes, and we can, and we specifically asked our head of institute "could we for
856 instance set up a bureau that advertised with the public lectures in the fields that we know,
857 and earn a living besides of our regular jobs?", and yes, we are absolutely allowed to do
858 that. So we have very #01:17:40#

859

860 I2: Do you have some clear standards for how to do that or? #01:17:43#

861

862 P3: I don't think they are written down actually, but when we asked, and we asked at a
863 department meeting or institutional meeting so #01:17:57#

864

865 I2: Have you ever come across any challenges in terms of (unclear #01:18:02#) collaborating
866 with industry or? #01:18:04#

867

868 P3: No #01:18:07#

869

870 I2: No issues #01:18:07#

871

872 P3: None what so ever #01:18:06#

873

874 I2: That's good #01:18:17#

875

876 I1: No one interfering with [... anonymized ...] (all laugh) #01:18:17#

877

878 P1: Exactly, maybe I should become a public lecturer (laugh) #01:18:23#

879

880 P3: It doesn't pay that much #01:18:25#

881

882 I1: It's not an issue in your field as well, is it? #01:18:27#

883

884 P2: I was trying to think, if I could think of any examples, I don't have any experience of it at
885 all, I suppose. The only thing that came to mind were colleagues who've taken part in
886 documentaries, I mean that's, and they do have to be careful with the things they are saying.
887 [... anonymized ...] #01:19:32#

888

889 I1: It will come, it will come...But I think that is quite common, I did an interview for some
890 [nationality] radio at some point, and she also said that was very good what I said, "but what
891 I would really like you to say is this. Can you say that?" (all laugh), and I said "yes I can say
892 that, but it's not true, so I'm not going to say it", "okay okay, I'll come back then", she said.

893 And the interview of course never got used, and I think it is not uncommon, and I didn't
894 think about it in commercial terms, but I guess when you work with a commercial uhm [...
895 anonymized ...], then of course it's it's an example of the same. #01:20:19#
896
897 P2: They want to get something very different. #01:20:21#
898
899 I1: And you can be very flattered, "oh they talk to us about this, and we can reach a broader
900 audience", so I guess that's where we really have to be careful...but I don't know how to
901 handle it, but maybe with contracts or #01:20:32#
902
903 I2: No but it's also tapping into when to publish your results, when to go out to the media,
904 when to communicate your results, do you need to wait to make it public? I think these
905 questions are also in the humanities, I think, or #01:20:55#
906
907 P2: You publish (unclear #01:20:55#) #01:20:57#
908
909 P1: And then it takes so long to publish anyway, yeah #01:21:02#
910
911 I2: But you don't go out into the media and tell about the results before #01:21:04#
912
913 P1: I'm sorry but nobody in this (unclear #01:21:08#) do (all laugh) #01:21:15#
914
915
916 P3: I actually had one in [newspaper] this weekend #01:21:18#
917
918 P1: Cool #01:21:16#
919
920 P3: On (unclear #01:21:19#), but I don't really think about, no, because it's so rare (laugh)
921 the news media wants to #01:21:31#
922
923 P2: I mean, as I said, my work is more rooted in the humanities, it has more to do with re-
924 interpretations of things, and that's hard to get media attention for, but a lot of
925 archeological researchers digging up new stuff in the ground, and that's exiting, the TV
926 channels will swoop in. I suppose then people will have to be careful at "what stage do I",
927 you know, "do I want to write it up first", and then get the attention, kind of, find out what
928 you want. Because if they get the attention it can bring them money, which they need, but
929 they don't want to release all information before they've studied it properly, so they have to
930 be careful #01:22:06#
931
932 I1: Could they also risk not being able to publish it if they have brought it at the TV channels
933 before? #01:22:10#
934
935 P2: Yeah, I mean, potentially, because once it's out there, somebody else could write about
936 it, and so then they might have said everything that's interesting to say before you get it
937 down on paper. So there is that. #01:22:29#
938
939 P1: I mean for me, the problem, but it has nothing to do with business, but it's just, uhm

940 there's this new thing that you do pre-circulated papers all the time, which I think, which I
941 don't do anymore, because I you know, well of course you say "please don't, you know,
942 please do not cite without permission", but you don't whether you're not being plagiarized. I
943 mean, I wouldn't, and then it's problematic then to prove it and so on, so that's the only
944 thing where I think...but everybody decided, but this is, I think there's a lot of sort of
945 unpublished work circling around, and I'm not sure whether people understand sort of that's
946 a bit dangerous #01:23:18#

947
948 P2: Well, I heard a story about a friend's girlfriend, they're both in [name of historical field],
949 and she'd given a talk, she'd presented some of her new research which then later showed
950 up uncredited in a publication of a more senior colleague. So that kind of thing happens.
951 #01:23:37#

952
953 P1: There are cases yes, and it's very hard to prove, very hard. #01:23:41#

954
955 I1: So it's the ideas that are then stolen or, yeah #01:23:45#

956
957 P1: Particular viewpoints, particular #01:23:48#

958
959 I1: Takes on something #01:23:48#

960
961 P1: Yeah, exactly, yeah. Connections that everybody has done previously. I mean, you
962 always have that of course, when you talk in front of a large audience, you know, you can't
963 control it, but I think it is even worse with the pre-circulated papers. Because to get
964 plagiarized when you speak, I mean, people must make, like, really impressive notes, take
965 impressive note, but if you give them a script as well, with footnotes and so on, you know.
966 Yeah I find that quite dangerous. #01:24:21#

967
968 I2: Do you see a tendency that they are sort of a culture of closing in? That you're afraid of
969 sharing your ideas publicly? #01:24:34#

970
971 P1: Yeah, I'm not afraid of sharing my ideas, I don't mind the talking and I present new
972 research, but I think uhm the, because, I think because so many people are under so much
973 pressure uhm you see it when you, I mean, I hear, I know so many of these stories. And I
974 myself think that I was plagiarized a couple of times, and I just don't do this anymore. Not
975 the, the presentation of my new research of course, but not the pre-circulated paper where
976 you can read it and copy and paste it and #01:25:04#

977
978 P2: So if you're at a conference where they ask, and you say "I'm not going to", do they
979 accept that? #01:25:08#

980
981 P1: Yeah #01:25:08#

982
983 P2: Okay #01:25:13#

984
985 P3: I was really surprised when I became [... anonymized ...], one of the things that I do is
986 that I read and comment, review on research applications. And one of the things that struck

987 me was how hesitant my own colleagues were in giving the research proposals for the
988 applications, because they were so protective of it. [... anonymized ...] I cannot share that
989 which is given to me in confidentiality to anyone, but still knowing that, there's some
990 "please, please do not share this, and I don't know if I'm sending it to you because
991 somebody might know what I'm applying for", and so even in this very collegial
992 environment, people are very protective of their work and their applications for future
993 funding. So there is that, I agree with you that there is something about this. #01:26:24#
994
995 I1: Has this to do with originality as well, that it has to be original, the ideas that you bring to
996 the table and not just something that you've done before? #01:26:36#
997
998 P3: Yes #01:26:36#
999
1000 P1: Yes #01:26:36#
1001
1002 I1: And your originality is lost if somebody else #01:26:40#
1003
1004 P3: Yes and also because it's a small community. You're competing with your colleagues, so
1005 even though you're collaborating, you're also competing and you're applying for the same
1006 funding, and you know that there are even less than 10 percent's chance of success. This
1007 new [university] structure is also not doing anything good to the humanities for instance
1008 #01:27:08#
1009
1010 I1: What do you mean by that? #01:27:06#
1011
1012 P3: They re-structured their entire funding programme, so it's even harder for the smaller
1013 research projects to get funding. And especially the humanities, because they focused a lot
1014 of their publication strategies towards the natural sciences. So for instance, we cannot apply
1015 for the university publication house, [university press] #01:27:34#
1016
1017 I1: Yeah, [university press] #01:27:34#
1018
1019 P3: Yeah, the university press for funding for publications because that has all, all of that has
1020 been channeled into the natural sciences, so that's a huge problem. And we're discussing
1021 that tomorrow. #01:28:02#
1022
1023 I1: Thank you very much, let's have a break and something to eat, before we then transfer to
1024 out little exercise #01:28:11#
1025
1026 [BREAK]
1027
1028 I1: So now we have a little exercise for you, because we talked about a few topics right now,
1029 so what we did in the first year project is that we went out to a lot of different experts
1030 within the field and within research integrity and then they came up with a lot of topics that
1031 they felt were topics we should cover. But what we don't know is, are these topics at all
1032 relevant for you guys, so therefore we would like you to, I've just given you a, so you have
1033 some here. So what I would like you to do now, is to put them on or sort them into these

1034 three groups, so some are very important for research integrity within your fields, some are
1035 somewhat important, and some are not important or minimally important. And then yeah
1036 debate it among the three of you, what do you think about the multiple topics. #01:48:59#
1037
1038 P2: Do you mean that they are important as, to us, or important in sort of wider practice as
1039 things are now? #01:49:10#
1040
1041 I1: As support for you within your field, so for example we talked about data management,
1042 GDPR, before, and so is that important for you? Well it's not really important, but it might be
1043 important anyway to have rules or guidelines? #01:49:27#
1044
1045 P2: Is is the question "IS it important?", now as things stand, or "SHOULD it be important?"
1046 #01:49:38#
1047
1048 I1: Is it important for you, would it be beneficial for you to have SOPs or guidelines within
1049 these topics, so you just, P3, you can start maybe? #01:49:51#
1050
1051 P3: Well, we can start with this one, I don't know how to phrase it, because I really think
1052 that data management is very important, but not GDPR. But handling your data, whatever it
1053 is, is very, but if you mean specifically the GDPR, I would place it here for our fields, also in
1054 terms of what we discussed before. But data management should be very important, in
1055 terms of source handling, so yeah that would be my take on that. #01:50:31#
1056
1057 P1: Absolutely #01:50:31#
1058
1059 P2: Yes, I agree (all laugh) #01:50:32#
1060
1061 I1: It's very easy #01:50:40#
1062
1063 P3: Then I have "publication and communication, authorship and open science", which, I
1064 think, also in effect of what we've discussed today, I would place as a very important, as one
1065 of the things that should be integrate to our field #01:51:00#
1066
1067 P1: Open science, is that like open access or what is open science? There's authorship open
1068 science, I mean, I just, so open access is now, of course, super important, so I agree, but I
1069 just want to know open sciences I specifically? #01:51:17#
1070
1071 I2: It's pretty much the same, but there is a shift in the paradigm, earlier we spoke about
1072 open access and now it's not only that I, things are available that we also shared before in
1073 terms of open science that you can see, it's just not only about that you can get access to
1074 publications but also that you can share data prior to. And I think it's really interesting in in
1075 in relation to what you've just discussed in terms of, you know, keeping it close and being
1076 afraid of sharing, so that sort of goes against this whole new paradigm of open science, and
1077 that's quite interesting. #01:51:56#
1078
1079 P3: But that's only up till the point where you get the funding or publish your, then
1080 #01:52:01#

1081
1082 P1: Once you publish, no absolutely, that's super important, the sharing of your unpublished
1083 that is a problem #01:52:12#
1084
1085 P2: It's important to get credit for what you've done. #01:52:16#
1086
1087 P1: Exactly. And it's really also about time so, I don't want to be in the position where I have
1088 to quote somebody who've stolen my ideas (all laugh) #01:52:23#
1089
1090 I2: Well, that's fair enough #01:52:24#
1091
1092 P3: Well, the last one is "education and training in research integrity", uhm...which I think, I
1093 think it's very important that we know this...I was shifting between should it be somewhat
1094 important because it easy to put a lot of stickers on this one, uhm...but of course it's equally
1095 important as this one, and all historical researchers should know about the content of
1096 research integrity. How do we produce scientific results, how do we know that our field is
1097 scientifically trustworthy, so yeah #01:53:18#
1098
1099 P1: Completely agree, it's just we've said earlier, yeah we don't need any more rules
1100 because it has always been so important to make this clear to our students on the lowest
1101 level. #01:53:30#
1102
1103 P2: Well, I think students, yes, you drum into them right from the beginning, "don't
1104 plagiarize" and that kind of thing. But maybe it would be good if there were more
1105 opportunities as you progress to sit around and think about these issues, because this is the
1106 first time I've done that explicitly. As a PhD student you just assume that you know what you
1107 should be doing, and there aren't, well for me at least there have never been opportunities
1108 to consciously reflect on integrity #01:54:06#
1109
1110 I1: so follow up courses are, for senior academics as well? #01:54:04#
1111
1112 P2: Yeah, but I now here in [country], PhD students all follow lots of PhD courses and I know
1113 that one which they are supposed to follow is a compulsory in ethics. So maybe that
1114 provision is here in [country], so maybe it's not, nothing else is needed, but it wasn't, I did
1115 my PhD in the [country], and we had nothing like it there. #01:54:29#
1116
1117 P3: And after next year, it will be obligatory for all at the university to have new courses on
1118 research integrity. #01:54:37#
1119
1120 P2: Okay, well that sounds good, I think #01:54:37#
1121
1122 P3: Are you doing that, by the way, is that you doing that? #01:54:42#
1123
1124 I1: We have a course for PhD students in business and social sciences #01:54:49#
1125
1126 P3: [... anonymized ...] #01:54:59#
1127

1128 I1: I think it's the [...anonymized...] scandal that triggered this. #01:55:02#
1129
1130 [... anonymized ...]
1131
1132 P3: [...anonymized...] #01:56:52#
1133
1134 I1: [...anonymized...] #01:57:05#
1135
1136 P2: Quite dramatic #01:57:03#
1137
1138 I1: Yeah it was. Without really being a big scandal, it wasn't like anybody had done, you
1139 know, fabricated data or anything, it was just #01:57:17#
1140
1141 I2: A lack of transparency #01:57:17#
1142
1143 I1: It was a lack of transparency and also, where are the boundaries between the funders
1144 and the ones doing the research. Yeah, P1? #01:57:33#
1145
1146 P1: Yeah, so I have "independence from commercial influences, academy, industry,
1147 collaborations". I mean, we've #01:57:41#
1148
1149 I1: Talked a little bit about it, yeah #01:57:41#
1150
1151 P1: Even though I said earlier, it doesn't really apply, I still think it is very important, because
1152 I still think we have to make sure, we remain independent if, you know, academia gets more
1153 and more new liberalized, so I can totally imagine a world in 50 years where you cannot do
1154 [... anonymized ...] research without, you know, having funding from a Coca Cola company,
1155 you know, so I still think that's very important...Then "responsible supervision and
1156 mentoring", I definitely think that it's very important that we constantly, also constantly talk
1157 about it, constantly do best practice, sort of exchange this. I found that in my old job we did
1158 it very informally, but very very regularly and it helped so much. It holds up the quality. So I
1159 think that it's very very important that we have good sense that responsibility is key in,
1160 when you supervise, when you mentor and when you have best practice ideas and
1161 #01:58:54#
1162
1163 P3: I agree #01:58:53#
1164
1165 P1: And then this "managing competition and publication pressure", I'm sorry it's also very
1166 important, because it comes, this managing competition and publication pressure, it comes
1167 to what we said earlier, it is really managing the pressure, is really big. Uhm I mean yeah, I'm
1168 a bit surprised that it is on here because I felt it was, yeah, sort of that usually we these
1169 guidelines that you have to publish two or three or four uhm articles or whatever, and this is
1170 managing that competition and managing publication pressure, and I think that this is really
1171 what it is about now. I mean as we said, like in the younger generation, we publish so much,
1172 and ten years before nobody would have done that, and like when you're quite junior. So
1173 yes and that has to be managed and there has to be DONE something about that #01:59:52#
1174

1175 I1: Well, good #01:59:54#
1176
1177 P1: I don't know what this is? #01:59:55#
1178
1179 I1: This is also for you, it was just because there wasn't an equal number #01:59:57#
1180
1181 P1: I suppose "transparency supporting a responsible research process", now okay yes it is
1182 important but we also know, we, I mean, we feel it's now implemented, but it's still very
1183 important, we can't put it in somewhat important can we. We have to put it, yes, right?
1184 #02:00:15#
1185
1186 P3: Yeah, we do #02:00:14#
1187
1188 P1: We do #02:00:22#
1189
1190 P2: Also a very important thing. Uhm so I've got "research collaboration" and then "RPO's",
1191 but I'm not quite sure what an RPO is? #02:00:30#
1192
1193 I1: Research performing organization, like a university #02:00:36#
1194
1195 I2: But also at a university, you can have centers or so forth that do research #02:00:44#
1196
1197 P2: Well, I guess I would say somewhat important, because we need something in (all
1198 laugh). No because I mean, I think that it's uhm...you can't say that it's not important at all, it
1199 seems that it's worth happening, but I don't think that all research that we do has to be
1200 collaborating between institutions and external bodies so. Uhm so that's why I would place
1201 it there #02:01:13#
1202
1203 I1: And you also said that you experienced, both of you, different standards from country to
1204 country, you've all done things in between borders and countries, so you would have
1205 experienced that standards might be different? #02:01:23#
1206
1207 P2: Yeah #02:01:23#
1208
1209 I2: But would you like a greater standardization among countries or what? #02:01:29#
1210
1211 P2: I wouldn't want it to be enforced, but maybe uhm...more awareness of those
1212 differences, so that we are not necessarily judging each other by the standards which we are
1213 used to #02:01:41#
1214
1215 P1: And it's such a good point, because I feel that everybody thinks we're so European or
1216 international, but when you DO work with, like go from country to the other, you realize
1217 that the country you are in has no idea about the other countries, right. They THINK that
1218 they have an idea, but they absolutely don't, they just, they operate with these things, oh
1219 yeah, just throwing the UK or throwing American and UK practices together, thinking
1220 everything works like, you know, basically people think that all works like the country that
1221 you're in now, but with a different language. And then you then just say "no, it's completely

1222 different the way teach, the way we supervise, the way, sort of the way we do publications,
1223 what are the publication strategies, everything is different", and that sort of what's behind
1224 this European framework now, and we have that lingua franca, and so people yeah, so the
1225 awareness is the main thing. I think it's cool to have different, of course it's great to have
1226 these different cultures, but it's also, sometimes, I don't know whether you feel it, but I
1227 sometimes think that it is so infuriating to say "no, no, no it is different", you know, there
1228 are these, yeah, so the awareness is super important #02:02:56#
1229
1230 P2: I mean I would never have had any idea of what you told us about the peer review, the
1231 way it's done in [country] #02:03:02#
1232
1233 P1: Yes, exactly #02:03:05#
1234
1235 I1: That was a new one, yeah #02:03:07#
1236
1237 P1: Yes, and the [nationality] are like, I mean they don't understand, they think it's sort of a
1238 new pa-, like a part, sort of a weird thing that [nationality] and American people do. Like
1239 they don't have the same, you know, they don't think it's like the best thing ever #02:03:25#
1240
1241 I1: A sort of really funny one, just a little one here, was Einstein, when he sent in one of his
1242 papers to a journal, and then they sent it out for review and then when he found out that it
1243 was sent out for review, he immediately wrote them and said "my paper wasn't intended for
1244 anybody else than you to read and evaluate, and therefore I will retract my paper and I'll
1245 publish it somewhere else" (all laugh), so that was his take on peer review (all laugh)
1246 #02:04:05#
1247
1248 P1: Einstein and me #02:04:08#
1249
1250 I1: Yeah, but sometimes we think of peer review as some really ancient tradition, but it's
1251 relatively new as well. And especially the universal character it has now #02:04:20#
1252
1253 P1: And a funny thing is, when the [nationality] then DO it, like I know who the peer
1254 reviewer is. I mean it happened to me as well, a peer reviewer came to me and said "yeah
1255 yeah, I've read your article, it was really good" (all laugh), it's so funny #02:04:33#
1256
1257 P2: Something else I had not thought of at all until recently, if you are asked in a peer review
1258 to do things, you just do it. Uhm but somebody, [... anonymized ...] with some quite high
1259 standing academic in [country], got into a discussion because somebody else, more junior,
1260 said "well I'm not gonna do it, if I'm not being paid for it". And he said "well this is just an
1261 accepted part of our work, and", but he got quite more of a backlash, a lot of junior people
1262 said "well, no I think we should be paid, if we're going to be doing this". #02:05:01#
1263
1264 P1: [... anonymized ...], right? #02:05:01#
1265
1266 P2: [... Anonymized ...], yes, oh you saw that, yes exactly. #02:05:14#
1267
1268 I1: Do you have? #02:05:14#

1269
1270 P2: Well these two seem quite close, similar to me, so "research ethics" "regulatory
1271 procedures" and even the "breaches of research integrity", uhm so I'm inclined I think to put
1272 them in somewhat important, just because I don't think that in my experience it crops up
1273 that often, that any procedures are needed, uhm or there are breaches of research integrity.
1274 Uhm I think it's far more likely to happen in the natural sciences, where you can fake lab
1275 results or something, you might need someone checking on what's going on. As you say
1276 where, I I think what we do is a bit more transparent with showing, you know, we take
1277 people through the sources that we are using and so on. But at the same time, as I've said,
1278 there are things going on for me here where I work that worry me. And there's nothing at all
1279 in place to stop that happening. And I think that there are people higher up in the university
1280 that know what, pretty much, what is going on. But they have got no incentive to do
1281 anything about it, because it's bringing in a lot of money. Uhm all of my colleagues are on
1282 long term contracts, they've got the promise of extensions dangled in front of them, so they
1283 won't speak out, and so if there was something in place, uhm to to #02:06:36#
1284
1285 I1: That's part of dealing with it, a whistleblower, it should be a whistleblower arrangement
1286 #02:06:43#
1287
1288 P2: Yes, that's what, but nobody will do that, because they've got #02:06:46#
1289
1290 I1: You know, but if you had like, you could imagine that you had uhm a set up like, so you,
1291 you could, where you could protect the whistleblower, but you could also protect the
1292 person being accused of course. #02:07:04#
1293
1294 P1: Can we put it in very important? #02:07:06#
1295
1296 I1: It is you who decide #02:07:08#
1297
1298 P1: Yeah, can we put it nevertheless in very important? #02:07:10#
1299
1300 P2: Yeah no, it is something which is very very important to me, and it's been bothering me
1301 a lot, so I'm fine with that. It's just that I thought #02:07:17#
1302
1303 P1: Yeah, no, I'm sorry but I find now, because I have a very similar, [... anonymized ...]
1304 #02:08:10#
1305
1306 I1: They should be uhm the best of the best right? #02:08:08#
1307
1308 P1: Yeah, [... anonymized ...] this whole whistleblowing process is very hard and didn't know,
1309 would that mean your end in [nationality] academia and so on. So so yes #02:08:59#
1310
1311 I1: Maybe it's the other one you want to, it's the one "dealing with breaches of research
1312 integrity", that's the way to blow off things #02:09:06#
1313
1314 P3: The fact that it's so rare that we actually, within our field, experience these breaches so
1315 that would be a reason to have it here, but the research ethics is very important. I think it is

1316 important for a number of reasons and one of these somewhat overlooked, I think
1317 sometimes we forget, is the ethics connected to the temporal, uhm temporary positions
1318 that sort of mask all of the lack of ethics within academia, which with some better
1319 regulatory procedures might be uhm sort of uhm helped, that if the EU projects need to
1320 follow regulatory procedures regarding research ethics, that also speaks to temporary
1321 positions and how to approach the fact that some people might act in different ways or
1322 abstain from doing or speaking up or something, we might get better research, we might get
1323 a better working environment, we might get healthier people. #02:10:31#

1324
1325 P1: Yeah #02:10:31#
1326

1327 I1: We have a proud tradition of [...anonymized...]. So could be something like that. And then
1328 you could have some neutral person you could go to, if you had worries like the ones you
1329 were talking about #02:10:53#

1330
1331 P2: Yeah, I find it very hard to imagine what it would be like in practice #02:10:56#
1332

1333 P1: Exactly #02:10:56#
1334

1335 P2: And I think people would still be very hesitant to come forward #02:11:02#
1336

1337 P1: People are, yeah #02:11:02#
1338

1339 P2: And I'm sure if I had a permanent position now, then I would be a lot braver to speak out
1340 about a lot of things which are bothering me...[...anonymized ...] #02:11:52#

1341
1342 I1: Yeah, no, everything here is confidential...Yeah okay, that was uhm, do you have
1343 anything you want to add to these things? Or are there any things where you think "why
1344 haven't they thought about that? That's the most important thing for us or also an
1345 important thing". #02:12:14#

1346
1347 P2: Not something that uhm I have ever experienced, but you hear about it a lot, uhm
1348 relationships in the workplace and particular between sort of senior and junior colleagues,
1349 supervises the PhD students and so on. Uhm as I said, luckily I've never come across it, but I
1350 think that's #02:12:33#

1351
1352 I1: Do you mean like love relationships? #02:12:36#
1353

1354 P2: Yeah, people in positions of power abusing that power also in personal life. #02:12:42#
1355

1356 I1: Yeah, so uhm what shall we call that...yeah #02:12:49#
1357

1358 P2: Yeah, and I think that it's common enough that it needs to be addressed #02:12:53#
1359

1360 I1: You could have rules yeah #02:12:54#
1361

1362 P1: How is that actually handled in [nationality] academia? I don't know #02:13:01#

1363

1364 I1: I don't think it's illegal, I think it's adult people and as long as you don't abuse or force
1365 anyone, I mean, people are allowed to fall in love of course and uhm or to have affairs or
1366 whatever, but I know from, I talked to somebody from the research integrity office at a
1367 [nationality] university, and she told me that she quite often comes across cases where
1368 people get divorced. So, they are working in the same university and then they end up in a
1369 nasty divorce or something, and then they start shooting at each other with research
1370 integrity issues (some laugh). But seriously that was a big part of her work, that what
1371 actually to handle these things. They start accusing each other of cheating, yeah. So yeah, so
1372 if people have relationships, it can be tricky to handle them. And I know some, I think some
1373 companies have rules where wife and husband are not allowed to work at the same place.
1374 But uhm yeah #02:14:25#

1375

1376 I2 :I think it is tricky to make a SOPs for that one (laugh) #02:14:30#

1377

1378 I1: "If you fall in love, then go there" (all laugh) #02:14:32#

1379

1380 P1: But maybe it's in general about exploitative relationships, right. That you, it goes more in
1381 our ethics thing. I find, because it's about any exploitative relationships, so where power
1382 structures are involved, right. Because I think, it's not, I don't know, I personally don't think
1383 it's such a big problem, but I have a problem with the power, I don't know, when it's quite
1384 clear that sort of so different levels are involved, you know, and sort of exploitation is going
1385 on #02:15:06#

1386

1387 I1: I guess there are many famous cases where supervisors and PhD students have ended up
1388 being married, but also yeah...okay thank you very much for this, I think we are coming to
1389 the feedback now. #02:15:28#

1390

1391 I2:The last one is adding new topics #02:15:30#

1392

1393 I1: Yeah, I think we covered that #02:15:30#

1394

1395 I2: Yes, I think you covered that. Yeah, so if you have time, we just wanted talk to you about
1396 how it was to participate and yes before that we of course want to thank you for your
1397 participation, because that is key to the project that we have some excellent focus groups,
1398 so without it we wouldn't have any data. So this is our data for this project. So what will
1399 happen now, I1 also mentioned it earlier, we will transcribe the interviews, and of course
1400 they will be completely anonymous and we are going to report to the European Commission
1401 next year and our report will be out in fall next year. So as soon as it will be official and
1402 published of course you will receive the report, so you can see how your results have fit into
1403 this process and also if some academic papers are coming out of course you will receive
1404 them, but as you know it can be (somebody says something that is inaudible and all start to
1405 laugh), you will be mentioned in the acknowledgements #02:16:34#

1406

1407 I1: We will acknowledge you anonymously (laugh) #02:16:38#

1408

1409 I2: But of course as you now it can take a few years before it's out. But we will, so this is our

1410 first focus group, so we would just like to ask you a few more questions than you normally
1411 do in the debriefing. So we would like to ask you, how did you experience the introduction,
1412 you know I1's slides. Was it clear? Did you have enough information about what was going
1413 to happen? #02:17:13#
1414
1415 P2: Yeah absolutely #02:17:16#
1416
1417 I2: Perfect. And also we discussed some overall uhm different kinds of research integrity
1418 topics that maybe, that we felt maybe would be relevant also draw into some specific topics,
1419 and did you feel that the questions I asked were clear, understandable in terms of, because
1420 it can be a bit, like to ask these questions, uhm because it sort of falls in between your own
1421 practices and also some very abstract SOPs. #02:17:51#
1422
1423 P3: Maybe I didn't read the material as thorough as I should have, but it could be a good
1424 thing to give them in advance. Maybe they are in there, your questions to sort of make us
1425 prepare a little bit, so we know that these are, but I think worked well, I understood what
1426 you said. #02:18:06#
1427
1428 I2: Okay, that's good, but a good point. And what about the exercise? #02:18:10#
1429
1430 P1: Good #02:18:13#
1431
1432 P2: Yes, that was very fine #02:18:12#
1433
1434 I2: Good...Do you think that we could sort of facilitate the focus group better? Is there
1435 something that could work better in terms of questions or the discussion or? #02:18:30#
1436
1437 P1: I mean, I totally enjoyed it much more than I thought I would. Uhm but I just would at
1438 the beginning maybe, cause you are so in the topic, so I asked this question to clarify and
1439 that was then, set it up so much, so I think that in your presentation at the beginning, saying
1440 "yeah we do this because there is a crisis in" #02:18:51#
1441
1442 I2: That's a really good point #02:18:51#
1443
1444 P1: Because I think because for you it's clear, but for me it wasn't. And the other thing is,
1445 also because I'm so bad with this, but I'm always so confused with all the abbreviations, so
1446 especially the RIPP that you sort of, I don't, maybe more often say the whole thing. Because
1447 it then became all so clear and so interesting, but I think I was a bit confused #02:19:19#
1448
1449 I1: Yeah I completely understand that. It took me half a year to (all laugh) #02:19:22#
1450
1451 P1: Yeah but now you're so in it. But now obviously you work with it every day #02:19:29#
1452
1453 I1: That's a good point. #02:19:31#
1454
1455 I2: That's a really good point, yeah. It becomes sort of silent knowledge, you just take it for
1456 granted that everybody knows #02:19:36#

1457
1458 I1: Yeah it does. And we even used it in one of the cards as well, "research collaboration
1459 among RPOs", it's easy to write it out. #02:19:49#
1460
1461 I2: And just the last question in terms of the form of consent process, was that okay? You
1462 still need our signature, and you'll get that. #02:19:53#
1463
1464 P2: well, not necessarily no, but I do still have a question about, because you say you are
1465 going to make everything anonymous, and I'm just wondering how far you go in that,
1466 because for instance if someone is hearing this [... anonymized ...] #02:20:14#
1467
1468 I1: We are definitely going, then we might not include that at all, so if we are in doubt we'll
1469 leave it out. So that's, so we will be very, what do you say, thorough, when we go through
1470 this. #02:20:35#
1471
1472 I2: And the transcription will only be read by the research crew. #02:20:39#
1473
1474 I1: That's not exactly true actually, because as we also in the consent form, we will actually
1475 because of this open science, and because of not wasting data, we will make it publicly
1476 available somewhere down the line. but there we will make absolutely sure that there are
1477 no identifiers what so ever. #02:21:01#
1478
1479 I2: But when we work with data, it will only be #02:21:04#
1480
1481 I1: So maybe we could also, I don't exactly how we will do, but they won't know that this
1482 group took place in [country] for example, and so yeah #02:21:15#
1483
1484 P2: We'll wait in a slight (unclear #02:21:16#) position (all laugh) #02:21:19#
1485
1486 I1: Well you will have by the time, it will be two years down the line, and of course that is
1487 very important because we know some of this can be sensitive. #02:21:31#
1488
1489 I2: And we take this very seriously. #02:21:37#
1490
1491 I1: But thanks for reminding us, because it is really important. Was that it? #02:21:46#
1492
1493 I2: I think that was it, unless you have any other comments? #02:21:47#
1494
1495 P2: I have one question, how did you decide on asking us? #02:21:49#
1496
1497 I1: So we had a, so first of all you should be from historical topics or disciplines and then we
1498 should have both people who had a permanent position and people who still who don't
1499 have a permanent positions, and we should have women and men, we should have three
1500 different disciplines. And we would have had that if we were all here. And then there were a
1501 number of other criteria, so and then we basically went to the web pages and invited
1502 people. And I have to say that it was easier this time than when we last did our interviews.
1503 Then we had to send out 8, up to 8 invitations, to get one participant. Here it was much less,

1504 and most people would like to participate but just couldn't make it work for practical
1505 reasons. So we're very happy that you took the time to come, it's very relevant information
1506 we got out of this. And you've helped to also clarify things, but also to see even more that of
1507 course there are differences between the disciplines and we need to take that seriously.
1508 #02:23:15#

1509
1510 P1: I think for me that is the most important thing in the whole, you know, European
1511 project, to really to give more space to the humanities. I mean, not more space, but make
1512 sure that it remains its own space, history and rules and norms. #02:23:36#

1513
1514 I1: Thanks a lot. We have a little thing for you. There are strict acts rules, so we are only
1515 allowed to give you a little present, because otherwise we would have to report it to the tax
1516 authorities, but this is so small that there are. #02:23:56#

1517
1518 I2: We have an extra consent form, that you can fill out. Because we need to have this, and
1519 you also need to get one back. #02:24:16#

1520
1521 P1: Thank you, that was actually lots of fun #02:24:17#

1522
1523 P2: Yeah, and really interesting as well. #02:24:19#

1524
1525 I1: Thank you, that's something we also sometimes experience that people, that we don't
1526 talk much about these things in our daily work, but sometimes it can be nice to. I thought
1527 we had a good discussion #02:24:31#

1528
1529 I2: Yeah, it was really good. #02:24:36#

1530
1531 P1: But I think for us it is also important that we are going to write these applications, so I
1532 mean that was why I was quite keen, you know, because we have to understand what's, you
1533 know #02:24:48#

1534
1535 I1: Yeah, what does it exactly mean when they say this. But this will first and foremost the
1536 organizations that have to pay attention to this #02:09:04#

1537
1538
1539