

What is 'Research-Adjacent'? with Sarah McLusky

(Research Adjacent Episode 97)

Sarah looks back at the archive to try and define who is research adjacent and what they actually do

<https://researchadjacent.com/big-news-and-reason-to-be-cheerful-episode-96/>



Sarah McLusky: [00:00:00] Hello there. I'm Sarah McLusky, and this is Research Adjacent.

Each episode, I talk to amazing research adjacent professionals about what they do and why it makes a difference. Keep listening to find out why we think the research adjacent space is where the real magic happens.

Hello there, and welcome to episode 97 of Research Adjacent. I am your host, Sarah McLusky, as always, and this episode today is gonna be the first of our compilation episodes looking back at the Research Adjacent podcast series. And that is because, as I announced in the last episode, we're gonna take it to 100 episodes, and then we are gonna stop making new episodes at that point, although the archive will still be available.

So this, as I say, first of the [00:01:00] compilation episodes, and I've had... When I decided I was gonna do these compilation episodes, obviously it prompts you to go back and have a good look through the podcast archive. And I decided to think back to, to both the original reason why I started the series and also to look at some of the common themes that came up throughout the episodes.

And so today, the theme that I have decided to settle on for this episode is what even is research adjacent anyway? And the reason for doing that is because I'm not that into these things, but when you go and have a look at the search queries and how people find the podcast, this might just be the way that, like, Google works, I don't know, but one of the most common search query that brings people to the podcast is: what is research adjacent?

And I think that is an entirely reasonable question. So it's a question that with now the hindsight of [00:02:00] 97 episodes in the bank, I am going to try and answer. And so 97 episodes, also coincidentally, when I added up everybody who's been on the podcast, there is exactly 97 guests as well, which I think is a very nice bit of synchronicity.

But what I'm gonna cover in this episode is: who exactly are these people that I define as research adjacent, some who now define themselves as research adjacent too. What kinds of things are they doing? Where do they work? And then also I'm gonna have a look at how these roles have emerged, because part of, as I'll come to in a minute, the reason for this podcast was because these roles are emerging and not really being recognized, and there's no collective term for them.

Also, I'll highlight some of the challenges that are common in these roles as well. So really, it's gonna be in a nutshell: who are research adjacent people and what are they doing? I'm not gonna go that deep into... Well, no, I'll mention the challenges here. The future episodes coming up, uh, one of them [00:03:00] is gonna be focused on the magic wand question, which I always ask my guests, because that is quite a nice way to both look at the challenges that there are, but also some of the ways to solve them.

So I'm not gonna go too deep into the challenges here. That will be coming later.

So then back to the question, what is research adjacent? Well, if you haven't listened to any of the early episodes, the short story is that I just actually made it up. I didn't entirely come up with the term research adjacent. I did see it on Twitter used a couple of times, once for a post about dancing sheep, which I don't know if it's still up there.

Um, I did put a link to it, uh, way back in one of the early episodes. And also, I saw one of my very first guests using it on Twitter as well, and that was Kirsty Ross. And so here is a little quote from Kirsty about why she started using the term research adjacent.

Kirsty Ross: It just really was a really good description of what I was. [00:04:00] You know, I was in there. I was part of the research process. I was associated with the research process, just not in the lab. You know, I was research adjacent.

Sarah McLusky: So Kirsty embraced the term research adjacent, and certainly at the time when I started the podcast, which was, uh, back in late 2022 when I was thinking about it, at that time, I had recently gone freelance, and I was trying to think of how to describe the work that I did, and it was becoming very apparent, and it had already been an apparent, I'd had a lot of these conversations with my previous boss in my l- previous... in my last employed role, and it's because there was no language at that time to describe the roles that these people were doing except either admin or support or just the generic term non-academic. Now, I'm not a fan of any of those terms.

I certainly was by no means the only person who's not a fan of any of those terms. Uh, I don't like the term admin because it can come across as [00:05:00] very dismissive. I think administrative

work is incredibly important, but it creates a kind of them and us sort of culture. Support, there's... Support's a tricky one.

I think a lot of people would accept that they are in these roles to support the research, but it does get a little bit tricky when the implication is that they are there to support the academics, which I think is a slightly different thing and a slightly different dynamic, and certainly not always the case with these roles.

And the reason I don't like non-academic is because, partly 'cause, like, it could mean just about anything, but also I never like language which defines people by what they are not. So it still basically centers the academics and says, "Here's the academics, and then there's, here's you. You are not academics."

And, uh, so I don't really like the term for that reason. And I, as I say, I am by, by no means alone in this. Lots of people too. So at the time, I needed something to use, and research adjacent just [00:06:00] kind of stuck in my head, and so I just decided to run with it. The next question then is: what do I mean by research adjacent?

And so what I mean by research adjacent is roles that contribute to either research actually being done, so the actual practical day-to-day business of doing research, or also people who are in roles that involve connecting the wider world to the research in some way. And that isn't actually the definition that I used when I first started doing the podcast.

It is a definition that has emerged over time. And what I have come to think of is that these roles fit into four main categories. The first category is roles which are around research communications and also research engagement, so that includes public engagement, schools outreach, public involvement, although arguably you could put that into, to the impact category as [00:07:00] well.

And so these people basically who are more about sharing the research once it's been done, I think is often the case with these roles. Um, but yeah, generally comms and engagement. I'll give some examples of all of these a, a little bit later. Then the next category is impact and knowledge exchange, and that tends to be people with very externally facing jobs.

There's a lot of connecting up between lots of different partners and stakeholders and things like that. There is research services, which is all the behind-the-scenes work, and I know that the Research Professional Futures programme, which was, uh, featured a couple of episodes ago, they actually have 11 different categories, and they, particularly this research services category, they break it down even further.

And so, yeah, there's a lot of different things you could fit in there. And then the last category I've got is people who are involved in training and professional development to some degree. So those are the [00:08:00] kinds of people, the kinds of roles that I'm personally talking about when I talk about research adjacent.

And I think one thing that's just worth mentioning before we go any further is that a lot of these roles, the reason we've ended up where we are now without language to describe these roles, is because a lot of these roles just didn't even exist until quite recently. I've been in and around this world doing this kind of work for over 25 years, which makes me feel very old, but it's the truth.

Um, yeah, the jobs that people are doing now most of them, some of them did, obviously jobs like technicians and probably research funding managers, things like that did exist 25 years ago, but most of them didn't. And a lot of them have sort of emerged gradually and in a very haphazard way, and with individual organisations organizing it themselves because of things like specific [00:09:00] initiatives, funding priorities, things like public engagement, the REF, um, Research Excellence Framework, the open research priorities, and things also like the Researcher Professional Development Framework, which is where a lot of the researcher developer roles emerged from.

So these are things which have evolved gradually over time, and inevitably, when things gradually evolve, you just end up with a complicated web that doesn't necessarily fit into existing frameworks. Another reason that some of these job roles are needed is because as research becomes complex, there is more expectation of doing things like collaboration or commercialization of research, the ethics becomes more nuanced, and certainly in the area that I'm in, the, the way that ethics has shifted in those 25 years, um, i- is really ... You know, I've seen a massive shift [00:10:00] there in terms of what's considered acceptable, what data we collect about people, what's appropriate, how much influence people have on research, and what that means.

So that has become much more complicated. And also, rightly so, I think, there is much more expectation that there is accountability for spending public money. So all of these changes have happened, but along with that, you need people to actually do the work. The job description of an academic, although these jobs, as I'm gonna come to, are not all in universities, but let's just stick with it for now.

The job description of an academic hasn't actually really changed very much for decades, and much as they will complain that they have to do a lot of extra admin than they used to do, which is probably the truth, I'm not, I'm not disputing that. But fundamentally, they still do teaching and research and publishing and, you know, things like that, and that all this other work is largely being absorbed by [00:11:00] people in these research adjacent roles. So these jobs have only really emerged in the last 20 years.

It's no surprise that we don't have the language for them or the structures and resources and things like that in place to adequately support them. And so that was the position that I was in three and a half... more than three and a half years ago now when I decided to start the podcast, nearly four years ago.

I was, um, feeling a little bit angry, grumpy. Again, I've talked about this before, about the situation and the lack of recognition and, the kind of othering in some of the language. And so that's why I felt it was important to do something about it. But as I say, I'm far from the only person trying to decide what to call these roles.

And, uh, there was, you know, again, maybe, maybe two, three years ago, there was a lot of discussion on social media about the language, and I have to say, things seem [00:12:00] to have settled on the term research professional. Some people use the term research enabler as well. I'm actually pretty agnostic about the term research adjacent.

Um, I like it. I don't always use it myself. It depends on the situation. But the thing that happened three and a half years ago was it caught on, and it was quite catchy, and so I ran with it. And it was important because it gave us something to work with and an opportunity to talk about these roles and a sense of collective identity.

And I was not the only person to find that that language to describe it was useful, and here are a couple of quotes from guests who have been on the podcast before. First up, here's Jenny Brady.

Jenny Brady: When I first heard about it, I think I said to you, "Where have you been all my life?" Because finally someone's come up with the wording and created the community and allowed us to speak about what we do, because honestly, without this kind of [00:13:00] work, the wheels don't turn as well as they could.

Sarah McLusky: And now here is a quote from John Elvin, who works for The Royal Society, who I haven't got this recorded, so I'm just gonna read it out, and he sent it by email. And he said, "I have shamelessly taken up the phrase research adjacent as a descriptor. It's a perfect encapsulation of where a lot of valuable work goes on to enable research to happen, which is not obvious to anybody who is not doing it."

So some quotes there from some of my guests, and that just shows that, at the time when the podcast started, both John and Jenny, those are from early in the podcast series, having some language to talk about this just felt really important. And it felt really important because, as John said at the end of that quote, a lot of this work is not obvious to the people who are not doing it.

And so right from the very start, the one and only rule I had about guests was it was for [00:14:00] research adjacent people only. I have, over the years, had a few researchers who wanted to come on as guests and, and I've politely said no, 'cause they've got lots of podcasts of their own. And, uh, a couple of researchers have snuck into some of the compilation episodes, particularly the Hidden REF one, but I will let them off because, A, nobody's perfect, and also, B, they are doing a lot of work to help to support people in these roles as well, so I'll let them off. But the reason I wanted to make this for researchers and people only is because I wanted to celebrate the people that nobody else was celebrating.

And as you'll hear as we go through some of these, these episodes and the future ones, these are the people who don't get named on research papers, they aren't eligible for awards, they don't get counted in the official statistics, and they often only get noticed when things go wrong. And I just, having done this myself, um, again, I have previously shared this story, but when [00:15:00] I was working in a university just before I went freelance, I did all the work to put together our impact case study, and we named all kinds of other people on that impact case study, but not me, and not some of the other people who had been involved in creating things like exhibitions. We didn't name our experts by experience. And all of that to me just felt really, really wrong, and it just made me really grumpy. And even the things like the awards, there's still now only one major award from the Royal Society, which people who are not researchers are eligible for.

And so things are getting better, but it's slowly. I'm gonna share now a quote from Rachel Reeds, who is also, like me, quite exercised about this stuff and, uh, she shares her thoughts from episode 60.

Rachel Reeds: Our roles are very much designed [00:16:00] to be invisible.

If you do your job perfectly in course administration, everyone gets their grades processed on time, everything hits the deadlines, there are no mistakes, there are no errors, everyone thinks it just happens by magic.

And yet when it goes wrong, it becomes this big, big drama and it's, and it's often not resourced because it's not recognized.

Sarah McLusky: So some of those challenges that Rachel identified there come up again and again throughout the podcast. But what I think is really interesting now is that we do have this archive, so hopefully through this podcast we are making the invisible visible. The podcast is an archive which I think is pretty unique actually for its specificity, and perhaps for the first time captures the breadth and diversity of people who are doing these research adjacent roles, all the different kinds of roles, and all the different kinds of people and where they work.

Now, I said at the start of the [00:17:00] show, I've got 97 guests. I cannot claim that they are a representative sample. The way that I identified guests for the show was, um, not particularly scientific. I did my very best to get a range of different types of roles, different types of employers, and geographical locations.

But inevitably, I went with a lot of people that I know personally, or there was a lot of people who introduced me to other people, which is one of the reasons why there's so many people from Durham University on this podcast, 'cause that's where I used to work. There's so many people from the University of Leeds because they were fantastic supporters, um, Ged and Ruth and the team in the Research Culture Uncovered podcast were such fantastic supporters and introduced me to lots of other people.

I have tried to make sure that there is a good range, and we do include, um, a pretty even balance actually across those four categories that I mentioned earlier.[00:18:00]

So thinking about that archive, here are just a little bit of an insight into the people that I have had on the podcast One thing I'm always going on about is the fact that research adjacent people don't just work in universities, and I think that is borne out by the guests that I've had on. 51% of them work for a university or a research, a similar kind of research institution.

But then after that, 21% are self-employed in some way, 10% work for companies that provide research services, including things like legal advice and consultancy, and then coming in each under 10%, but there are guests who work for charities, who work for the NHS, who work for places like learned societies and membership organisations, and also even local government and publishers.

So research adjacent people are working in a huge range of places. And just a fun fact, the most common guest [00:19:00] name is Helen. I have had three different Helens on the show, Helen Underhill, Helen Riding, and Helen White as well. That's just a bit of a tangent.

So they work for a range of different types of organisations. They also work in a range of different jobs. So just to give you a bit of a taster, I'm gonna give you a few examples of people who we've had on the show in those different job categories. So starting off with the comms and engagement category, you've already heard from Kirsty Ross, who was my, uh, it wasn't actually my first interview, but she was the first guest interview that, that I released back in 2023. Uh, Kirsty is a public engagement specialist who works currently at the University of St. Andrews. Matt Partridge I had on, who is a, an illustrator and cartoonist. I think he does something slightly different now, but I'm sure he is still sketching on the side.

I had Maria Kohut, who is a medical journalist, and even an exhibition curator, David Wright. So a big range of different kinds of roles but [00:20:00] that's a flavor of what there is in the comms and engagement side of things. I should say that some of the people, some of the people I've had on inevitably, just in the time that this has been out, have changed jobs, and so I'm mentioning their jobs when they were interviewed, but some of them are currently doing

something slightly different. Then we come on to the impact and knowledge exchange category. So some examples of people there. We had Orla Kelly, who is the knowledge exchange network manager for the, the whole of Scotland, all the universities in Scotland, and has been a fantastic supporter of the podcast.

One of the few people who has been on twice. Another popular episode was from Rosalind Gill. Rosalind is head of policy engagement at the National Centre for Universities and Businesses. Ged Hall, as mentioned, fantastic supporter of the show, who is a research impact and culture specialist at Leeds and one of the hosts of the Research Culture Uncovered podcast.

And then even people like biotech entrepreneur Christian Tidona, who sits at the intersection of industry and [00:21:00] university, and so employs PhD students to actually work on real industry projects during their PhD, so sitting at that intersection there.

Then we have research services, and I have to say when it comes to research services, this was probably the group that was trickiest to get along to the podcast. And I think it's because a lot of people in these research services, they're the kind of people who are, like to be a bit behind the scenes, and so, um, not necessarily the kind of people who will put themselves forward to be interviewed on a podcast. Which is fair enough, but it does mean that I know there are some massive gaps in this category.

But anyway, to give you some tasters, Lorna Wilson, a research office director at Durham University. Anthony Cavanagh, again, one of the most popular episodes, who is a patent attorney. Kath Burton, who at the time of the interview worked in publishing.

Again, she is doing something slightly different now. And another recent episode, Andrew Cripps, who it took me [00:22:00] until episode, was it 94 to get a technician on? It did take a while 'cause again, they like to be behind the scenes and don't necessarily want to be interviewed. But lots and lots of people doing incredible foundational work to make sure that research happens.

And then in the training and career development, we have people like researcher developers, and a good episode for that is to go to the one that I recorded live at the Vitae Conference. I think that was 2024, that one. And, uh, guests on there, Saneeya Qureshi, Ipshita Ghosh, and Jennifer Leigh, all, um, researcher developers helping support career development.

We had Duncan Yellowlees on an early episode, who is a presentation skills trainer. Holly Prescott, who's a careers consultant. Again, big supporter of the show, and Holly has got her own book on, uh, careers coming out very shortly. And Papa PhD, AKA David Mendes, we did an episode swap, but he does loads of stuff around careers for [00:23:00] PhD students.

So a little taster there of the kinds of people that we have had on the show and the kinds of jobs that they are doing. So now that we've pretty clearly established what we mean by research adjacent roles, I decided to have a bit of a look at what some of these roles have in common. And through all the interviews, I did start to notice some common threads.

Now, as I said, a lot of these roles are very much behind the scenes, but one thing that came up a lot is how important these roles are for holding everything together. And we've already had a quote from Rachel where she said, "These are the jobs that if something goes wrong, everything falls apart." And it's the kind of thing that you, you don't notice how important they are until they're not there anymore. They are the glue that holds the entire research ecosystem together.

Here are some quotes [00:24:00] from some guests which really encapsulate that nicely. First up is Helen Riding, who is a research manager in the NHS

Helen Riding: One of my managers always talks about our role as very much being, um, that expert glue, bringing all the different stakeholders together.

Sarah McLusky: And here is Laura Breen, uh, from the University of Manchester.

Laura Breen: She's described me like you are glue. It's it's thinking about who should be in the room for this? Who are we missing? Who are we forgetting? Who should have been brought into this beginning? So it's building those relationships really across all different bits of the university. So. And knowing who should be there in that project.

Sarah McLusky: And here is Jeni Smith, who is a networking expert and who is currently doing a PhD on how people connect.

Jeni Smith: There's a lot of people who naturally connect to others. Yeah. They're just like natural connectors. They'll speak to someone and be like, "Oh, [00:25:00] you need to speak to that person." Mm. And often they end up in job roles like that- Mm-hmm

where they can, you know, they can use that ability. But sometimes people who are just, you know, their job's got nothing to do with that, but they do that naturally for colleagues anyway. Yeah. And they're invaluable when you find- Yeah ... them people.

Sarah McLusky: Another unrecognised aspect of these roles is the influence that they have, and I think it's really interesting if you go back and listen to the episode with Anja Roeding, who founded the PRISM Network. She talks a lot about this, and it's why they set up that network, is often the people who are in these roles actually have a lot of power and a lot of influence. And that power and that influence can be incredibly important. I have got a couple of quotes here.

First one is from Joanna Royle, who was a guest on the episode where we talked specifically about this.

Joanna Royle: I think the way you get influence, or you have influence, probably is to be the kind of person that [00:26:00] sees the challenges, wishes to address the challenges, and then works out how to connect the people, and that, I think, is a lot of influence. It is something you can do without the job title. In fact, it's sometimes, sometimes harder, but sometimes easier without the job title, depending on how you position that conversation.

Sarah McLusky: And this is Impact Consultant Sarah Morton

Sarah Morton: And you know, most people in knowledge mobilisation and research impact roles, they have to be quite innovative and and positive and encourage people to try things and, take people to the lake whether or not they want to drink.

Sarah McLusky: Some other things that came out are that the people who are doing research adjacent roles are generally highly educated. There is sometimes a little bit of a misconception that you need to have a PhD to do these jobs, and certainly it can be useful, but actually only 47% of my guests do.

Although it has to be said, most of the [00:27:00] others do have a master's. So they're people who often really understand the research and understand the research process, and that can be a huge advantage, although as I say, absolutely not a necessity. But another thing I have noticed is that a lot of my guests are clearly very proactive problem solvers.

So as well as being the ones who are influencing behind the scenes, holding things together, they're also just figuring out how to make things happen. And I think that, again, sits perhaps obviously, alongside the fact that these are roles that are emerging, and often they'll be coming into a job where nobody's ever done this before, so they have to figure it out as they go along.

So here are a couple of quotes. First up, we have got Johanna Stadlbauer from the University of Graz, a researcher developer in Vienna, and then also Rachel Reeves again.

Johanna Stadlbauer: And in fact my boss at that time told me she was a little bit overwhelmed by me advocating [00:28:00] for myself so often because I came regularly and said, so what do you think needs to change?

Rachel Reeds: Make the system work or subvert the system as far as you can. When I worked in course administration, academic would be like, "Oh, but the regulations say we can't do this," like there's no wiggle room. I'm like, "There is always wiggle room." "We will find a way."

Sarah McLusky: So we've heard all about the incredible work that these roles are doing and why they are so important to the research world. But inevitably, we did talk a lot on the podcast about the challenges that these roles face as well. And a lot of it does come down to the unstructured way that these roles have emerged and the fact that the conventional measures of esteem in the research world, so that's things like publications and funding, just don't apply to these jobs, because they're people, as I say, often not named on publications.

They're not eligible to apply for funding in their own right, or they're just not ... Like, they're making these things happen, [00:29:00] but just not the people who are standing at the front and talking about it. And so it means that they're under-recognized, the huge contribution that they make.

So the biggest recurring challenges that kept coming up again and again and again were a lack of recognition for the work, and also the precarity of a lot of these jobs and the reliance on short-term contracts and limited opportunities for promotion, especially the fact that these roles are sitting alongside academics who have very established routes for promotion.

So first up, I have got Elisa Collado, who I interviewed at the Hidden REF Festival, and then Anja Roseding, who is the founder of the PRISM Network.

Elisa Collado: Our work is not very well recognized within the university and research environment.

We face a lot of things like short term contracts which means carrying work is sometimes difficult because you have to change roles and you have [00:30:00] uncertainty.

Anja Roeding: I was going from one short-term contract to the next, so it was like one month, three months. I think the most I had was six month. And you're basically, you know, powering and trying to do your best, getting to grips with all the new challenges that were thrown my way and the stuff to deliver, and at the same time wondering, where am I going to pay the next bills from, and looking for the next opportunity.

Sarah McLusky: And now here is Public Engagement Specialist Faye Watson, and once again, Impact Consultant Sarah Morton.

Faye Watson: There's a lot of precarity in, in what we do, and, you can't really move up without moving out, which is one of the problems, especially working within higher education.

We have really rigid HR systems and things like that, and public engagement professionals fall between that gap between research and professional services.

Sarah Morton: Every promotion we had to argue for because if you're on an administrative track, it's all about how many people you manage and if you're on an academic track, it's all about your publications and grants. And of course I was somewhere in [00:31:00] between those two things.

Sarah McLusky: So as I said, I am not at this stage gonna dwell much on these challenges, although I have certainly experienced all of them myself, so I'm not in any way dismissing them. But we are gonna cover them a bit more in upcoming episodes. My plan is that the next episode is gonna be about the, the weird and wonderful career journeys of the people in these roles because, as I say, nobody grows up wanting to do these jobs because they haven't existed for very long.

So I'm gonna be talking about that and then also another episode on the magic wand question, which I think is helping to think about how we tackle some of these challenges. And despite the challenges, I do think that research adjacent roles are here to stay. I think it is inevitable that they will evolve and change over time.

I talked about in the last episode, I've been around for a long time, and I have seen how they change, and they will continue to change, and that is ... I think it's a good [00:32:00] thing. I think it's a reason to want to be in these jobs because, uh, you're never gonna be bored. There's always gonna be something else coming around the corner.

So although I think these roles are here to stay, I have, as I say, decided that the, the archive is as complete as I'm gonna make it for now. When I started this podcast, though, I did know that I was in a little bit of a unique position to gather these stories, and that is because I'm not attached to any organisation, and I don't have a particular agenda other than just wanting to share these amazing people's work with the world.

I think that was helpful 'cause I think it meant that guests felt that they could be honest, and in turn, that honesty is what has resonated with the audience. So I'm hugely grateful to all of my guests for sharing even the difficult parts of what they do. But the thing that comes with that, though, that's a little bit tricky, is that I'm not in a position to [00:33:00] actually change anything.

All I can do is share the stories and hope that someone somewhere would realize that systemic change was needed. And as I say, I am in no way the only person who has been talking about these things. These ideas actually started in my head when we started having the conversations about research culture, which happened when I was working at Durham University.

I first started to get involved in that, and it's all tied up together. And I do think change is happening. The Research Professional Futures programme, which we featured a couple of episodes ago, they are gonna be really tackling some of the systemic stuff, some of the administrative work that needs to go on behind the scenes to help tackle some of those challenges around recognition and precarity and what good professional development would look like.

Also, I did an episode with the Hidden REF project, and they are also campaigning for everyone who contributes to research, whether that's research adjacent, whether that's technicians, whether it's [00:34:00] lived experience partners, and so on, everybody to be acknowledged and

to be rewarded. And I know that there are lots of local research culture initiatives and staff networks popping up all the time.

As I say, I, I know quite a bit about what's going on at Leeds, and it seems that they are being very proactive in this area, which is fantastic. So I am optimistic that perhaps one day, as Lorna Wilson wished for in episode 95, that these will be roles that people aspire to rather than roles that they fall into.

But on that note of falling into roles, that is something that I am gonna be covering in the next episode. So that is all from me for now. I hope that if you are new to Research Adjacent careers or if you've been in this for a while, that that was an interesting encapsulation of what we, what I have found out about who is doing these jobs and what they're doing.

So that's it from me for now, and I will see you next time.

Thanks for [00:35:00] listening to Research Adjacent. If you're listening in a podcast app, please check you're subscribed and then use the links in the episode description to find full show notes and follow the podcast on LinkedIn. You can also find all the links and other episodes at www.researchadjacent.com.

Research Adjacent is presented and produced by Sarah McLusky, and the theme music is by Lemon Music Studios on Pixabay. And you, yes you, get a big gold star for listening right to the end. See you next time.