One reason I wanted to be here today is because I have a nagging concern about the drive to incorporate research more explicitly into teaching.

It's reminiscent of the drive for "quality" education in schools, which is also, in principle, very difficult to argue against.

The problem with terms such as "research" and "quality" is how they are defined.

Many people did, in fact, begin arguing against "quality" education once it became apparent that the measure of quality was standardized testing.

I have a similar concern about how some may choose to define "research" and how it will be measured.

I'm particularly concerned that it NOT be about indoctrinating students into preordained research methods so they can better meet funders' and industry's goals for more applied research.

Teaching & Research: Learning's Twin Poles

If knowledge is learning's core, teaching and research are its twin poles.

The problem is that although teaching and research may not be mutually exclusive, they do resist simple amalgamation.

Why? Because the propensity of teaching is to explain (to circumscribe and consolidate knowledge), while that of research is to question (to expand (and in so doing) dissipate knowledge).

How best, then, to bring the two together? especially since the active and ongoing nature of research (if one rejects the crass reduction of research to the "scientific method") makes it all but impossible to circumscribe, consolidate, and explain as a *fait accompli.*

The follow-up to the Boyer Report (*Reinventing Undergraduate Education: Three Years After the Boyer Report*) found that "undergraduate research programs are much better developed in the laboratory sciences and engineering than in other disciplines."

This is hardly surprising, since in the "hard" sciences, research is synonymous with method—the "scientific method." This method, of course, is only one aspect of a rigidly circumscribed understanding of what constitutes the world and how we come to know and interact with it. (This scientific world view is contested, of course, even within the scientific community, but its adherents constitute a massive majority.)

No single world view dominates the arts, humanities, and social sciences, however, so it's hardly surprising that the Boyer Report follow-up also found that even though "faculty and administrations [in the arts, humanities, and social sciences] are developing inquiry-based techniques and thinking and talking about inquiry-based learning, … there does not always seem to be a clear consensus."

The answer, attractive as it may seem, is not to impose a single world view and a rigidly defined model of inquiry (scientific method) on the arts, humanities, and social sciences.

My suggestion is that "research" is best understood and integrated into teaching as a critical, questioning, and reflective *attitude* toward the world rather than a proven method(s). What the follow-up to the Boyer Report identifies as "inquiry-based teaching."

Unfortunately, such an "inquisitive" stance toward the world is often the first casualty of formal learning, and many students, young and old, need to be reacquainted with, and reinitiated into, an attitude of research—of critical inquiry: typically, learners are treated as empty vessels to be filled with knowledge; learning is a one-way, passive process wherein an expert transmits knowledge to a novice.

I've found that the inquiry-based teaching model I've been using helps to remedy this situation by promoting, fostering, and facilitating an attitude of research—a disposition of critical questioning and reflection—by encouraging learners to become active in the creation of knowledge rather than simple passive receptors of knowledge.

Simply introducing students to predefined notions of "research" does not help them develop and refine a critical-questioning disposition.

In fact, such structured models of thinking, Pierre Bourdieu suggests, "function as the most absolute system of censure, since they are… the things which structure what is thought."

Thinking About Limits - Pierre Bourdieu, *Theory, Culture & Society, Vol. 9,* 1992

This does, however, as Bourdieu notes, present a dilemma, "one of the antinomies of thought: if we are not educated, we cannot think much at all, yet if we are educated we risk being dominated by ready-made thoughts."

This is why Bourdieu views the educator's role to be critical, to be at once, "very dangerous and indispensable": dangerous because s/he can impose and reproduce existing structures of thought; indispensable because only s/he can teach how to start thinking about the "limits" that structure thinking.

Bourdieu insists research, "if it is not to be stupidly positivistic," is not about "allowing categories of historically constituted thought, which are often related to the education we have received, to think in our place, " but about thinking "the structures of thought of the thinker," because "they are… the things which structure what is thought, and therefore they are themselves extremely difficult to think."

So what is it about the inquiry-based model I've been using to help students develop the kind of critical capacities they need to begin thinking about the things that limit and structure their thoughts that distinguishes it from a method-based model?

Given the time constraints, I'm just going to touch on three key elements of course design that are most salient to our current discussion

1. As opposed to method-based teaching, which focuses on teaching a method to *prevent* errors, inquiry-based teaching provides opportunities for learners to make errors, learn from them, and correct them.

> Group work - peer review/exchange - dialogue - minimal intervention - guided moderation

2. As opposed to method-based teaching, which focuses on reproducing a single way of thinking, inquiry-based teaching should provide opportunities for learners to break free of habituated thinking patterns and develop new ones.

> Structured assignments that provide explicit instructions to help learners break habituated thinking patterns

Reflective Analysis

Choose from the assigned readings what you consider to be a pivotal, transitional period/event/personage in the development of Western civilization. Start out by briefly describing: (1) the social relations (how society was structured); (2) the political relations (who held or shared power and how that power was legitimated); and (3) the cultural relations (the Zeitgeist or cultural/intellectual mood of the time) prior to and

after the transition/event (15 to 25 per cent of the exercise).

Decide which of the three areas of relations (social, political, cultural) was responsible for the change(s) that triggered the transition and provide an analysis (a rationale and textual evidence) in support of your position. In your analysis, consider the question of whether this transition was an inevitable or natural stage in the development of Western civilization, or the result of one or a series of contingencies that only appear inevitable in retrospect (50 to 60 per cent of the exercise).

Conclude your analysis with a reflection on why you feel it is advantageous to consider questions such as this from an interdisciplinary perspective (10 to 15 per cent of the exercise).

Note the proportion of the exercise's three elements:

• descriptive (15 to 25 per cent)

• analytical (50 to 60 per cent)

• reflective (10 to 15 per cent)

Your analysis should be no longer than 1,250 words (six double- spaced, typed pages). Do not submit papers that are purely or primarily descriptive as a reflective analysis. The reflective analysis is weighted ten per cent of your course activities.

3. As opposed to method-based teaching, which is teacher- and/or content-centred, inquiry-based teaching is learner-centred and provides opportunities for learners to become independent and self-directed in their learning.

Students work in small groups to build confidence and peer interaction.

The first assignment is typical, a "find the answer in the text" test:

Small groups of learners discuss their answers and investigate their complexities among themselves and later with the whole group
Learners' experience used to contrast Common Sense Theory of Learning (scientific model) with Dialogical Theory of Learning
Students asked to explore their own "resistances" to new knowledge by constructing their own questions
Difficulty learners experience coordinating action are used to compare "executive decision-making" versus democratic decision-making

Encourage and provide learners with opportunities to risk and interact

Maximize opportunities for interaction and dialogue and minimize "corrective" interventions

Learning exercises that move learners from the familiar (teacher centred) to the unfamiliar (learner centred)

Timely commentaries that tie what the learners are experiencing (based on exchanges/dialogues) to the topics under discussion

Focus on learners leaving with the ability to formulate probing, critical questions as opposed to regurgitating memorized answers.

Reaction Papers

You are required to write two reaction papers and moderate two online discussions based on selected assigned readings. Each paper/moderation activity is weighted fifteen per cent (for a total of thirty per cent) of the course activities. Your work will be evaluated according to the guidelines identified in the Course Guide section titled "Evaluation Criteria."

Reaction Paper 1: Select one of the assigned readings for Weeks 7 through 11 to write about, and moderate an online discussion during the week of the assigned reading.

Reaction Paper 2: Select one of the assigned readings for Weeks 12 through 15 to write about, and moderate an online discussion during the week of the assigned reading.

Before writing your papers, review the section titled "Intellectual Indebtedness and Plagiarism."

Note: Your reaction paper must move beyond a summary of the assigned reading or a simple "like / dislike" reaction. If you have questions about this assignment, please contact the professor. Each reaction paper should each be 250 to 500 words in length, with double–spaced lines. In developing your reaction paper, you might choose one or more of the following strategies.

1. Challenge the author if the position he or she takes is not supported by evidence, or the evidence is unconvincing.

2. Relate the material discussed in the reading to other courses or other contexts.

3. Relate the material discussed in the reading to your own life experiences.