Using Podcast Interviews as a Source of Qualitative Investigation

By

Christopher G. Haswell

Using Podcast Interviews as a Source of Qualitative Investigation

By Christopher G. Haswell

This book first published 2025

Ethics International Press Ltd, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (Hardback): 978-1-83711-589-1

ISBN (Ebook): 978-1-83711-590-7

Dedication

My wife is the most beautiful, dedicated, and insightful person I have ever met, so much so that I married her as soon as she said "yes." She challenges me to be better every day. She is also a world champion-level garden designer and horticulturalist, skills she has occasionally set aside to care for our family. Without her, I would not have my two wonderful boys, nor would they be as motivated as they are to learn about and change the world; they are an absolute delight, asking many questions about what we know (but mostly about what we don't). Families are a challenge, but one worth taking on. Writing books and articles takes away from family time, but Michiko understands the world I exist in, and she has supported me entirely. If you find anyone as valuable, go all in - bet the house.

Contents

Foreword

The first time I was invited to talk about my research on the Lost in Citations podcast, I was still a PhD student. I was finalising my thesis on intercultural competence development in Japan, and like most PhD students, I suffered from a severe case of impostor syndrome. Lost in Citations gave me a voice for the first time; it gave me the encouragement to believe that others would also benefit from my work, and so it was with great honour that I accepted Christopher Haswell's invitation to write the foreword to this book.

Throughout the years, I have come back to Lost in Citations, probably more often than most, to share new articles and new projects. Looking back now at my own interviews and at the eclectic list of guests, I realise that Lost in Citations has helped to give a voice to academics worldwide whose remarkable works and ideas might otherwise have reached a much smaller audience.

For many of us who are regular guests and listeners, Lost in Citations has been a platform to share, argue for, and debate thoughts and ideologies. It has been an opportunity to learn about research in fields that we would not have otherwise known about. And it has been a step towards developing a more interdisciplinary approach to our own research and teaching practices.

The speakers and interviews featured in this book showcase the broad range of discussions that can take place when we are open to dialogue. From Marc Helgesen's discussion on happiness in the classroom to Annette Bradford's debate on kokusaika and

nihonjinron to Isabel Pefianco Martin's remarks on language and colonialism, this book illustrates how dialogue surrounding academic and social issues can be fostered beyond journal publications and conferences.

In fact, this book shows that a podcast like Lost in Citations can create a new space for academic and philosophical discourse with the potential to impact not only how we perceive our work and the society around us, but also how we choose to take action moving forward. With a focus on a wide range of issues, this book helps us to connect the ideas from different guests, adding a new layer of complexity to the thought-provoking debates on the podcast.

Lost in Citations has been a journey for those of us who have contributed to and followed the podcast for the past few years. Very few podcasts have achieved what Lost in Citations has: a meaningful platform to reflect on and engage with academic research. Christopher Haswell's book is proof that opening up to dialogue and debate is the first step towards the critical conversations we should and need to have.

Ana Sofia Hofmeyr
Associate Professor, Kansai University, Osaka, Japan

Introduction
Improving your Learning Opportunities in the Current Era

The last time I wrote a book, the topic was the podcast "Lost in Citations" itself. I wrote about its purpose, its production process, how to frame good questions that create valuable answers in the moment, and the use of the produced materials. I wrote it not so much as an instruction manual (which would be pointless anyway, as genres within genres produce very different formats between podcasts), but as a record of the experience and as encouragement to others to join in the space.

This time, I'm focused on how research prospects related to this podcast have been expanded while participating in this project, and how I came to understand the subsequent fruits of learning that are laden on its branches (to extend the metaphor) far better than I did five years ago. "What's next?" is always the question that has driven the podcast forward, particularly once we had harnessed the podcast 'narrative' (Haswell, 2025) for publication, producing materials that helped us return to regular academic life after the COVID-19 pandemic.

This book is about research, specifically related to issues that come up from time to time in interviews that were not necessarily on the decided topic of the interview. Don't get me wrong, the podcast will always be about the contents, but while making it, I cannot stop being an irrepressible person who loves to learn. Do the name of the pod, the vision of the pod, and the contents of the pod

continue to work smoothly as something that supports both the interests of its listeners and my interests as a researcher? I hope the interviews will help others, but if they don't, they will help me. I do not suggest anything grandiose - I love the process of learning.

And, it is a process. And, it is lovable.

In a recent interview with Professor Nicos Sifakis from the University of Athens (Interview #178), he asked me two questions: "Do we believe our students want to learn? Do our students learn in our classrooms?" These are relevant questions to consider when deciding on content: Are we working for our students or for ourselves? If we do it right, we can do both. In this context, 'students' are the listeners, the audience, and I. Unlike our course students, who often have to take our classes as directed by the university, listeners to a podcast can vote with their feet (or ears, depending on how far you want to extend this metaphor). If you create a podcast series purely for your enjoyment, it won't have broad appeal, and no serious academic would intend to spend an hour of their life being interviewed for a podcast with only four listeners. And, as you will see later in this section, we have more repeat customers than that.

What learning opportunities do podcasts provide?

We don't just grow up; we grow out in various ways. We learn to learn more broadly, developing skills that are tangential to our primary focus. We often don't know what we need to know until we see the opportunity, and then we decide whether we need it or whether we can learn from it. It's not the end product that defines us, but our path to get there. And, to be clear, I hope I am not *there*

yet: my learning is not yet complete, and my journey will never be over. Podcasting, which, in our approach to it as a genre, utilizes long-form interviews covering a wide range of subjects, is a medium that provides me with valuable learning opportunities. This book aims to demonstrate the vast range of similar opportunities available if you are open to them.

In a more profound sense, the iterative process of learning is the process I speak of in the title of this book: we can explore; we can learn in many different ways and directions, if we have the motivation. I recently tried to explain this to a student: learning should be both an external and internal struggle—you won't be happy about the outcome unless the process brings some growth in your journey—so embrace the struggle. And this is my daily experience of others' podcast offerings: I select a news, sports, or current affairs podcast every day, and sometimes it either inspires me or breaks my heart; it's not always a binary experience, but 'meh' is not a level of attention that encourages clicks. I care deeply about both the positive and negative stories I see, and I recognize the need to respond in the same way to our listeners. You shouldn't be able to put down a LiC podcast and say, "Well, I thought nothing about that."

Side story: I was speaking with contributing editor Chris Cooper about his most recent podcast regarding machine grading of tests. "Good pod, Chris - it kept me company while I did my household chores." Not meant as a slight in any way, and he didn't take it as such. Podcasts accompany us while commuting, taking a stroll, working out, and hoovering. They fit seamlessly into that space in our heads we want to afford them and give us something more to

think about, other than if we really need to break out the dedicated 'cleaning the tops of the curtains' nozzle.

Related to the podcast, I must acknowledge that this is tied to discussions with listeners when I meet them at conferences about their intentions for listening. Some have said they use it for lesson ideas and even content. This is a good 'in' for me to mention my other academic websites, elfcommunication.com and authentic-academics.com. Gives us something to talk about before the next presentation.

The podcast is downloaded around 75 to 100 times in the first week after publication. Still, it may be downloaded several hundred times more over time (and a couple have been downloaded thousands of times); however, if these outliers are discounted, the average is just over 200 times in 6-12 months after release. As both a podcast producer and a qualitative researcher, I've noticed that people with similar investigative proclivities go back through the catalogue to find something that interests them. Hence, we should have various fields of interest to keep the listeners (and me) engaged. Such an approach suits me well, as it challenges me to produce content from different academic fields that colleagues and new listeners may want to engage with and explore.

Is podcasting a genuine research vector?

What began as a hobby has evolved into an obsession - ask my wife how often she has called me to sleep after midnight as I pore over the transcripts. You interview a few academic heroes, then consider what else to do with the results. You transcribe them, build a website, and then create another one. After that, you publish

several blogs that become journal articles. The next stage is to travel the world, giving academic presentations on the results of your analysis. Finally, you write a book. And then another one. So, I would answer "yes, podcasting is a genuine academic pursuit because it brings me closer to subjects that interest me and teaches me something simultaneously; how else would you define research?"

Grounded theory

Long-form, recorded-as-live interviews are a form of 'grounded' approach to collecting data. That is to say, you cannot begin an interview of this kind with a complete set of questions; questions that will yield interesting paths of investigation generally only happen in the moment. If one only wanted to know the stated thesis of the paper, one could merely re-read it. At "Lost in Citations," we seek something more profound, novel, and ultimately the best way to understand the subject, the writer, and the contents of the work. Hearing the writer's voice humanizes them and brings them closer to the listener as a source of information not elucidated in the written work.

A grounded theory approach aligns well with our research work. In their seminal paper, "Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria" (1990), Strauss and Corbin describe the concept of 'open coding,' note taking and categorization done in real time as "the process of breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualizing, and categorizing data" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p.61). 'Coding' was later explained as "Field notes, memos, questionnaires, cultural maps, transcribed interviews from storywork or oral histories [that] may contribute

to the data and the key points (words, phrases, nuances that highlight important issues) found may be continuously coded" (Kress, 2014, p.13), and perhaps more simply as the "process of coding, memoing, and identifying emerging conversational themes from the data" (Edwards, 2021, p.18). Sitting online or in the room, listening intently and scribbling 5-8 pages of notes within the 45 minutes to 1 hour of the interview, this approach of 'tagging' and 'coding' (in my case, noting and summarizing) before asking the next question describes my process very well.

Despite my initial reservations about joining the podcast project (as outlined in the first book), I soon came to understand its value as a research tool that appealed to me. The reason was apparent: all the qualitative data collected was based on human experiences. Whether speaking with an undergraduate on a mission to change how language is taught or an emeritus professor seeking to change people's methods of interaction, and everyone in between, the stories were personal, which made them relatable and accessible to a broad audience, even those not engaged in academia. Even if the stories were closely tied to methodology, findings, and conclusions of research projects, the interest demonstrated by the interviewee and the energy injected into the discourse by well-founded questions revealed the writer's personality.

One interview that will not be included in the book's other chapters, but I would like to share in this introduction, is that of Matthew Baldock. Not because it wasn't good, but it wasn't necessarily academic, which is the book's general theme. However, we did cover many of his literary inspirations in building his business, so I used a sub-category of the podcast called "Haswell on the street." We created this sub-category to allow for short

interviews to be conducted at conferences, where presenters, conference organizers, and event staff can be questioned for 5-10 minutes. Then, 5 or 6 of these mini-episodes can be stitched together to make a single podcast episode. I believed that Matthew's story fell into this category and is a good example of the overall mission of the podcast as it relates to sharing stories that can inspire others.

Matthew owns a real estate company; I have known him for over 25 years. We met as (forced) share-mates in Nottingham Trent University's Basford residence, got along, and spent the next three years having great times (but rarely studying much, if I am honest - Matt can entice anyone into a hash brown breakfast or San Miguel lunch at a moment's notice). However, the interview primarily focused on business psychology, prioritizing the person over the product, and emphasizing the importance of interaction quality over financial gain. I don't have to worry too much about a bottom line, as I work for a public university, but Matt does. He genuinely cares about his clients, as evidenced by his words and work. As I mentioned earlier, the outcome of the interviews is a collection of personal stories about complex tasks undertaken with a mission, along with failures that often lead to successful outcomes.

The dream job

I'm a lawyer by qualification, a teacher by training and experience, and an economist by reading (through which vectors also have an unnecessarily detailed understanding of the Napoleonic wars thanks to Bernard Cornwell's series of Sharpe novels). An uncommon collection of labels, to be sure, but given my heritage and story, not entirely unlikely, and, if truth be told, not so

different a circuitous route to current research endeavours of my much-respected academic colleagues. Even before starting the podcast, I was able to learn about a wide variety of academic fields by spending 30 minutes in the cafeteria with my faculty associates or having a cup of coffee in the break room at a conference. My colleagues are brilliant, and lunching with them is enjoyable. They, like me, are so hyper-focused on one subject that other things are not worth arguing with, so you end up listening to a new methodology or location or cohort of investigatees, and you kind of get lost in their passion for their current project (but quite fun to debate when and if they give it a go). Outside of my wonderful family, I think my joy in life is having lunch with academic mavericks. It's a nerd's dream. The podcast was my attempt to replicate these discussions for a wider audience.

(True story: while I was writing this, a colleague from down the hall stopped by with his steeping cup of tea to ask about recent collegiate events and request some information and advice; barely had I noticed his leaving the room when a student from outside of Japan asked for an hour of my time to work through his research question choice and methodology for his graduation research study and report—this is having a lunchtime academic session in real life). I love my colleagues; they are the best people on Earth. To state clearly: they take great pleasure in their fields of investigation. Me too! I have spent the last five years interviewing people whose work interests me. We don't always agree, but we have enjoyed the honest exchange of ideas. The things we disagree on are not divisive; they ultimately make the content productive. When I get a knock on my door, I am rarely as freaked out as I used to be. This lowering of my concern about speaking with colleagues helped me to approach strangers for interviews.

Why is in-room interviewing better than ZOOM or Skype?

The podcasts and a classification of interviews, called the #LunchtimeSeries, extend the aforementioned 'nerd dream' into the realm of a qualitative analyst. This series of interviews was my attempt to replicate my lunchtimes with other faculty members. Now that we can meet in enclosed rooms again, just bring a coffee, a bento, and an opinion (or two), and we will discuss your publication. I agree that this sounds very reductionist, but I will have notes, and we will look each other in the eye and then not, which is a sure sign of a thought process while I scribble something down illegibly. This was the original plan of the studio, built for a different project, repurposed for the podcast, and effectively utilized for producing content. This studio has recently been updated with additional screens and a purpose-built Mac-driven hub, encouraging sponsors of recent invitees to the university's FD sessions to recommend these invitees to become interviewees (#167 Ron Thomson and #174 Danica Salazar). Investing in the future brings results!

In the pursuit of effective communication, physical expressions are vital. Microexpressions are a recognizable aspect of conversation analysis that most people understand but rarely discuss. We even covered them in Interview #5 with David Matsumoto; Microexpressions are the key to effective communication. If someone is thinking before they speak, you just know; if someone is lying (or spinning an embellished yarn), you just know. When you are in the room and not on Zoom, you have a better understanding of the opinions and credibility of the interviewee's responses. I hope the number of in-room interviewees increases to

make up half of the podcasts. The invitation is open; however, Ito campus is not easy to access, so make a long weekend out of it.

So far, the 'Lunchtime Series' has been limited by the number of people who can make it out to Ito Campus, a fair way out from the center of the city of Fukuoka. Our participants have been:

#151. Andrew Chapman (Kyushu University)
#154. Eoin Jordan (University of St. Andrews)
#156. Joe Vitta (Kyushu University)
#160. Matteo Tarsi (Uppsala University/Kyushu University)
#161. Gregg Wroblewski (Kyushu University)
#165. Robinson Fritz (Kyushu University)
#167. Ron Thomson (Brock University)
#170. Shaun O'Dwyer (Kyushu University)
#173. Fern Sakamoto & Ana Sofia Hofmeyr (Nanzan University & Kansai University)
#174. Danica Salazar (Oxford University Press)
#176. Narahiko Inoue (Kyushu University)
#182. Greggory Wroblewski (Kyushu University)

The names in **bold** are non-Kyushu faculty, meaning that five of the first 13 participants braved the Kuko subway line and the Showa bus trip (45 minutes to 1 hour) to make it to the studio; the others simply had to take an elevator a couple of floors.

All of these 'Lunchtime' episodes occurred in the last 30 publications, as the first was the January interview after the New Year break in 2024. I wanted it to be an example of how the process had been improved, even streamlined, as the recording could be made directly from the suspended YETI microphone to Audacity.

There was no need to convert the m4a file to WAV (not that this was *too* much trouble, in all honesty, but efficiency and quality were improved). Having the interviewee in the room changed the energy and made me more aware of the situation: it felt more real than an on-camera interview. My flubs went way down; I used fewer fillers like "*um,*" "*ah,*" and "*you know.*" I felt and continue to feel more engaged with the interview. So, come over to the west side of Fukuoka and join me for lunchtime.

Why does the medium of podcasting suit me specifically?

Please also let me make an admission: I'm a bit of a polymath. This is not a brag; it's a problem. It's like a 'jangly thing' that attracts me to give an opinion - my wife will tell you I will not shut up about some subjects; I have been banned from watching news shows (this is true - "come to bed; stop shouting!"). I walk to another place, and my afternoon is over before someone distracts me again: it leads to conversations over the dinner table with blank-eyed stares from my family - Dad's got something in his head and wants to know what we think about it. This was why the podcast appealed to me after my initial reluctance to join: who else can say they get to talk to experts in various fields at least twice a month, for reasons you might otherwise overlook, and learn things you didn't know you didn't know? I can find sufficient input for my curious mind while researching topics I have never studied before. It's similar to the sadly passed-away Anthony Bourdain's concept of traveling the world to understand cuisine. Still, in academia, you get to sample what the world has to offer weekly, but you have to care - Anthony indeed did.

As you age, allocating your available time becomes increasingly challenging. Ten years ago, I had the year of the "Pay-Off." I had spent so many years saying "Yes" to everything so I could make tenure, after which I had to say "No," but with a caveat: Was it going to help me? You can call me anything you want, but this question was what (almost) kept me sane. I had to invoke what fellow podcast listeners will know as "The Adam Carolla Principles" when deciding whether to participate: Does it make you money or make you happy? This was how I concluded that 'Lost in Citations' was a project I should continue to pursue (and I can assure you that I make no money from it).

The podcast continues to surprise me. How could it not? When the people with whom you are speaking are telling you something you hadn't heard before, would that not spark an interest in you, especially as it is delivered in real time? A recent interview with a colleague (not included in this book's canon as it is still pre-publication) had us both fumbling for the Google option as we wanted to prove we were correct. He was, mostly. But how often do you experience that? "I don't know it, but I *want* to know it" moments are as precious as "That's a great question" moments, but maybe I should investigate that point.

A quick update on the statistics of the works being investigated in this book

Before we approach the meat of the book, here is a short note on whence the interviews come. The previous book drew its content from the first 160 episodes. As it has been a year since I locked off the contents at that episode number, I decided to extend the source materials to the first 180 interviews. (I know I previously

referenced an interview beyond this range, but please see below for the caveat.) Here are the descriptive statistics updated from the last book (previous figures are given in parentheses):

	Downloads	Words	Minutes	WPM
Total:	39,688 (37,190)	1,677,350 (1,436,383)	9,807 (8,801)	
Average:	227 (232)	8,780 (8,977)	54 (55)	161 (163)

As in the first book, the total and average downloads do not include the five most downloaded episodes, which number in the many thousands, as they were hosted on a popular language learning website (the total number of downloads as of the time of writing is 58,500). Therefore, these large numbers of downloads for a single podcast are not included as they would skew the figures. I mention this because 200 downloads is an aspirational figure for some interviewees, but a higher number may be off-putting. Please remember that I encourage people throughout their careers to share their work. 227 is a plenary-level audience number, in my experience.

While the number of words has increased by about 250,000 since the first book corpus, the averages have remained fairly consistent. This is good, helpful news for me, as I can reliably say that when I pitch the idea of participating in this podcast project, potential interviewees will reach around 200 new consumers of their work over the next year or so. It won't take more than an hour of their time. Keeping a close track on the statistics shared above is also

something that helps to encourage others, as in the recently joined Chris Cooper, as it does not require many hours for either them or their interviewee.

The statistics also allow me to note how the podcast has evolved to become more comprehensible over time, as the WPM has decreased. As an advocate of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), making sure we are delivering an interview that is comprehensible for most English language users, including aspirational academics, is something essential to keep in mind. The reduction in WPM could be due to the change in the interviewer. Still, the format has also become more effective in allowing interviewees to breathe, thanks to the interviewer's familiarity with the genre.

#1-50	164wpm
#51-100	163wpm
#101-150	162wpm
#151-180	152wpm

This reduction in speaking speed is probably due to the increasing familiarity with the genre by both the interviewers and interviewees (not by much, but enough to place the podcast squarely in the 150-160wpm range). We are moving on nicely.

The theme of this book

OK, so what is the point of this book? It continues the vector of the first book, “Podcasting: A Voice to the Words,” by delving into the interview contents and contextualizing them more clearly; we aim to help writers have their words seen by as many people as possible. You may ask why a podcast needs a book, but you could just as readily ask why a writer needs a podcast. The answer is

simple: if you have a message to convey, the more projection angles, the better. Writers who appear on the podcast always have a message to share.

In my previous book, I looked at the "great/excellent question" as a vector for investigation. I bring this up here because I don't want anyone to approach this book as me supporting or unduly criticizing what has been said in the interviews included here; I am also not taking a stance for or against anyone for their position. My concept of both the podcast interviews and their inclusion here is to offer an alternative way for people to share their thoughts. I do not always agree with the words. Still, I wholeheartedly agree with giving people, friends though they may or may not be (very often, especially early in the podcast's lifetime, the first time to speak to the interviewee was when their face appeared on the ZOOM screen), an opportunity to share their work.

I am not a quantitative researcher, but rather a qualitative one. I want to look at spoken words holistically, in context as much as possible. Such a statement may sound like a word salad of buzzwords, but I assure you it is not. I love to talk and listen, and my colleagues would best describe me as a "smart-arse" regarding my responses. I want to make what could be a dry interaction more vibrant, inclusive, and more like a stand-up set than a dusty dirge of facts and figures. My colleague, Jonathan Shachter, described me in a joint presentation as "juggling bowling pins while I watch on," which is a bit much (but I understand the vibe). Still, I appreciate the somewhat left-field interest in our investigations, mostly from me. I want the signal, not the noise; I want the connection, not the head-nodding.

Once I graduated from the play-pen of the conversation school teacher role to the real-world stresses of university work, I had to accept something about myself: I am a challenging person to work with; I have come to terms with this fact in my middle age. I wrote a section in the last book about the numerous departments and universities from which I was 'let go.' My opinions did not always align with the narrative of the respective departments. Aaron Hahn and Joseph Seigel, my longest-running research collaborators, will attest that "What did you say this time?" is a recurrent refrain when I return from a funding meeting or open-forum faculty discussion dissatisfied. Again. However, I am consistent: my answer on one day is the same on the following day. Disagree with me as much as you want, but I have been around the block enough times to have at least a decent argument about the idea we are discussing. We will still disagree tomorrow; however, we will remain colleagues and friends.

While I am interested in most academic areas, I don't have in-depth knowledge of many of them. However, I can listen to someone and respond sympathetically, which means I can understand the situation being discussed from my own experiences, some of which we may have shared. I can also connect empathetically with someone from a similar background, as I have some experience communicating with individuals from similar backgrounds. Despite appearing to be only a balding, straw-haired, annoyed Norseman, I am also a teacher, academic, husband, father, younger brother, uncle, and son. Things get real occasionally, but we learn and grow from them. You can develop a connection with an interviewee with whom you have never spoken before the microphones went live, even if you come from different backgrounds, by being aware and in the moment.

Now that we understand the background to my approach, let us move on to the concept of framing and how I strive to perform as an effective investigator across the various issues covered in the podcast. If I were not interested in the challenge, I would only interview Global Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca academics and have twelve listeners. How did we get to nearly 60,000 downloads overall, and what academic value was added?

Let us begin.

Chapter One
Framing and How to Approach an Issue of Which You May Know Little

What is 'framing'? This concept involves defining your boundaries before approaching an argument; framing also allows you to control the narrative of the discussion. It is highly effective in defeating an inexperienced debate opponent, and is often seen in 'gotcha' videos on X, Facebook, and Instagram (see: Ben Shapiro). I didn't think Ben was untrustworthy, but their opponents are *unreliable*. However, we don't approach our interviews in this manner. Classical education consisted of the Trivium: Grammar, Logic, and Rhetoric. While the grammar in my writing could do with a brush-up, as ably demonstrated by my Grammarly comments when it comes time for editing, I focus on the latter two pillars of The Trivium throughout this book. All our interviewees have the rhetoric down, but the response "That's an interesting question" demonstrates that a new angle has been inserted into their reasoning on the focus of the interview, likely from a well-considered rumination on the topic, and an addressing of the interviewee's ethos with a little sprinkling of my logos. We make engaging content together.

As said before, this is not a 'gotcha' podcast. Some interviewees, having perhaps seen the one-sided, "Humiliate a genuine individual because you can" style YouTube Shorts-edited clips that pop up far too often, I work very hard to assuage participants of potential concerns; we only want to learn more about the work that

led to the paper we are discussing. By asking clear, logical questions, you frame what comes next, requesting the interviewee to expand on the topic for both me and the podcast listeners. In this framing, you set a boundary about what the next five minutes of the interview will cover and allow the interviewee to feel a little more secure in the interview.

This book will cover how I produce quality qualitative data from interviews. This process will involve framing the discussion or overarching issue, providing relevant transcripts from the interview, and discussing the content of this section. This way, I attempt to demonstrate my mental state during the interview. The transcriptions will be interspersed with a running commentary of what I thought when the interviewee spoke and what I was probably writing down on my paper pad, which is always beneath my be-pencilled right hand. These are, in essence, my 'field notes' and 'concurrent memoing' required for a grounded approach to research.

Framing of sections of an interview is a key skill. We have had interviewees (whom I will not name) who spoke for an unbroken 5, 10, or even 15 minutes on subjects unrelated to the question or the paper being discussed. For this reason, I have tried to select sections of our podcast interviews that are framed by my questions or succinct explanations formed by the interviewees' rhetorical skills. I try to provide enough context from the interview's speech or my commentary for you, the reader, to know why this section of the interview was included.

Value added

There is a clear distinction between a love for the topic and an interest in the dialectic. Maybe I cannot immediately connect with the topic from my own experience and research, but a good discussion catches the eye of an inquisitive person. As mentioned in my previous book, I don't only use my connections to make content; I am curious. One does not need to be a polymath to be a perfect interviewer; curiosity is key. It also helps when you can edit your interviews so the long gaps where I am making notes or forming the next question don't appear in the finally published item.

Socrates was a great interrogator, requiring his interlocutor to answer "Why?" This may seem like a simple question, but in practice, it is the most challenging. Present yourself with this simple question: Why did you buy that box of cereal? Why did you not? Was it the flavour of the contents from past consumption, or the colour of the box within which the morsels are to be found? Did you pick it up, read the ingredients, and review the nutrition information? Was it in a 2-for-1 sale? I don't want my children to eat too much cereal; I think it has too much sugar and insufficient protein or vitamins, so I always read that information first. These are significant concerns for parents. Apply these concerns as an adult learner and your time: we need some time for fun and flavor (the sugar), but sometimes we need something else (the protein and the nourishment). Or, did you never think about it? You wanted the cereal. That is still your "why?"

The Socratic method requires asking "why?", but the podcast interview method requires the interviewer to find a more subtle

way to ask what we want from the interviewee. Honestly, if you downloaded a podcast, and the only follow-up question was "Why?" "Why?" and then again, "Why?" Would you ever download it again? I think not; I wouldn't.

In this vein, I am a father of two very inquisitive boys. We have breakfast, lunch, and dinner at the dining table, and a world map is under a plastic covering before our eyes. Any questions they have about the world (and they have a multitude) are readily available. When they bathe, a periodic table with the relative weights and positions of the elements, along with their uses, is attached to the wall. To their right is a timeline of influential historical individuals, including their birth and death dates and notable accomplishments. Having a bath in our house is said to make you smarter. My kids can recite the periodic table down to about 34 (which is selenium, by the way - I checked; I lose it after carbon, with an atomic weight of 6). Why do I lose my thread at 6? Because I love Lamborghinis - specifically, for the reason that 6 is the magic number for a Lambo, Google it.

I only mention this type of (literal) in-house study as a learning concept because I believe in and have worked with active, passive, and experiential learning throughout my career. The podcast medium is a form of passive learning for the listener. When I was in my teens and early twenties, I would pass the time while walking from place to place (at that age, living in rural south Yorkshire, what choice did I have? Bus? You'd be lucky!) listening to music on my Walkman, then discman, then MD player (still have lots of those MDs and an antique player in my office with which to enjoy them). I loved "books-on-tape" as we used to call them. In the 2000s, I switched to an iPod and started listening to podcasts.

Rather than just enjoying the music (which I still do), I heard various voices from around the world and multiple opinions on an array of subjects. I began formulating my ideas across different areas of study. Podcasting is active learning for me, given the time it takes to produce one interview. However, this form of admittedly self-selected in-house study has helped me create frames of reference for fields of academic investigation such as those outlined in this book.

I'm a keen proponent of the Socratic Method, so I prefer spending most of my time asking questions of the young minds in my classes and study groups and requiring them to ask each other. They sometimes return to my research space and ask, "Did you mean…?" I always respond, "What do you think I meant?" This is not a trap but a requirement question: I can't fix your reasoning, only extend it; if you think about the root of the question, we can work together to understand how you reached your conclusion. This is the logic part of the trivium.

My students are well-trained in how to study, but not well schooled in logic or critical reasoning. When I prepare a lesson, I approach it using the Socratic method: How many value-adding questions can I ask the student group within 90 minutes? How many questions can I have the students ask each other? Socrates was a tricky teacher for his students, but he was not Diogenes (Again, Google it). My point is that asking questions is never a negative vector: you may receive an answer you did not want to hear, but if the recipient cares about your conviction, they will support the answer they give. My students tend to respond with a 'tilt head, eyes right' response, which is fine because you know