One of the distinguishing features of teaching graduate students in depth psychology is our approach to the choice of research topic. Identifying the topic is the first and most crucial decision students face in the research experience. Moreover, when research is imagined as arising out of, and in relationship to, dynamic unconscious processes – the *sine qua non* of depth psychology – how the topic emerges is of foremost importance. In well-regarded texts devoted to research design and methodology, however, finding the topic – or, to foreshadow our approach to teaching research – is given scant attention. For instance in Creswell’s (2013, p. 18) thoughtful, important discussion of philosophical assumptions informing a research project, he says philosophy ‘shapes how we formulate our problem and research questions’ but beyond this treatises choosing the topic as a settled matter (pp. 16–19).

We contend philosophy is revealed when graduate students are musing upon what to study, long before any formal research process as such commences. If ‘attention is the cardinal psychological virtue’ (Hillman, 1994, p. 119) then what draws our attention and how it does so – in research as in life – are profoundly psychological questions.

The questions of what and how, at the heart of research formulation, typically are addressed at the level of ego. For example, Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009, p. 113) briefly discuss the personal reasons to choose a topic, emphasizing career advancement. Creswell’s (2009, p. 23) text on qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-methods research says something similar. ‘Before considering what literature to use in a project,’ he states, ‘first identify a topic to study and reflect on whether it is practical and useful.’

Marshall and Rossman (2011) also emphasize practicality and utility. The first two of three considerations when choosing a topic are ‘do-ability,’ that is, feasibility, and ‘should-do ability,’ the potential significance of the study. We agree with the criteria of practicality and usefulness. The aim to enlarge the scope of knowledge within a discipline is a particularly important and laudable goal. We respect the many fine graduate programs that give practicality and usefulness a personal slant, encouraging...
McClintock’s comment above suggests, ‘the topics about which we write are emotion-laden’ (Creswell, 2013, p. 51). When teaching depth, curiosity and meaningfulness remain paramount. One’s relationship to the research topic is intimate, sustaining, and generative. We and our graduate students fit comfortably within the family of qualitative and mixed-methods researchers who ascribe to the idea that knowledge is socially constructed, arising between researchers and participants (Creswell, 2009; Lincoln & Guba, 2000; Marshall & Rosman, 2011). Creswell (2013) sums it up nicely:

[The researcher’s] culture, gender, history, and experiences shape all aspects of the qualitative project, from their choice of a question to address, to how they collect data, to how they make an interpretation of the situation, and to what they expect to obtain from conducting the research. (p. 55)

However, we take the idea of socially-constructed knowledge several steps deeper, imagining the relationship between researcher, topic, texts, and participants as situated with a rich, inter-subjective field which, due to the participation of unconscious processes, is only partly known or knowable.

### Body, Mind, and Soul in Research

Whether conducting a first research project or the fiftieth, researchers acknowledge the importance of their personal history, orientation to research, ethics, and political stance (Creswell, 2013, p. 51). The awareness of the self which one brings to the research topic, or researcher reflexivity, is a hallmark of qualitative studies (Creswell, 2009; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Marshall & Rosman, 2011; Moustakas, 1990; Rossmann & Rallis, 2003) and is necessary throughout the research process because in qualitative studies, the researcher is the instrument (Creswell, 2009; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Marshall & Rosman, 2011, p. 112). When teaching depth psychological inquiry, this instrument includes mind, body, and soul, and thus renders reflexivity a far more demanding task. Researchers are ‘fully involved with the opus on every level,’ both personal and archetypal, which ‘makes the work especially meaningful and especially arduous’ (Coppin & Nelson, 2005, p. 101).
Research, in our view, is not merely an ego task with visible and measurable consequences in the world. Though the product, a thesis or dissertation, may be printed and bound, shared or shelved, the total outcome crucially includes the personal transformation of the researcher. In teaching a depth approach to methodology, we take seriously the participation of unconscious processes and the unfathomable psyche. James Hillman expresses this poetically:

The psychological life of each individual … opens into depth at every step. Our footfalls echo on its vaults below. There is an opening downward within each moment, an unconscious reverberation, like the thin thread of the dream that we awaken with in our hands each morning leading back and down into the images of the dark. (1979, pp. 66–67)

One of our goals is to help dissertation students develop an ear for this echo and attune their body–mind to the reverberation created with each step of the research process. The hoped-for outcome is summed up nicely by Jung (1950/1966, p. 103) in reference to the German Romantic poet Goethe and his exemplary creation, Faust: ‘The progress of the work becomes the artist’s fate and determines his psychology. It is not Goethe who creates Faust, but Faust who creates Goethe’. When applied to graduate studies, the analogy is clear: The research will create the researcher.

This reversal of the expected relationship dynamic is so crucial that we speak of depth psychological research as a vocation, language normally reserved for spiritual experience (Coppin & Nelson, 2005; Romanyshyn, 2007). In other words, we have extended Edinger’s (1997, p. 8) premise – depth psychotherapy is vocational, ‘both a science and an art, both a theory and a practice’ – to say that depth research also is vocational. For graduate students, formulating and conducting a study is an essentially creative process that contributes to their individuation, the move toward wholeness. This is only possible when students and their advisors recognize and respect the irrational factors in the work and understand individuation as ‘fidelity to the law of one’s own being’ which irretrievably separates one from ‘the herd’ (Jung, 1934/1954, pp. 179–186 [paras 295–300]). Coppin and Nelson (2005) explain:

[Research] obligates the individual to be centered in and on the psyche from the moment the work begins until it ends. Yet the life of a creative work often has mysterious beginnings. Moreover, who can know with certainty when it ends? Concepts such as the beginning and the end are fictional constructs, ego decisions, or both. People use them because they’re handy, they work as part of the story, and because they help create a useful container for the work – not because they are literally true. In fact nowhere is the profound depth of inquiry felt so keenly as in the first task the researcher faces: Developing a preliminary idea of the topic. (p. 114)

Heeding the call requires skill, patience, and attention to the many ways that the psyche offers hints ‘which can include flashes of intuition and deep movements of desire’ (p. 115). We have found that some students respond easily and ably to this demand while for others it is simply confusing or frightening. Invariably, students engaged in depth psychological research will feel ‘the opening downward within each moment’ (Hillman, 1979, p. 66) at some stage of the process. An adequate and creative depth approach to methodology must help students recognize such moments and view them as profound opportunities. This is the challenge facing instructors. In some sense, we must become psychopomps, guides to the souls of our students, and allies to the soul in the research.

WOUNDED TEACHERS: ON BEING DEPTH PSYCHOLOGY RESEARCH INSTRUCTORS

Like all genuine teaching that focuses on educating the whole person, some of the challenges we face are based on our own identity as wounded teachers, an identity that obligates us to be mindful of the transpersonal dimensions in our work with students. In addition, these rewards and challenges originate in the various contexts, educational, cultural, social, and historical, that shape our students’ approach to the study of depth psychology. In other words, in any research approach centered on the complex psyche, the instructors’ and the students’ complex web of assumptions, beliefs, and hopes about what research is and how to do it must have their place, to say nothing of the often intense associations to such words as ‘school,’ ‘education,’ and ‘learning.’
To illustrate the complexity of this endeavor, we begin with a discussion of the vicissitudes of being a depth psychology research instructor, then present three models of integrating depth that have emerged in our teaching. In the first model, the student begins by actively, rigorously separating her intellectual research pursuits from her depth experiences, then slowly moves toward a depth psychological engagement. In the second model, the student chooses a topic based on intellectual appeal or the availability of resources for the study and, at the same time, is eager to examine the depth psychological dimensions of the research. In the third model, students are claimed by the topic through the activation of psychological complexes.

The terms ‘research’ and ‘science’ represent a particular epistemological perspective emphasizing quantitative, rational, and empirical scientific worldviews (Coppin & Nelson, 2005; Creswell, 2002, 2008, 2009, 2013; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Elsner, 2009; Romanyshyn, 2007; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). Such a perspective is often seen as being in opposition and superior to the relational, emotional, intuitive, embodied, and spiritual dimensions of human experience embedded in the complex natural world (Coppin & Nelson, 2005; Elsner, 2009). However, any splitting of the empirical, measureable, and reductive approaches to research from others which are mindful of complexity results in lack of wholeness. My (Yakushko) experience with research began precisely with such splitting. I studied in research institutions that emphasized empirical approaches as the exclusive pathway to knowledge. To complement this knowing, I obtained an additional graduate diploma in Women and Gender Studies. The qualitative and feminist methods employed by this program paved the way to questioning traditional research methods. My inner work, which included therapy, analysis, and participation in training and retreats, further propelled me to explore the significance of the unconscious and spiritual aspects of research and knowledge.

My first teaching position at a research university offered me few formal opportunities to integrate the two approaches: I continued to live out a split life as an academician. Even though I had knowledge of a more holistic perspective on research, it was difficult to teach it to students who were, for the most part, unaware of and uninterested in depth ways of understanding themselves and the world. My transition to Pacifica Graduate Institute was a welcome relief, offering me an opportunity to focus on integration, healing the split in my identity as a research scholar and instructor.

Thus, for me (Yakushko), teaching often involves awareness of this split and offers an invitation, both for myself and for my students, to heal it. Reflecting the notion of the ‘wounded researcher’ (Elsner, 2009; Romanyshyn, 2007), I see myself as a ‘wounded teacher.’ I too seek awareness of how my own complexes drive my teaching, including my approach to understanding my students’ work. In addition, as a wounded teacher I can embrace the presence of psyche when teaching all subjects, including traditional research methods. I can also honor the presence of the independent, self-directed unconscious, both personal and collective, that guides students’ interactions with the material, with me as an instructor, and with their own research process. I find this process deeply rewarding and alive: It is about living fully in the world of people (students) and ideas (research approaches and topics) while remaining present with my own psychic life. Among the challenges of this work is the recognition of the various models that guide student learning.

Like Dr. Yakushko, my (Nelson’s) early experiences of research were grounded in a traditional understanding of ontology and epistemology. My first research project was an undergraduate honors thesis in political science, a comparative study of Nigeria and the Netherlands, two countries that adopted a similar consociational political model to give voice to, and share power among, the distinct cultural groups within the nation-state. At no point did I discuss with my thesis advisor why I was drawn to this topic, though in retrospect it is now possible to trace some psychologically pertinent themes – themes which have, over the course of a few decades, presented themselves quite clearly in different guises. Though I was urged to pursue a doctorate in political
science and economics – my double major as an undergraduate – my heart simply wasn’t in it and I eschewed graduate studies for nearly a decade.

Then I discovered a love for literature and eagerly followed Eros into this field. However, neither my advisors nor I viewed my master’s thesis on the poetry of John Keats as anything other than an intellectual exercise unrelated to any deeper archetypal ground. Some part of me must have known, however, that it was more than merely intellectual. My decision to explore Keats’ (1990) poetry rested on a single haunting quatrain from his *Ode on Melancholy* and it was sufficient to inspire a year’s work.

*Aye in the very Temple of Delight
Veil’d Melancholy has her Sovran shrine.
Though seen of none save him whose tongue
Can burst joy’s grape against his palate fine.* (p. 290)

If a depth psychologist had been guiding my master’s project, she would describe this quatrain as the *call*. Keats’ unforgettable poetry nested close to my heart, repeating again and again like a mantra. The images the quatrain evokes still emerge in dream and meditation 20 years later. How could I know that another famous statement from the poet, written in a letter to his brother, would be quoted again and again by the depth psychologists I had yet to meet? ‘Call this world the vale of soul-making,’ Keats wrote, ‘and you will know the uses of the world’ (p. 473).

From such experience, moving into research centered on the soul was an easy and perhaps inevitable step. My own research and the research courses I teach continue to be guided by Eros on behalf of soul. Research is a fundamentally creative activity and I rely heavily on Jung’s (1950/1966, p. 103) writings about the creative process to guide my graduate students. ‘The progress of the work becomes the artist’s fate and determines his psychology,’ says Jung, and this begins with saying ‘yes’ to what seeks my attention. I have learned faith in psyche’s ways, and know that if I can keep an eye and an ear attuned to the dark and sense the reverberation of my footsteps in the vaults below, the depths in the research and the depths in the researcher will meet one another.

**MODEL ONE: RESEARCH AS AN INTELLECTUAL PURSUIT**

In the first model, students begin by actively, rigorously separating their intellectual research pursuits from their life outside of the academy. One of the main impetuses for such separation is related to students’ prior education in non-depth oriented settings. Typically, such education stipulated any knowledge worthy of the name is objective and impartial, and that an intrusion of the personal into scholarly work is extraneous at best and ultimately detrimental to the outcome of the study. (As discussed earlier many reputable researchers, especially those adopting a qualitative approach and/or espousing feminist and social-constructivist values, have effectively challenged this idea.) Some students educated according to Model One are aware that pure objectivity belongs to a particular worldview, a perspective toward research but not the whole story. They may have sought their own depth-oriented therapy or analysis, or gained awareness of the unconscious through other means, and thus have a personal interest in, and sympathy for, a depth approach. Nonetheless, such students rarely understand how depth applies to research, a process they separate from their intuitive, emotional, and embodied psychological life ‘that accepts the irrational and the incomprehensible simply because it is happening’ (Jung, 1957/1967, p. 17).

Teaching students with this academic training often involves inviting them to investigate their own perceptions of research. To begin with, texts describing a depth psychological approach to research are helpful, such as Coppin and Nelson (2005) and Romanyshyn (2007). Other texts, though they never use the phrase ‘depth psychology,’ are depth psychological to the core. These include Moustakas (1990) and Van Manen (1990). Students seem eager to hear of our own experiences as depth psychological researchers: They want to know how we walk our talk. In addition, we use the classroom as an active imaginal space to invite students’ associations to the word research. This process brings to the surface inherited images, possibly indicating a wound, as well as new and fresh images of what scholarship could be. We invite students to explore how their
own inner work – therapy, analysis, and working with dreams, spiritual practices including meditation, yoga, tai chi, or Qi Gong, and creative endeavors such as drawing, painting, singing, or dance – can be intimately integrated with their formal doctoral scholarship. Finally, and mindful of Pacifica’s motto *anima mundi colendae gratia*, we explore how passionate, heart-felt work students are already doing in their communities may be the source of a research topic. In summary, our premise is that scholarly research can arise from and be guided by the students’ psychological, spiritual, and communal life.

To illustrate Model One, research as an intellectual pursuit, consider James, a third year doctoral student in clinical psychology with an emphasis in depth psychology. James received his bachelor and masters degrees from prestigious research universities emphasizing objective, quantifiable knowledge. He excelled in his studies and his faculty mentors praised him for his abilities and ideas. They included James on a number of grants and publications that approached psychology and the study of human experience exclusively from an experimental approach. As a gay man, he found himself involved in several large-scale studies on gay men’s mental health.

Despite this public success, James privately felt a lack of connection between his studies and his personal development. He described his life experience as empty, conflicted, and filled with sorrow. He often berated himself that although he possessed more knowledge than most individuals regarding mental health in general and the mental health of gay men in particular he could not overcome his struggles. His embarrassment about his psychological life, which he described as ‘deficient,’ kept him isolated from others whom he perceived as capable of applying the traditional behavioral and cognitive strategies to ‘solving’ personal problems.

When he began Jungian analysis, James acknowledged feeling ‘normal’ for the first time in his life: Embracing the splits embodied in his own experience as well as the splitting he observed around him, including in the academic environment. Using his creative imagination, including dreams and art work, he was better able to recognize the complexity of his own experience and of others’. His analysis, nevertheless, remained a private experience, which James did not disclose to colleagues at his academic institutions. He also never attempted to integrate his profound life-changing learning in therapy to his scholarly work: The two worlds remained separate. James continued to believe that his professional life had to follow the traditional path, a path which appeared to be the only acceptable way to achieve academic success. This split, however, ultimately resulted in James’ decision to forgo academia and pursue clinical training.

When James began doctoral studies at a depth-oriented research institution, he was excited and relieved. He was eager to study depth clinical approaches, yet resisted the research classes. Research, he felt, was a ‘necessary evil’ for obtaining a doctoral degree. He told himself that it would be ‘easier just to do a study’ that replicated his research in his prior training. James’ emotional reaction to research, especially his dissertation work, was characterized by frustration, boredom, and grandiosity. James described the dissertation as ‘nothing special’ yet persistently felt insecure, believing that his work did not meet the expectations of his committee. He hoped that he could ‘just get through the dissertation,’ an academic exercise mostly unrelated to his personal and clinical interests.

In working with James, one of the first steps was to invite him to explore the splits he ‘had to live’ in his prior academic life. When the splits became conscious, James discussed his early scholarly experience in ways similar to his life as a closeted gay man. These experiences were marked by a sense of invisibility, lack of belonging, self-doubt, self-hatred, and devaluation of him and others. James described this awareness as grieving.

In the next stage, James practiced some of the moves of depth psychological research suggested by Coppin and Nelson (2005) and Romanyshyn (2007). One move, for instance, an invitation to actively dialog with images arising from the unconscious, helped James ground his research pursuits. James discovered that he still felt ‘called’ to study the experiences of gay men, but from a different perspective. Now he wanted to adopt
his research with a depth sensibility, we cannot and would not compel him to do so. We may see great healing possibilities in doing depth research for James and for the community his topic serves. Nonetheless, he may refuse the invitation at this time and pursue the familiar and safer path. There are good and legitimate reasons for such refusal, not least of which is that the old ways might shelter James from the unconscious, which is independent, powerful, and always transformative.

Among the rewards of working with students like James is the continuous invitation to us as depth psychological teachers and researchers to re-engage with our own depth processes. We also enjoy participating in the transformative power of the depth-oriented inner work, akin to what the depth therapist or analyst experiences in working with clients. Mentoring students on this journey reminds of the sacred nature of psyche-centered life: Its imaginative, vast, surprising, and ever-giving presence.

MODEL TWO: RESEARCH AS A FUNCTIONAL PURSUIT

Many students drawn to depth psychological research as a functional pursuit begin with an intellectual interest much like those we describe in Model One. However, these students seek training in depth psychology precisely because of the importance of the unconscious to their academic experience, and thus are eager to ground their research in the psyche. Students who fit Model Two may, in fact, be motivated to choose a depth-oriented academic program because of the research values it embodies. However, for such students the inquiry begins with intellectual curiosity and seeks a rational or empirical explanation for a phenomenon or develops a theoretical viewpoint.

Although such an intellectual starting point is understandable, it can diminish the likelihood of recognizing the unconscious factors that contribute to the topic selection (Coppin & Nelson, 2005; Elsner, 2009; Romanyszyn, 2007). Unawareness of the underlying psychological factors germane to the inquiry often results in a functional approach and outcome. Though the final work is adequate in every respect it may lack depth, resonance, substance, or complexity. In addition, students often
entirely lacked cultural sensitivity. At the next stage of the research, while interviewing participants, Maria’s own experience was brought viscerally and visibly forward in such profound ways that it created tremendous personal tension. Typically, we have observed that tensions like Maria’s are manifested in behaviors that our students call procrastinating. Rather than asking themselves why it is psychologically difficult to sit down and transcribe the recent interview, or conduct the next one, students berate themselves on their poor will power or inability to cope with multiple life stressors.

In the last stage of Maria’s research, reading and analyzing the interview transcripts and composing the summary and findings, she revisited the participants’ traumatic stories. Again, the research felt profoundly personal. Although Maria told herself that she should be able to manage her feelings and rise above it all, the horrific narratives she attempted to analyze dispassionately made her feel exposed and raw, stimulating undigested remnants of her personal trauma.

As instructors, we invite students like Maria to examine their transference to the topic. Though a topic may seem ideal for many reasons, as Maria’s was, we encourage our students never to underestimate the truly unfathomable depths of the psyche. Through personal therapy or analysis, as well as an active commitment to active imagination, sand play, dream analysis, art, and movement, students become more familiar with the underlying dynamics in the study. Romanyshyn’s (2007) transference dialogs, for instance, are highly effective in creating an imaginal space to foster such awareness. As a result, students are better prepared for the emotional intensity of the project or they may choose another research topic, one less psychologically activating.

In the third model, students are irresistibly drawn to a research topic through intense affective response that colors the research with the highest possible value. It is as though they cannot not conduct research on this topic. The vocation feels obligatory and inevitable, and they believe they are fully cognizant of its power.
From one perspective, we often welcome this kind of student because it happily undermines the reputation of traditional research as dull, plodding, and of little or no enduring personal worth or meaning. For students with a strong and recognized emotional attachment to the research, their dissertation or thesis is rarely a checklist item as it was described in Model One. From another perspective, however, guiding such students can be challenging because they may not fully recognize the emotionally dazzling effect of such a strong vocation. The possibility of inflation is real, and it can lead to theoretical narrow-mindedness that veers dangerously close to fundamentalism. Students who view research as an emotional pursuit may be incapable of the small, prudent moves that depth psychological inquiry, and all thoughtful research, depends upon. In this regard, we appreciate Jung’s (1948/1981, p. 297, [para 569]) definition of research: ‘The purpose of research is not to imagine that one possesses the theory which alone is right, but, doubting all theories, to approach gradually nearer to the truth.’ As instructors, it is important for us to remember that depth psychological inquiry is one of many approaches to understanding complex life, not the only one.

To illustrate Model Three, we have created the composite case of Jennifer. When Jennifer began her first year of coursework, she announced that she already knew her dissertation topic: The trauma of growing up with addicted parents. She was eager to begin her research and sought ways to write on some aspect of addiction in her coursework. In fact, Jennifer had published a few essays in professional journals on the topic and was looking ahead beyond the dissertation, to the moment she could transform it into public seminars, lectures, and a mainstream book. Jennifer was certain that this work was her vocation; earning a doctorate would enhance her credibility as an expert.

In the early drafts of the dissertation concept Jennifer submitted, the introduction to her topic was dominated by sweeping knowledge claims about addiction and trauma. She viewed the parent-addict as persecutory – the one who wounds – and the children as victims – the ones who are wounded. Jennifer focused her attention on the parent–child dyad and saw little need to look beyond it to environmental, sociocultural, political, or ancestral factors. During one exercise, Jennifer and her classmates were invited to read their work critically to identify unfounded or unexplored opinions and to articulate any underlying, hidden assumptions in the writing. This was very difficult for Jennifer to do. It was as though she was deaf to the tone of certainty in her own writing.

Students such as Jennifer illustrate what Whyte (1978, p. 8) described as the great danger of our age: ‘total obsession with partial ideas.’ When they are unable or resistant to seeing or hearing how their approach to the research is dominated by a single view, we use techniques of active imagination to help them identify who is speaking in this moment. This archetypal approach to research allows multiple persons or figures to emerge in differentiated form so that a student like Jennifer can witness who or what is dominating her consciousness. This helps make a psychological spaciousness in which other voices can be heard. As Jung (1957/1967) pointed out, there are various techniques of active imagination suitable for different kinds of learners (and researchers).

The way of getting at the fantasies varies with individuals. For many people, it is easiest to write them down; others visualize them, and others again draw or paint them with or without visualization. If there is a high degree of conscious cramp, often only the hands are capable of fantasy; they model or draw figures that are sometimes quiet foreign to the conscious mind. (p. 17)

What Jung calls ‘conscious cramp’ may also be described, for some researchers, as a sort of intellectual tyranny and a tyranny of the intellect. Even a student like Jennifer, pursuing graduate work in depth psychology, may not realize just how deep the unconscious is, or how surprising.

Our students, and others with extensive knowledge of depth psychology and an impressive amount of experience as analysts, are frequently surprised at how active psyche’s images are. We have observed, in our own research and in the classroom, the truth of Jung’s statement about active imagination as theater:

As a rule there is a marked tendency simply to enjoy this interior entertainment and to leave it at that. Then, of course, there is no real progress but only endless variations on the same theme, which is not the
may be a legacy millennia in the making. Jung (1961/1989, p. 233) believed this of his own life’s work. ‘It has always seemed to me,’ he says in his autobiography, ‘that I had to answer questions which fate had posed to my forefathers, and which had not yet been answered, or as if I had to complete, or perhaps continue, things which previous ages had left unfinished.’ Romanyshyn (2007, p. 113) adds that the vocational nature of research is suggested by the word itself. ‘It is research, a searching again for what has already made its claim upon us and is making its claim upon the future.’ Rather than finding a topic, researchers may need to find the courage to say ‘yes’ to a topic that has already found them.

Vocational research – inquiry that touches and moves the deepest levels of being – will continue to be demanding through the life of the project. As we have attempted to show in our three composite case examples, a depth psychological approach can enrich the research process regardless of the students’ initial attitude toward, and understanding of, the complexities of their relationship to the topic. Depth psychological researchers aim for a complete, whole, complex understanding but know that it will always exceed their grasp. In the process, however, they may sharpen their ability to scent the subtle, fleeting, and evanescent thought, and track the novel idea that makes research exciting and worthwhile. As Coppin and Nelson (2005, p. 39) put it, ‘it is this gap between reach and grasp that stimulates human creativity, fosters enchantment with the yet-to-be known, and inspires the art of inquiry.’
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