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Intro Top 5

1. I have an understanding of how researching on a topic you particularly are fond of can make a difference in the level of heart that is in said research. However, what happens in the event that a topic delves into rather dark or murky territory that some researchers might not be too fond of, my question is mostly how would said person cope?
2. Podcasts have been shown to be a way to ease peoples nerves and provide information to the masses. This is a problem in that as of recently, certain podcasters have been using their platform to spread lies and misinformation, something I am all too familiar with, How would this podcast be able to set itself apart from the bad apples?
3. I know that “scholars” were the control group here in this context, but why only those scholars, was it because of the large wording they used that the average person, or student would not likely understand, I wonder if they could have changed up the questions to fit the average person.
4. I appreciate that in the book, the author flat-out states that the information is recorded in a rather random way. This however leads to a very confusing reading experience where you don’t know what to expect when looking for a particular topic, why would it have been such a bad thing if it was put in a standard way?
5. The mentioning of how the podcast breathes new life into researchers to love the research they once thought was mundane. I genuinely wonder how I could do the same, trying to find new joy in things that I have long since lost interest in.