

knowledge? This was defined very neatly by Dr. Dev Gupta in the LTD Session on Teaching and Research. Dev suggested that there are three ways in which we advance knowledge: (1) by developing a new methodological approach; (2) by developing and advancing the empirical knowledge of the problem; and (3) by developing a new theoretical approach. Of these, Dev considers the third to be the most worthy and, at the same time, the most difficult.

To paraphrase an old professor of mine, from Bristol University, "Knowledge is that which passes from my notes to your [the students'] notes without passing through anybody's head." A teaching university, then, might be said to pass on knowledge. It does not question, does not contribute, does not research, neither carefully, nor systematically. The geography professor can therefore dictate that "The earth is geoidal, i.e. earth-shaped." And I, from the authority of my position as a teaching professor at a teaching university can dictate the following from the Spanish text book, American, of course: "Our good neighbours [pause] to the South [pause] the Mexicans [pause]"

So, it seems to me that we have a clear and important choice – careful and systematic investigation in a field of knowledge, an investigation, moreover, which leads to an intellectual advancement, a factual development, or a new theoretical approach within that field, or more of the same, the box, the whole box, and nothing but the box, as pre-packaged in our eternal text-books. "The earth [pause] ..." "Our good neighbours [pause] ..."

Roger Moore, PhD,
3M Teaching Fellow (2000)

I Ching *continued...*

the poems to each other and to the I Ching. The next task is to show how the final form of the poems (Duración and Vaivén) may be linked to the moment of inspiration, the reading of the I Ching. The professor sets a new project: cast your own I Ching hexagram; then, write out, in Spanish, six stanzas, one for each line of the I Ching. Submit this poem to the group members, along with your own reading, and see what you come up with in the discussions.

Is class preparation research? Can the professor's preparation of these poems for this class be considered research, or at least the first steps along the road to research? How do we define research? Can we link research and teaching, creativity and research in a classroom situation? The answers to the above questions will vary with each reader. However, at the more formal level of research, it will be possible for the professor to now move several steps further forward. The research idea has been conceived: there are clear links between the I Ching and not one, but two of Paz's poems. More in depth research is needed. At the critical level, a comprehensive bibliography is essential and critical reading must be continued; at the textual level, there may be textual variants, so (a) the search must begin for manuscript variants and (b) the 1961 edition of Salamandra must be compared with the 1969 edition, to see what revisions, if any, took place. Interestingly enough, Paz married in 1962 and ideograms 31 and 32 deal precisely with the relationship in a permanent partnership between man and wife. There must be a lasting relationship (Duración) and a certain give and take (Vaivén)! But will there be any trace of these ideas in the actual revisions to the two editions of Salamandra?

So: this summer the professor will probably head to Toronto for a couple of weeks and take up residence as close as possible to the research library there and see what there is to see. And maybe there'll be a published peer reviewed article at the end of it; and maybe there won't be; and maybe there'll be some funding for the research, but there probably won't be much money available, as internal research funding is, as always, kept to a bare minimum.

Meanwhile, closer to home, the professor is faced by more mundane questions: can we link research to teaching and vice versa, teaching to research? Is our university a teaching institution or a research institution? The professor is astonished that one is forced to take up a pen and try to explain, let alone to defend, the links between teaching and research. That said, let us revise our ideas and start again, with a different scenario.

"Please, sir, what's the I Ching?"

"What a dumb question. Everyone knows what the I Ching is. Don't waste precious class time. If you don't know what the I Ching is and you want to find out, search for it on Google or Wikipedia when you get home. Now let's get on with some real work: repeat after me ..."



Teaching Perspectives

St. Thomas University

Spring 2005

Promoting Effective Learning and Teaching Strategies

Inside This Issue

- **Team Learning in Large Classes** 1
- **Mount Everest and Oxygen: Research and Teaching in Perspective** 2
- **The Connections Between Research and Teaching: A Reflection** 3
- **Octavio Paz, Salamandra, the I Ching and the Links Between Research and Teaching** 4
- **The Interconnectedness of Teaching** 5
- **Conducting Historical Research and Teaching Criminology** 6
- **Some Thoughts on the Research-Teaching Connection** 7
- **Classroom Instruction as a Bridge over the Great Canadian History Divide** 9
- **My Educational 9-11** 11



Team Learning in Large Classes, Kathleen McConnell, English Department

2002. It's my first September at STU; I've never *taken* a literature course with an enrollment cap as high as 70, let alone taught one. By October, I know that drastic revision of my teaching techniques is in order.

Fortunately, I realize this in time to attend UPEI professor Brent MacLaine's workshop on "...Building Successful Learning Teams." MacLaine has adapted for the liberal arts, techniques for teaching large classes which were developed by Larry Michaelsen, Distinguished Professor of Management at the University of Oklahoma.

In the 3 1/2 courses I have subsequently taught using Team Learning techniques, I have found most students become gloriously engaged — so much so that, by mid-January this year, there are still 69 students in my Victorian Literature course.

Team Learning has three crucial aspects:

1. Each student belongs to a **Permanent Group**, formed without pre-existing cliques, and including a varied cross-section of students, a criteria accomplished by basing the groups on the results of a short "Asset Evaluation" questionnaire administered on the first day of class.

2. **CRITs, or "Critical Issues Reading Tests,"** which are sets of multiple choice and true/false questions developed to encourage critical reading and analytical thought. Students first do a CRIT individually, then redo it in their groups; both count toward their grades. Marvellous discussions happen at this point—CRITs briefly turn a large class into a seminar.

Furthermore, when the group feels that a wrong CRIT answer is justifiable, they can appeal the question. If they don't talk sufficiently in the group CRIT, they're guaranteed to hammer out appeals most passionately.

It helps that the students determine how much Individual and Group CRITs count toward the final mark. The first group task at the beginning of the course is to determine how 60% of the marks will be distributed between Individual CRITs, Group CRITs, Assignments (individual and group), and a Term Paper. Then each group picks a representative, who becomes a member of a temporary meta-group, to reach consensus on the mark distribution for the whole class.

3. The 40% that students do not determine is usually shared between a 30% final exam, and 10% **Peer Evaluation**. At the end of the term, each student evaluates the contribution of the other members of her or his group. Students unafraid of offending me by being unprepared, work very hard for peer approval.

In peer evaluation, students must give a spread of grades, and justify their high and low grades. They must also explain their reasons if they give more than two grades the same, or half-increment grades.

Drawbacks to Team Learning include the long learning curve. However, MacLaine vehemently pointed out that under-utilized groups develop very unhealthy dynamics; one can't apply this method half-way.

I've also noticed a flattening of grades; the best students don't do *quite* as well as they might in a conventional class, and the less-than-competent students do a *little* better than they might otherwise. (This problem may be self-correcting, once I've climbed all the way up that learning curve.)

Finally—and most seriously for an English Literature course—there is not much space for writing assignments. This would not be problem in an environment where the number of large classes was limited; I would know that while my CRITs are developing critical reading and analytical thinking skills, other, smaller classes are providing writing practice. However, since all second and third year literature classes are capped at 70, that is not guaranteed.

For more information, download Michaelsen's articles "Getting Started with Team Learning" <www.ou.edu/idp/teamlearning/docs/GettingStartedWithTeamLearning.pdf> and "Designing Effective Group Activities..." <www.ou.edu/idp/teamlearning/docs/TLAssignments.pdf>.

them have rendered me quietly confident that they can help Canadian historians construct a bridge between their academic endeavours and a sustained and influential contribution to public debate.

1 *The initial alarm bell was sounded in Michael Bliss, "Privatizing the Mind: The Sundering of Canada, the Sundering of Canadian History," Journal of Canadian Studies 26,4 (1991-92): 5-17. It was expanded upon and developed in J.L. Granatstein's sensationalist, Who Killed Canadian History? (Toronto: Harper Collins, 1998).*

2 *On these themes, see A.B. McKillop, "Who Killed Canadian History? A View From The Trenches," Canadian Historical Review 80,2 (1999): 269-299; Bryan D. Palmer, "Of Silences and Trenches: A Dissident View of Granatstein's Meaning," Canadian Historical Review 80,4 (1999): 676-686; Timothy Stanley, "Why I killed Canadian history : Conditions for an anti-racist history in Canada," Histoire sociale/Social History 33, 65 (2000): 79-103. For two recent attempts to bridge the gap through more reflexive narratives of Canadian History see Ian McKay, "The Liberal Order Framework: A Prospectus for a Reconnaissance of Canadian History," Canadian Historical Review 81,4 (December 2000): 617-645 and Gerald Friesen, Citizens and Nation: An Essay on History, Communication, and Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000). For a trenchant analysis of intellectual and pedagogical challenges such debates engender, see Michael Boudreau, "A Shared History or a Shared Authority?: Canada's National History," Newsletter of The Atlantic Association of Historians 37 (Winter 1999/2000): 13-15.*

3 *George Wilson, "Why Teach History," Queen's Quarterly 40 (1933), 407, 410.*

Editorial

On the 11th of September, 1958, my world was shaken. My high school's new geography master walked into class and said. "Dictation time — are you ready? 'The earth [pause] is geoidal [pause] i.e. [pause] earth-shaped.'" When I went to university, 5 years later, I was surprised to find that across England, on that fateful date, all geography pupils received, by the dictation method, the same information in an identical box. But many students like their knowledge, even if it is not this simplistic, packaged for them in boxes. They want to be presented with the box, to get inside the box, to dominate the box, to be graded by and for the box. In later life, they want to move the box to government, or the civil service, something with security and a pension, something where the box is useful both as an observation post and a bulwark of self-defence. You may change the perimeter, alter the parameters, substitute a grid and tick or fill in the adjoining spaces, but you must never, never touch the concept of the box. Why not? Because questions are dangerous; they break down the walls of the cliché; they cause problems.

"What does earth-shaped mean?" "Geoidal." "What does geoidal mean?" "Earth-shaped." "Why is the earth earth-shaped?" "Because it's the earth." "Is the moon earth-shaped?" "Don't be so silly." The questions are soon silenced. Authority takes over. And the number one rule of this style of teaching is to never let authority be undermined or questioned, authority is authority. I was taught to question and challenge authority when I went to Toronto, in 1966. I was delighted to be studying at the second university in the Commonwealth to possess a LINAC (linear nuclear accelerator). The Banting and Best Institute was renowned, world-wide. Toronto was a research institution on a par with any in the world and I loved the research climate.

But what do we mean, when we say research? How can we define it? Well, what about "Careful, systematic study and investigation in some field of knowledge" (*Webster's New World Dictionary*). That is most certainly what I did at the University of Toronto. But is that any different from what I am doing at St. Thomas University? Not really. I still carry out *careful, systematic study and investigation*. In fact, I probably do more investigation now, than ever before; however, I publish a great deal less. More, I am willing to bet that most of us, especially the younger faculty, conduct research, here in Fredericton. If I did no research, if I carried out no systematic study, no thorough investigation, I — like many other conscientious researchers and teachers — would not consider myself a university professor, even though I teach and research and study systematically, at an institution which often calls itself a *teaching* university.

What is a *teaching* university? I do not know. It is a concept that does not appear in *Webster's*. I know what a teaching high school is: I went to one. Here is the box; do not question the box; oh worship the box. Is a teaching university one in which basic skills are taught? One in which the box is established, in all its glory, and then taught? I don't know. The term, as I say, does not appear in any of my dictionaries. What I do know is that, as a university professor, I advance knowledge in my field. I have done so for the 33 years I have taught here. How does one advance

Classroom Instruction as a Bridge over the Great Canadian History Divide

Michael Dawson, History

"Research and teaching form a reciprocal relationship: research informs one's teaching by highlighting new avenues of historical study; teaching, in turn, clarifies research questions by reminding us that scholarly advances, if they are to fulfill their full potential, must inform our larger society. Indeed, academics ought to seek out and embrace opportunities to make their research accessible not only to undergraduate students, but to the non-academic community as well." So I wrote as part of my application for my present position here at St. Thomas University. And so I believe. Innovative university teaching requires an up-to-date research agenda and an awareness of the latest developments in one's field. Hence, the courses I design and teach draw upon the latest contributions to Canadian History, including my own published books and articles. Feedback from students suggests that they recognize and appreciate this approach.

But besides allowing me to do my job effectively, cultivating a reciprocal relationship between teaching and research offers the possibility of dramatically refashioning the relationship between academic historians and the general public. For over a decade Canadian historians have debated the merits and demerits of a field of study that has expanded dramatically to include histories of previously ignored voices and experiences, and yet at the same time communicated the results of these studies to an ever smaller percentage of the reading public. The field of Canadian History has become too narrow, some observers claim, too specialized, and too self-referential. Academic historians have given up on trying to answer the 'big' questions about Canadian history, identity, and political culture. And they have abandoned their civic duty to inform public debate.¹ Others disagree and champion the liberating possibilities of social history and its focus on detailed micro-studies of minorities and the underprivileged. Too often, this side argues, political historians have offered all-too-comforting narratives of Canadian History to the general reader that overlook the conflict and tension that is so much a part of Canada's past.

Much of this debate has focused on who is to blame for the present situation in which academic historians rarely make a concerted effort to try to communicate their findings to a general audience. One side blames the excesses of the social historians; the other side points the finger at a restrictive and inflexible narrative of all-important events that traditionally prioritized political history.² In short, the debate has centred on blaming one side or the other. Little effort has been made to find a solution to the impasse. And this is where the reciprocal relationship between research and teaching comes into play.

When a student in one of my classes here at STU asked me to explain my continuing motivation for being a professor, I offered a number of related answers. I enjoy learning about the past. I enjoy studying the ways in which people 'use' history to further their social and political agendas. And I enjoy having stimulating conversations with intelligent people. University teaching, I find, offers a very efficient way of holding these conversations. Having people show up at an appointed time and place in a regular fashion is so much more effective than wandering the streets of Fredericton seeking out people who have the time and aptitude for in-depth reflections on Canadian society. So why not use this valuable resource that sits in front of me two or three times a week as a sounding board? Canadian historians can look to this (captive) audience for guidance. All it really requires is that we ask ourselves a number of questions at the end of every lecture or seminar. Do the students seem more or less interested in certain topics? Why is this the case? Do they emphasize different aspects of the weekly readings than I had anticipated? Do they seem a little bewildered by the manner in which I've remained focused on a detailed retelling of the intricacies of the Cold War's impact on consumerism? Should I step back and try to focus a bit more on the 'big picture'? And, most importantly, since my students seem to think that both political and social history are important (and can't really be understood in isolation from one another) why are Canadian historians so determined to cling to this dichotomy? Asking and answering these questions could well point the way to a middle ground in which insights drawn from the latest research into both social and political history are transformed into informative (and accessible) examples and cases studies that speak to broad issues in contemporary Canadian culture.

Back in 1933 historian George Wilson encouraged his colleagues to stop pretending that all of their students would go on to graduate studies. "A great fault of our universities is the all too general contempt for the ordinary student," he lamented. Professors ought to take their teaching duties seriously, he explained. "Many a student's mind is like a lumber room. All the necessary materials have been collected, but there is no attempt to turn them into a building," he charged.³ I don't share Wilson's positivist assumptions about historical facts. Nor do I think all students come equipped with the same quality of building materials between their ears. But my classroom conversations with

Mount Everest and Oxygen: Research and Teaching in Perspective,

Don Robinson, Science & Technology Studies

It all started on Christmas Day in 1997. One of the presents I received was a hardcover edition of Jon Krakauer's *Into Thin Air*. I read it over the same day without many breaks. The book recounts the harrowing ordeal of climbers on Mount Everest in 1996 after a very bad storm blew in on the upper slopes of the mountain. Many climbers were members of two private expeditions who paid upwards of \$70,000 (US) to be guided up the mountain. Ten people died on the mountain over a period of a couple of days. Krakauer had been sent to do a kind of exposé of private expeditions and ended up writing a book which pointed the finger of blame on one of the guides, climber Anatoli Boukreev. The ensuing debate over who was to blame sparked outrage and controversy. The debate also raised issues concerning the attitudes climbers have toward mountains and a decline in mountaineering standards and ethics.

My own interest in the debate rekindled my interest in what was happening in mountainous regions the world over, including the Rocky Mountains in Western Canada. Having grown up in that region, I saw over a period of many years a decline in the respect for the mountainous region by locals and visitors alike. In a beautiful remote canyon (Grotto Canyon, in Kananaskis) just southwest of Calgary, Hopi pictographs on its walls have to compete with hundreds of bolts placed in the walls by rock climbers. Thousands of tourists visit Banff each year, placing ever-increasing demands on the facilities and hiking trails.

I began to investigate the case of Mount Everest, because it seemed to me that all of the issues raised in mountainous regions throughout the world were in some sense magnified by the example of Everest. My research led me into areas about which I had previously known nothing, including the history of Nepal and Tibet, because Mount Everest lies on the border between these two countries, the history of the Sherpa people (who live mostly in Nepal near Mount Everest), as well as the history of climbing on Mount Everest (which dates back to the 1920's). It occurred to me one day about five years ago that one of the central themes in the history of high altitude climbing, particularly on Mount Everest, was a debate over the use of bottled oxygen. At high altitudes, the effects of lack of oxygen can be alleviated by the use of bottled oxygen. The more I explored the history of climbing on Mount Everest, the more I saw that oxygen not only often determined who would and who would not climb the mountain but the style in which it would be typically climbed.

When Hillary and Tenzing made the first successful ascent in 1953, they relied heavily on bottled oxygen. Many doubted whether it could be climbed without oxygen, but in 1978 those doubts were put to rest by Messner and Habeler, who made the first successful ascent without bottled oxygen. Since then, nearly all climbers on Mount Everest use bottled oxygen. Following the 1996 disaster on Mount Everest, some elite climbers questioned the reliance on this form of technology and some even argued that it should be banned outright. This interested me because, as a teacher in a programme in Science and Technology Studies (STS), it seemed to me that the debate over banning oxygen technology was akin to debates over eliminating other forms of technology, such as nuclear weapons and...I was hooked.

At some point it occurred to me that I could actually incorporate my research on these issues into a course and so I taught this material in my course STS 2103 Science, Technology and the Environment. During my first full year sabbatical leave, for 12 months I researched this material much more completely, obtaining a mass of material through document delivery including a number of books and articles written by members of expeditions to Mount Everest over a period of about the past one hundred years, as well as traveling to libraries at other universities. I also wrote a book called *English Air: The Consumption of Oxygen and Mount Everest*. The title refers to what local porters called the oxygen brought to Mount Everest by British climbers. The subtitle is intentionally ambiguous. The book is over two hundred pages long and could not have been written if I had not had leave from teaching, particularly given the fact that our teaching load here at St. Thomas is heavier than it is at almost any other equivalent institution.

This year I was scheduled to teach STS 2103 Science, Technology and the Environment and I decided that it might be fun to spend the entire semester (as opposed to half the semester, as I used to do) teaching my book, including the entire history of climbing on Mount Everest and the role played by bottled oxygen. I am doing this right now. Next year I will be teaching the same course but it will be linked to a course taught by Brad Cross in the history department based on his recent research on a social history of aluminum. Students will have to sign up for both courses, which means Brad and I will be able to address the many and varied connections between social histories of different kinds of 'stuff' (oxygen and aluminum) and also connect all this up with other social histories of things like water, salt, and so on.

My research made it possible for me to teach this course. Conversely, teaching the material continues to challenge me to articulate my thoughts to students. I get to try out my ideas on them in the classroom and I have to get them right. I get some sense from their answers to questions on tests and examinations, as well as from their research papers, how well or how poorly I have managed to explain things. In addition, many students over the past few years have made research discoveries of their own related to my book topic. They have found books and articles I did not find on my own. I see the entire project as a collaboration between me, my colleagues, and my students. In conclusion, let me say that I do appreciate the fact that some researchers working on relatively obscure topics, say, Latin abbreviations in the mid-14th century, may find it difficult to incorporate their research into their teaching, but I trust I have made a very strong case for the claim that my research and my teaching are inseparable and that being given leave from teaching is absolutely essential for both my research and my teaching.

Note: I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Jane Jenkins for her extremely helpful editorial comments and suggestions.

The Connections Between Research and Teaching: A Reflection, Shaun Narine, Political Science

The questions surrounding the connections between “research” and “teaching” are confusing and difficult. What is an acceptable definition of “research”? Are teaching and research two sides of the same coin, i.e., are both integral to the process of creating knowledge? Are there practical and political issues that we miss when we adopt too broad a definition of these terms? I don’t have any definitive answers to any of these questions. The following discussion is offered more in the spirit of dialogue than opinion.

I think that a lot of the disagreements we may have around research and teaching depend on how we define the terms. A narrow definition of research argues that it entails work that is produced with the objective of professional publication or product. Teaching, in this formulation, is a distinct activity which might be complemented by research. However, there is no necessary connection between the two; it is possible to be an exemplary teacher without publishing anything or having any desire to do so. Contrasting definitions of research and teaching see them as “reciprocal”, different sides of the same activity, i.e., the production of knowledge. Research is broadly understood to be any activity that produces and disseminates knowledge. Thus, research activity for the purpose of better teaching is as likely and legitimate as research for the purpose of publication. Research for teaching would involve (as I understand it) projects and approaches designed to enhance the classroom experience. Research for the purpose of publication keeps academics intellectually engaged in their own disciplines, well-practiced in research techniques and goals and, therefore, better able to teach these things to their students. In this formulation, teaching and research (in its different forms) feed off of each other. I find this latter definition to be both intellectually and philosophically appealing. However, for the sake of argument, I will defend the narrower understanding of research and teaching and I will adopt the position that the broader definition risks defining away legitimate and significant differences between these two activities.

What is “teaching”? In the university setting, teaching fosters students’ abilities to think critically, question received truths, and analyze facts and arguments. A person cannot be a good teacher if she is not engaged in the critical analysis of the material she is teaching. This process also involves coming up with new pedagogical strategies to help students learn. University-level teaching can never just be imparting information to students. Note that what I am referring to as “teaching” is essentially the same as what others might call “teaching as research.” However, the definitions that I am using do not extend “research” to encompass these kinds of activities. Instead, these activities are simply part of what it means to teach effectively. Implicit in this argument is the idea that there is not a necessary connection between teaching (as defined here) and research for publication; they are not “reciprocal” activities. Research may well feed into teaching- it may provide the professor with greater inspiration, greater knowledge and the impetus to remain current in his/her field – but an individual may choose to do all of these things as part of a teaching strategy and never try to publish anything.

Is this narrow definition of “research”, which restricts it to activities that result in publications or other tangible products, desirable? Probably not. But I think it is the common understanding of the term in most universities across North America. We live and work in an academic environment where professional standing and tenure are based mostly upon where and how often professors publish articles –not, unfortunately, on how well they teach. The upshot of this pressure is that academics often want time away from teaching so that they can engage in research that will result in published work. In this circumstance, teaching and research are at odds. At this point, the highly specialized areas in which most of us work raises the issue of how relevant our immediate research is to who we teach, particularly undergraduate students who usually first need to be taught basic knowledge of our fields before they can begin to acquire specialized knowledge in a specific area. (Note that acquiring specialized knowledge is not the same as learning how to think critically). There is not the one-to-one correspondence of a reciprocal relationship between research and teaching. Doing research may mean taking time away from teaching to focus on activities that, indirectly, may eventually translate into enhanced classroom performance - or they may not. Similarly, time spent in the classroom may help to further research objectives – but not necessarily so.

I am not saying that the professional model described here is desirable. It is not. But it is a norm that has been established within the larger academic community, and it is one that we cannot avoid – and, indeed, one that many of us have implicitly accepted. During the recent labour/employer dispute at St. Thomas, the claim was often made that STU professors risked “professional suicide” if we did not have a “redistributed workload.” Given the comparatively little weight that our profession currently places on teaching, this claim seems to accept the model of professional emphasis described above. Moreover, it is worth noting that the criteria for the distribution of the course releases we have gained in the recent collective agreement are oriented towards the production of a tangible academic result.

We at St. Thomas can consciously try to advance an understanding of teaching and research that argues for a reciprocal relationship between the two. However, this approach may not be widely accepted in the larger academic community and, therefore, may come with costs. Moreover, it is not clear what implementing such a policy would mean. It is here that the debate really starts: does being a good teacher (i.e., teaching as research) require course releases or, implicitly, is it already built into the nature of the profession? This is not a discussion that we can broach without entering the domain of university politics, but it is a discussion worth having.

needed to recognize that there are different activities that fall under the term “research” itself, activities with quite different purposes and outcomes. Research serves many purposes besides specialist displays such as publication. If teaching is not intrinsically connected to discipline-based or interdisciplinary research, then what is its reference point – the personality cult or the particular propaganda of the subjectivity of the professor?

We might at STU like to ignore the shifting national context of higher education. By that I do not mean that all universities are in the trend of becoming intensive commodifiers of published texts for specialist audiences only. What I mean is that it is research activities (in the plural), research corridors, and research networks which, among other factors, are distinguishing universities from community colleges in a knowledge-based economy. Research activities sustain the capacity to innovate and adapt the knowledges of the discipline in response to rapidly changing socio-economic, political, social and ideological contexts. Regardless, to a certain extent, of whether it is published to the nth degree, universities have been and continue to be defined as producers and modifiers of knowledge.

In this context, teaching involves critically engaging students in the how (the process) and the what (the content) of generating or modifying discipline-based knowledges. This presumes that professors themselves are actively engaged in research activities that support teaching. Not for the sake of establishing the authority or credibility of the professor as a conduit of knowledge, but more importantly in order to transfer the process and the content of discipline-based knowledges into the learning environment in ways that are accessible and appropriate to undergraduate students. Call it the empowerment model vs the transmission model, or whatever: the point is that our learning environments need to be places where students can actively practice developing their research skills and thereby actively practice becoming producers or modifiers of knowledge. The guide to this learning experience needs herself or himself to be engaged in research and its reflexive transfer into the learning environment. If the professors of STU are going to assist the task of forging a future for STU as a nationally and regionally competitive university delivering a high-calibre liberal arts education and committed to teaching excellence, I don’t see how this can be achieved without research being a regular part of the professor’s professional activity and workload. The students of STU are entitled to learning the skills of research and building their own discipline-specific knowledge-base. They ought to be able to rely on STU to provide its students and future graduates with skills and knowledges that are transferable to any number of the personal and professional pursuits ahead of them, wherever they may go.

In this context, teaching involves critically engaging students in the how (the process) and the what (the content) of generating or modifying discipline-based knowledges. This presumes that professors themselves are actively engaged in research activities that support teaching. Not for the sake of establishing the authority or credibility of the professor as a conduit of knowledge, but more importantly in order to transfer the process and the content of discipline-based knowledges into the learning environment in ways that are accessible and appropriate to undergraduate students. Call it the empowerment model vs the transmission model, or whatever: the point is that our learning environments need to be places where students can actively practice developing their research skills and thereby actively practice becoming producers or modifiers of knowledge. The guide to this learning experience needs herself or himself to be engaged in research and its reflexive transfer into the learning environment.

If the professors of STU are going to assist the task of forging a future for STU as a nationally and regionally competitive university delivering a high-calibre liberal arts education and committed to teaching excellence, I don’t see how this can be achieved without research being a regular part of the professor’s professional activity and workload. The students of STU are entitled to learning the skills of research and building their own discipline-specific knowledge-base. They ought to be able to rely on STU to provide its students and future graduates with skills and knowledges that are transferable to any number of the personal and professional pursuits ahead of them, wherever they may go.

Whether or not we professors here at STU choose to publish specialist research, we are in a situation where 1) it is our task as university educators to assist students in learning research skills and thereby become active modifiers and producers, not merely passive consumers, of knowledge; and 2) it is our task as university educators to assist students in discriminating, evaluating, discerning valuable research from less valuable research. How to meet these challenging tasks, except by bringing significant findings (both substantive and procedural) into the course materials of the learning environments we teach in? I fail to see, in either case, how it is that we, as professors committed to the teaching mission of STU, can bypass conducting research in support of teaching.

Of course, there are also many different kinds of teaching ... and learning. Another conversation, for another time. I suspect they involve different kinds of research. Regardless of how you take it, research (both directly and remotely related to the classroom) constitutes a recognizable chunk of our professional responsibility and workload.

None of the above is to suggest, let alone argue, that there is only a single way in which to approach the reciprocal relationship between teaching and research.

Some Thoughts on the Research-Teaching Connection, *Derek Simon, Religious Studies*

There are different lines of thinking on the relationship between research and teaching. Some say that research and teaching are peripheral to each other. Others that they are complementary activities, and no more. Others yet that they are reciprocal, and intrinsically interrelated. These are but some of the possible lines of common sense positions if not deliberate lines of thinking.

To further explore the dialogue, I would like to probe whether the notion of reciprocal activities is the same as the notion of complementary activities, and what such a distinction, if any, might yield for a reflection on the converging or diverging interactions between research and teaching. To my mind, two things that are complementary to each other are mutually beneficial to one another while existing separately. They can just as easily get along without each other. Two things that are reciprocal, however, are intrinsically connected to each other. They are interdependent. When severed, each of them is diminished. In effect, “reciprocal” and “complementary” activities far from identical. They each afford a different kind of correlation between research and teaching.

On the basis of this distinction between complementary and reciprocal activities, I would contend first of all that teaching and research are intrinsically connected to each other in a reciprocal exchange. The knowledge-base and skill-base generated by actively conducting research on a regular basis are an essential support to the responsibilities of teaching and have an impact on the quality of the learning environment, including the classroom. The classroom and the broader learning environment, by contrast, can be a forum for exploring insights and making links between disparate strands of knowledge, even to the point of articulating or deepening the direction of a particular research agenda. Cultivating the identity of “a learner among learners” is not merely a matter of establishing legitimacy in the eyes of students or the surveyors of ideological purity (whether imaginary or real): it is a matter of establishing the priorities and perspectives which are decisive in the classroom and the learning environment, whereby teaching and learning are nourished by the active discovery and integration of discipline-based knowledge, both substantively with respect to contents and procedurally with respect to methods. Teaching that is not nourished by regular contact with the field and sub-fields of the discipline, where knowledge is being actively produced or adapted, risks compromising what it can offer to the learning environment. If the lead-learner within the learning environment is not actively learning and displaying the whole process of learning (from formulating questions, gathering materials, analysis, interpretation, and communication), how are the co-learners (ie students) in that environment going to be able to learn how to actively acquire, critically discuss and apply or communicate the knowledge of a discipline?

Clearly, teaching and research require different sets of skills, arising from different types of practices. Research and teaching are each an art. Taken as an art, the skills and displays of specialist research are not performed as such in the classroom. By contrast, the skills and displays of undergraduate teaching are not performed as such in fieldwork (whether observer or action-oriented), the conference hall, or in the study. Research and teaching as performed art occur in different places, according to differing game-rules and expectations. As a performed art, the places in which the distinct activities occur could be seen as complementary and not necessarily reciprocal.

In this respect, there are profs who excel and delight in the performed art of delivering research results (through a peer-reviewed publication or in the conference hall amidst specialists), but who experience a more complicated relationship with the performed art of teaching. There are also profs, conversely, who excel and delight in the performed art of communicating effectively with undergraduates (to assist the development of their critical thinking and writing skills, both in general and specifically in relation to their immersion in the knowledge-base of a discipline), but who struggle for all sorts of reasons with the performed art of publishing research findings. At the level of performed art, research and teaching are in some respects complementary activities. Outcomes in the one activity do not hinge on outcomes in the other. Professional ability and satisfaction with the one does not automatically translate into or depend on professional ability and satisfaction with the other – as a performed art. The performed art serves different audiences, it produces different outcomes that are specific to each audience, and requires a setting with infrastructure that are quite distinct in producing audience-specific displays of knowledge. It is not all that difficult to imagine a professor who excels as a teacher yet publishes not a stitch, or the professor who scales the wildest peaks of research yet falls off the 2 ft scaffolding (enough to hurt without breaking a limb) in the construction zone of the classroom on a regular basis. Many of us fail to identify professionally with either of these limit-situations.

Regardless of the (in)frequency of these limit-situations, I nonetheless contest the notion that one can be an excellent teacher and not actively conduct research on an on-going or at least frequent periodic basis. Such research is oriented towards the teaching/learning environment, regardless of whether it is published or not. Recognizing that research and teaching can be situated in quite separate settings, with quite separate outcomes directed towards quite separate audiences, however, does not in any way constitute an effective argument against the claim that research and teaching are intrinsically reciprocal intellectual activities. In order to further access the reciprocal connection between research and teaching, I’ve

From Classroom to Conference to Published Paper: Octavio Paz, Salamandra, the I Ching and the Links between Research and Teaching *Roger Moore, Romance Languages*

The saga begins in a St. Thomas classroom on a snowy day. The saga begins with a raised arm and a question: “Please, sir, I know it’s a stupid question, but ...” The student gets no further. The professor stops her, mid-sentence and says: “There’s no such thing as a stupid question. Every time you ask a question, there are ten other students in the room who wished they had been brave enough to ask just what you did. Remember: the most stupid thing you can do is to leave university after four years with unanswered questions, questions left unanswered because you never plucked up the courage to raise your hand in class. Now: what’s the question?”

“What’s the *I Ching*?”

“Good question!” says the professor. “How many of you know what the *I Ching* is?”

Everybody in the class looks blank.

“How many of you don’t know what the *I Ching* is?”

Have you ever noticed how ashamed students are of admitting their ignorance? One by one the students in the class raise slowly and hesitatingly their hands until every student has a hand in the air. Some look around sheepishly; others are embarrassed; seem keep their heads down; others will not look the professor in the eye.

“The *I Ching* is the Chinese Book of Changes. Does that help?” Some nod and begin writing. The professor can see the words appearing upside down on the page: “The *I Ching* is the Chinese Book of Changes.” Students stop writing and look up for guidance.

“Does that help?” The professor asks.

“Yes!” say the students. And they nod their heads.

“Why does it help?”

“Because now we know what the *I Ching* is.”

“Do you? If so, please tell me what the *I Ching* is and how it operates.” The silence is complete. The professor knows cruelty. “All right. Let me ask another question: how many of you have three coins of the same denomination in your pocket?” The students actively search for money. Hands are raised. “Take the coins out. And complete the following exercise ...”

Each member of the class casts the coins on the desks, once, twice ... six times. Points are counted for heads and tails. The hexagrams are formed: uneven numbers / long line, even numbers / two short lines. The students are told what they have just done. They want to find out the meaning of their own individual castings, but it is all too much for one day.

“Tomorrow!” says the professor. “And for tomorrow’s class please read Octavio Paz’s poem *Duración*, bearing in mind that the poem is written as an interpretation of Paz’s reading of one hexagram from the *I Ching*. And remember: bring your questions to class tomorrow.”

In preparation for the next class, the professor reads *Duración* again and again. Then the article *Duración* by Marsena Walkowiak is found and (re)read. Then Walkowiak’s interpretation of the *I Ching* (hexagram 32) is applied first to the poem and then to the *I Ching* itself. At this stage, the professor makes an interesting discovery: 31 and 32 are almost the same hexagrams, but reversed. Not only that, they are inter-related and sometimes change position in one’s reading of the *I Ching*. More, when the lines from the *I Ching* are set against Paz’s poem, lines 5 and 6 of 31 clearly reflect Paz’s fifth and sixth stanzas in *Duración*, while lines 5 and 6 of 32 do not.

More, in *Duración*, Paz has numbered his stanzas in Roman numerals from I to VI. *Duración* is sometimes used as a title for hexagram 32 in the *I Ching*. However, it is not the only title. In addition, form 31 has the idea of give and take or ebb and flow. Guess what? There is another poem in this same book, *Salamandra*, that is divided into six stanzas; but this time the stanzas are marked from 1-6 with Arabic numerals. This poem is called *Vaivén* / ebb and flow. Are *Vaivén* and *Duración* related in some way? The professor begins an exhaustive word by word comparison of the two poems. He then compares them with the *I Ching*. New ideas emerge, new ideas that relate to Paz’s poetic creativity; how he revised his poems; how he created them in the first place. Now: how does the professor use this information to teach the next class?

Students are divided into groups. The groups discuss the links between the two *I Ching* hexagrams and *Duración*; then they discuss the potential links between the *I Ching* and *Vaivén*. Next they compare the two Spanish poems, counting similarities, plotting threads that link

☛ continued on back cover...

The Interconnectedness of Teaching, *Rusty Bitterman, Department of History*

The image on the screen in the classroom could be better. I make a note on my lecture outline to remember to scan a fresher (less travelled) version of the Prince Edward Island road map next time I cover this material. The subsequent image, a scanned version of Samuel Holland's 18th-century survey map of the Island, is crisper. I can tell by my students' response that they have grasped my main message even before I begin to discuss the two images: the Island landscape they know carries the marks of 18th-century British planners. Island roads follow the lines of the survey map that Holland sent to London in 1766, as do county lines and town locales. The past persists in the present. Helping students to see this is a central task in teaching History. Learning to recognize the influence of the past on the world they inhabit, and to problematize the present, rather than simply to take existing circumstances for granted, is a first step toward recognizing the power of human agency. It is as well, I hope, a step toward helping students use their own part of this power wisely. The images made my immediate task easy in this case.

Underpinning my use of these images in my teaching is my work as a researcher. I have spent months (probably years at this point) reading materials in British and Canadian archives concerning the history of the Maritimes. Not only can I provide my students with an image of Samuel Holland's original map, I can tell them what he said in the letter that accompanied it. Indeed, I can show them an image of the letter. And I can talk to them about how historians use materials such as these to understand the past, framing the challenge in terms of my own struggles to make sense of the issues that I study as a professional historian. This immediacy allows me to help students move from thinking about: historical writing as a consumer good, to thinking about historical writing as an outcome of research and critical analysis.

Conversations grounded in my experiences as a researcher and as an author also help to demystify historical texts. If fallible people like me write them, it becomes immediately apparent to my students that they need to read texts critically and be on guard for sloppy thinking and poor use of evidence. This recognition is a good thing, and one of my pedagogical goals.

My teaching is informed as well by the third facet of my responsibilities as a university professor, my professional service. When, for instance, I discuss differing interpretations of the past with my students, I draw from the knowledge that I have gained as an editor of scholarly journals. There is nothing like reading the anonymous readers' reports on manuscripts that are under review, and attempting to summarize them for the manuscript's author, to help clarify some of the interpretive divisions that inform historical writing.

As well, my professional service allows me to talk more knowledgeably in the classroom about how public policy is constructed and why history matters to the process. In the case of Prince Edward Island, I have contributed my arcane knowledge of the British land policies, such as those reflected in Samuel Holland's survey, to contemporary discussions of land policy. The experience of responding to requests for research on regional land issues and of presenting this research to policy makers and stakeholders also brings insights that thread back into my teaching.

I have framed this discussion in terms of one aspect of my research, teaching and professional service (my work on Prince Edward Island history) and I have explained how my teaching in Canadian History is informed by the other two components of my academic work. In reality, similar claims hold for all my teaching, which includes the various World History courses I offer. As well, the dynamic among teaching, research and service is multidirectional. Each informs the other.

Since I came to St. Thomas, I have been working with my wonderful colleagues in the History Department to develop a new World History curriculum that will span all four years of undergraduate study. To the best of my knowledge this teaching initiative will distinguish the History programme at St. Thomas from that offered at any other Canadian university. It is an exciting project. Developing the courses for this new curriculum, and teaching them, is causing me to rethink assumptions that had informed my scholarship to date. As well, the curricular initiatives are changing the subject matter of my research agenda. Inevitably, this work will also change the professional service I perform. For me, research, teaching and professional service form an interdependent unity. The biggest challenge I have faced since coming to St. Thomas is that of maintaining a healthy balance among these three things, while also maintaining my own health.

Conducting Historical Research and Teaching Criminology

Michael Boudreau, Criminology & Criminal Justice

Starting a new academic appointment is a daunting task. Doing so while switching disciplines has made my first year at St. Thomas even more challenging. I am trained as a social historian, but I now find myself teaching not only historical reactions to crime and deviance, but hate crimes and an introductory course to criminology and criminal justice. In addition to supportive colleagues, this transition from teaching in the humanities to the social sciences (converting to the "dark side" as my PhD supervisor called it), has been made easier by the research that I am presently conducting. Indeed, without directly utilizing this research in my lectures and seminar discussions, I would be left with relying almost entirely on textbooks as a source for lecture material.

My current research project examines social protest movements in Canada during the 1970s. This project is an attempt to assess the impact that these movements - including student organizations, the women's and gay liberation movements, and the environmental movement - have had on social policy, popular culture, and the law in Canada. Moreover, I hope to determine how the law and civil society, notably the media and the criminal justice system, have responded to these movements and to social protests generally.

Prior to my arrival at St. Thomas, the chair of my department asked if I would be interested in submitting a proposal for a new course on social protest in Canada. I was delighted to oblige. The outcome is Criminology 3743, Social Protest and the Law in Canada. This course is an exploration of the historical and contemporary incidence of social protest in twentieth- and twenty-first-century Canada. My students and I grapple with the reasons for and the nature of social protest and we critically discuss how these so-called "fringe" elements of society are perceived and treated by the law. I Moreover, we debate the fundamental right of individuals and protest movements to assemble and to express their views, versus the right of society to be protected from the violence that may, and does, erupt during demonstrations.

As an historian I am constantly being challenged, and challenging myself, to make the past relevant to the social and political issues of the present. Nowhere is this task more difficult, and rewarding, than in a criminology course at a liberal arts university such as St. Thomas. This is because I cannot expect all of my criminology students to have the same type of varied historical background as the students in the Canadian history courses that I have taught at other universities. Hence the importance of my research. By understanding the tactics and strategies utilized by social protest movements in the past, I can highlight to my students how current social movements have built upon, and learned from, the past in order to craft their message and shape public policy today.

For example, the present debates over same-sex marriage and the de-criminalization of small amounts of marijuana are, at least in part, direct results of the efforts of the gay liberation movement and the Youth International Party - the Yippies - to demand equality for gays and lesbians and to protest against the perceived injustice of Canada's drugs laws respectively. The 1971 riot in Gastown, Vancouver, was one of the first public rallies in Canada to call for the legalization of marijuana. Between 1500 and 2000 people had gathered on 7 August 1971 in Vancouver's Gastown district to express their opposition to the Vancouver Police Department's crackdown on drug use in the city. The crowd chanted "power to the people" and a few protesters burned a copy of the Criminal Code. In an effort to halt the protest, the police, some on horseback, charged the crowd. As one protester later recalled, the police "were brutal...They came in swinging. They didn't ask people to move."² The police arrested 79 people, 38 of whom were charged with offences ranging from causing a disturbance to possession of a dangerous weapon.

The public inquiry that was held in the wake of this protest found that the police had used "unnecessary, unwarranted, and excessive force."³ Even though this protest did not lead immediately to the legalization of marijuana, it did continue the public debate over this issue. Moreover, the inquiry recommended that the Vancouver Police begin filming public demonstrations.⁴ This has now become fairly common practice during protests, for both the police and protesters, as way to document incidents of alleged police brutality or illegal behaviour. By bringing this knowledge, as well as profiles of the men and women involved in these movements, to my class, it is my sincere hope to demonstrate to students that their world has been influenced by the actions of others. Similarly, teaching this course has prompted me to read more widely, not only in history, but also in sociology and legal studies, in order to integrate into the course the most relevant and up-to-date literature. Literature that will inform the students and make them actively engaged in the critical learning process.

In this sense, since most of the students in this course are from disciplines other than history, they have provided me with a fresh perspective on the course material. A perspective that has compelled me to re-evaluate some of the conclusions that I have made about my research. Including the extent to which social protest was viewed as a form of democratic expression or simply as a public nuisance. So for me, the reciprocal nature of teaching and research has already been rewarding.

¹ The text for this course describes social activists and protesters as "Watchdogs" and "Gadflies." Tim Falconer, *Activism from Marginal to Mainstream* (Toronto: Penguin Books, 2001).

² The Vancouver Sun, 7 August 2001.

³ Thomas Dohm, *Report on Gastown Inquiry, 6 October 1971* (University of British Columbia Law Library), 11.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 16.