1. **Project Title**
Embedding Undergraduates in the Research-Teaching Nexus: The Case of Money Sex Power in Global Context

Project Team: Professor Christina Hughes, Dr Anne-Marie Kramer, Maud Perrier, Department of Sociology, University of Warwick

2. **Keywords**
Co-teaching; feminist pedagogy; participatory research; Sociology

3. **Summary**
The overall aim of this research project has been to develop a curriculum which is not only research led and student centred but is co-managed and co-taught by students. Principally, students have researched and delivered teaching sessions on the third year undergraduate module in sociology *Money Sex and Power in Global Context* and, as part of the participatory action research model being used, formed a Student Steering Committee that contributed to the management and evaluation of the project.

The methods used for evaluation were questionnaires, focus group interviews, a cohort analysis of examination results, tutor observations and consultation with the Student Steering Committee. The outcomes include curriculum redesign, improved academic results, greater involvement of students in the module, re-energised teaching, two conference papers, one invited presentation and a forthcoming chapter in an edited collection. The intellectual contribution of this research is that it brings to the fore the place of pleasure as a key aspect in the intellectual development of learners.

This model of teaching and learning works best for small classes and requires changes in assessment practices, not only to enhance commitment and engagement from students, but also to suitably reward them for their investment in this pedagogical model.

4. **Activities**

(a) Pedagogical and Methodological Background
Teaching and learning on the third year undergraduate module *Money Sex and Power in Global Context* was originally organized through a traditional lecture and seminar format. However, research indicates that lecture based teaching is not always the most effective way of encouraging student learning (Biggs, 2003; Boud and Feletti, 1997; Ramsden, 2003). This is because information processing models of teaching, such as lectures, can encourage a passive response from students who are more likely to take a surface approach to understanding and to engage in a utilitarian approach to learning. For example, Barnett (2000) argues that academics need to surrender a measure of 'pedagogic space' to students by shifting their teaching focus from a reliance on lectures towards more student centred learning activities. In consequence, proponents of active models of curriculum organisation argue that problem and discovery based approaches are more effective for developing deep and meaningful learning.

In undertaking this project, the research drew specifically on feminist pedagogical approaches. These encompass, indeed they are the antecedents of, notions of surrendering pedagogical space. Feminist pedagogy is specifically concerned with

countering anti-oppressive practice and seeks to bring together the lecturer/tutor and the student in a co-relationship of exploration. In this way, and with strong connections to Freirean principles, feminist pedagogy is a political project that seeks to challenge the forms of knowledge produced within the academy and also to introduce the idea of non-hierarchical and liberatory teaching and learning practices (Hughes, 2000; Coate, 2006). For these reasons, the aim of this research project has been to develop a curriculum which is not only research led and student centred but that is co-managed and co-taught by students.

Drawing on feminist concerns, the methodological approach has been based on participatory action research. This includes an ethical commitment to work with, rather than research on, those who are viewed as the beneficiaries or stakeholders of the research. Such a model has concerns with social justice through which issues around power, representation, voice and the ownership and shaping of knowledge systems are taken into account through recognition of the cultural and historical mores of a specific user group. One example of this approach is the Kaupapa Maori model through which 'Maori people, as communities of the researched and as new communities of the researchers, have been able to engage in a dialogue about setting new directions for the priorities, policies, and practices of research, for, by and with Maori' (Smith, 1999: 183). Accordingly, the project included setting up a Student Steering Committee that was viewed as not simply being a consultative group. The Student Steering Committee was envisaged as contributing in partnership to the development of the project.

(b) Research Objectives

The research objectives that were originally set for this project focused on the skills and support structures that would enhance the student experience of this pedagogical model:

- To provide an assessment of the skill sets required by students which facilitate their engagement in research-led curriculum development and delivery.
- To provide an assessment of the support structures which are necessary to enable students to successfully undertake research-led curriculum development and delivery.
- To provide an analysis of the impacts that can be discerned of these innovations in terms of the enhancement of subject specific student learning and transferable skills.

As the research progressed, these objectives were supplemented by an intellectual focus on the place of pleasure in learning. This became a key element in the analysis of interview data and resonated strongly with the experiences of students. Thus, a further objective has been:

- To provide an analysis of student learning that brings to the fore the place of pleasure as a key aspect of the intellectual development of learners.

(c) Stages of Research

The research was developed through three stages.

(i)Stage One: Pilot

The first pilot stage was completed during 2005-6. The module had recruited 30 students for this academic year and the pilot required students to prepare and deliver three lectures and seminars. An evaluation in the form of a questionnaire and focus

group was undertaken as well as an analysis of exam results. Out of 30 students, 5 achieved a first class examination mark and all other students (bar one) achieved a 2.1 (See also Table 1 below for comparative data between the two year groups). The questionnaire and focus group evaluation generally indicated a positive response from students with some caveats (pressure of work that this kind of initiative produced; group process concerns; timing issues; tutor and technical support). Apart from technical skills such as presentation, hand out preparation and so forth, the findings also pointed to a lack of pedagogical understanding.

(ii) Stage Two: Full Project

The full implementation and data gathering stage of the project took place during the academic year 2006-7. We prepared for this main stage through re-organisation of the curriculum into thematic sections, introducing pedagogical and seminar skill workshops, paying attention to the practical support issues that this pedagogical model required and setting up a Student Steering Committee. Through curriculum re-design we made space for four student-led sessions where students were expected to prepare and deliver lectures and seminars to their peers. Students taking this module were informed of its pedagogical innovation prior to deciding whether or not they elected to take it. 24 students took the module in 2006-7.

During the year we listened, observed and consulted with students and towards the end of the module we conducted individual and focus group interviews. We also provided written feedback on their student-led sessions that focused on presentation and organisation, intellectual content, issues to be taken to the Student Steering Committee and prompts to enable them to reflect on, and further develop, their co-teaching skills.

These aspects of the project are outlined here together with an analysis of how successful they were (ie what worked and what did not).

Re-Organisation of the Curriculum
The pilot indicated that re-organisation of the curriculum would be beneficial. In part this was because the module was not originally designed by the module tutors but had been inherited due to staff changes. It was also because we considered it important that the students had the opportunity to reflect and work within a framework of ideas that they had been introduced to and could, hopefully, extend.

In terms of curriculum redesign, a major concern was to provide a way of deepening knowledge across the curriculum. The topic based approach leads to a tendency for students to view each lecture as discrete and unconnected to other lectures. Moreover, we needed to incorporate meaningful space in the curriculum for the student-led sessions. To resolve these issues, the module, and the associated assessment, was redesigned on a thematic basis where topics were brought together to provide coherent and fruitful connections. This meant that some lectures from the original organisation of the module became redundant and it also meant that new lectures had to be written. Overall, four themes formed the overall design of the curriculum:

- Theme 1: The power of money and the meaning/deployment of power
- Theme 2: The Politics of Sex
- Theme 3: The Quest for Power
- Theme 4: Money, Sex and Power in Global Context

We also had to build in space for the student-led sessions. This was achieved by reducing the tutor-led sessions from 20 to 16 thus freeing up the timetable for four student-led slots. For these four slots, the students were given an overarching question that addressed the entire theme. This was handed out at the beginning of each theme in order that they would have time to work on it.

The reorganisation of the curriculum into thematic segments worked exceptionally well. It provided clearer coherence and connection with the consequence of facilitating depth of understanding. It also fitted well with the co-teaching model that was being developed by providing students with an intellectual structure within which to work.

Needless to say, some themes worked better than others in terms of intellectual connections and the final theme, which crossed over from the Spring to the Summer term, was not well timed in terms of student availability and commitment. Ongoing refinements will address these issues. In addition, students commented that they could not start on the planning for their own input until they had all heard all the tutors' lectures which led to them trying to organise themselves and their work in a relatively short space of time. This signals a needful shift in student reliance on the authority of the tutor which is both deep-seated and has been developed throughout their learning careers.

Pedagogical and Seminar Skills Instruction

The pilot demonstrated that students needed further support in understanding the underlying pedagogical issues that were at the centre of the innovation. This was to enable them to recognise the value of the pedagogical model as offering the potential for deeper learning. Accordingly, the module was redesigned to include a lecture on feminist pedagogic principles. This was included in order that the students had a philosophical and political basis upon which to develop their co-teaching practices and also in order that they may more fully understand the principles upon which the pedagogy of the module was based.

In addition, a workshop on the varied forms of seminar and group activities (buzz groups, fish bowl technique, Q&A sessions, 'heated debate', ice breaker activities etc) was organised. This was because the pilot indicated that students had very limited knowledge of the variety of ways in which seminars could be organised and no understanding at all of the place of 'ice breakers', for example, in easing social relations in the classroom.

Both the incorporation of the *Feminist Pedagogy Lecture* and the *Seminar Skills Workshop* were very useful innovations as they enabled the students to more fully appreciate the underlying principles that were contributing to their teaching and learning experiences and to extend their skills. Students did comment quite explicitly that they had helped them understand why we were doing what we were doing. Moreover, for some students the opportunity to develop peer teaching skills was seen as a key motivation for taking the module in 2006-7. This was because they were planning a teaching career and saw the benefits for their CV and for extending their experience.

However, two issues remain of concern. First, the timing of the lecture and workshop is crucial. Should this be early in the module to prepare students in advance or should it be later when students have had some experience and therefore the lecture and workshops provide an opportunity for reflection on practice and experience? We chose the latter option with mixed results. Some students considered this came too

late and would have welcomed earlier instruction. Others, naturally, felt that the sessions did help them make greater sense of their experiences. The lecture and workshop were also not embedded sufficiently within the curriculum of the module and as a consequence many students perceived them to be an 'extra'. Thus attendance for these sessions was low. Whilst timing of these sessions would always remain a matter of academic judgement, the issue of embedding this topic can be further resolved through further curriculum development.

Practical Issues

There are two concerns here. First is that of support for students. The second is related to timetabling and room availability.

(i) Support for students: The pilot demonstrated that students needed greater support outside the normal teaching hours of the module. This support was both practical and in terms of facilitating greater group interaction. In terms of practical support (photocopying of handouts, booking of rooms when necessary, etc) the appointment of a Research Assistant to the project provided vital and necessary resourcing. One of the roles of the Research Assistant, for example, was to provide a service to the students in terms of liaising with them over these issues. In addition, the tutors indicated that they would be available for discussion of student led sessions and other matters as required.

In terms of group interaction, one issue that arose during the pilot was that some students on the module were part-time degree students and, therefore, it could not be assumed that all students had the same levels of availability to meet. We took two steps to manage this. First, we set aside seminar time for group discussion. Second, an electronic site called the *Money Sex and Power Forum* was set up to assist with communication across and within the groups. This Forum space was designed for students to post messages, initiate on-line discussion and so forth.

Students welcomed the practical support offered by the Research Assistant who kept in touch with them regularly throughout the project. Nonetheless, they were not able to avail themselves of her services as much as they might as, for some groups, time management skills were not the best. Often students left things to the very last minute before finalising handouts etc. The call on tutors was also minimal. Few groups, or individual students, took the opportunity to discuss their plans outside class time.

In addition, the *Money Sex and Power Forum* did not work well at all. A few postings were made (including posting by the module tutors) but the activity levels were very low. The reasons for this include the site being formally constituted within University IT facilities and in consequence under the tutor's eye. The potential for surveillance of embryonic student thoughts and comments inhibited usage. In addition, this site was not set up by the students but by the module tutor. Consequently, students had little investment in it. However, they did set up a Money Sex and Power site on the social networking site *Facebook* which, from their accounts, proved to be a great success.

Finally, allowing space in the seminar for discussion of student led sessions was beneficial in the sense of managing some of the extra time demands this pedagogical approach placed upon them. However, it also had the effect of limiting the time available to discuss the substantive issues associated with the topic. Much time, for example, was taken up with organisational issues of when students would meet or who would do what rather than exploring the conceptual and theoretical issues at

hand. In future years it would be more beneficial to extend the formal timetabled commitment to ensure adequate time is given to both aspects.

(ii) Timetabling and Room Size Requirements: These practicalities arose for two reasons. First, in a standard lecture-seminar format, student timetables are designed in two hour slots. The original design of this module was no exception and recruitment to the module (between 20-30 students each year) resulting in timetabling for one lecture per week plus two seminar groups. These seminars follow the lecture and each other (three hours of consecutive teaching time). However, the design of the innovation requires all students to be together for the four student-led sessions. This can be problematic when they have other commitments when other seminar groups are meeting. Accordingly, all students were told when they initially signed up for the module that they could not book in other seminars or have commitments during the seminar slot they were not timetabled for.

In addition, space and timetabling availability in the University is problematic in terms of finding a room large enough to take all students for a three hour slot. It is also insufficiently flexible when such a room is not required every week of the teaching calendar and when innovation occurs after the University timetables have been set. The popularity of the Reinvention teaching space on Westwood Campus during 2006-7 also meant that this was unavailable at the times required for the four student led sessions. Consequently, student led sessions were held in different rooms and on different parts of the campus throughout the year and required some changes of time for some sessions (ie a 9 a.m. start for one session rather than the usual 10 a.m. start). Despite regular circulation and information sent out to students about location of these rooms, this inevitably led to some confusion with students getting lost on campus and not finding rooms and – particularly for the early slot – a lower attendance. In future years, this issue may be resolved by greater pre-planning that fits in which the University own timetable for room bookings.   The new Library Teaching Grid, moreover, will potentially provide a valuable space for this form of teaching and learning.

Student Steering Committee

As outlined, this was seen as essential in terms of modelling the pedagogy of co-teaching. 9 students (out of 24) initially volunteered to be members of the Student Steering Committee which was very heartening. The Student Steering Committee met three times during the year. This aspect of the design of the project had great benefits in terms of the Committee acting as a consultative group both in terms of trouble shooting any concerns that the students had as they arose and, later, in terms of discussing the intellectual analysis that we were doing of interview data collected as part of the evaluation. Commitment, nonetheless, was variable resulting in only 3 students attending all meetings.

In addition, whilst the Steering Committee was a useful consultative body, the power relations between students and tutors remained relatively unchanged. In this regard, the tutors stayed very much as authority figures. This should not be surprising given how such power relations are so deeply developed. There are also formal limitations arising from, for example, module approval processes on how much the curriculum, can be handed over to students. Nonetheless, it remains an important issue that requires further attention and development.

Student-Led Teaching

The students delivered four sessions during the year. In organisational terms, there were two seminar groups on this module during 2006-7. For delivery of the student-

led teaching, the students decided that each seminar group would alternate between lecture/seminar responsibilities. Whilst this organisation of responsibilities did become the subject of discussion during the year, overall the students kept to this pattern. In addition, students divided up the topic amongst each other and undertook to present linked aspects in the form of mini lectures and in the form of seminar tasks.

In terms of tutor assessment of the quality of student-led sessions, this was outstanding (*see Outcomes below*). Students used a variety of resources that they had sourced independently, including podcast, video clips, visual materials, case studies and formal lecture notes. This enabled them to demonstrate deep intellectual understanding of the key concepts and theoretical ideas at the heart of the module in a way that can not always be captured through written assessment.

Seminars were less successful overall although there were some high spots. Students provided materials for their peers to work with, including quizzes and case studies. Despite student anxieties that no one would speak during seminars, the commitment from their peers to make it work was evident. Generally, here, however, there was a greater sense of disorganisation and lack of direction that slightly mitigated against deeply engaged debate around a topic.

We observed all student-led sessions and the last one was filmed. The use of video took some negotiation as students were at first, not surprisingly, reluctant to agree to this. There is future potential for the use of video to contribute to the development of student (and staff!) skills. Students were also given written feedback on their sessions that acted as a form of tutor evaluation and to provide developmental guidance on the kinds of issues that students might bear in mind for future sessions. Students welcomed the feedback particularly in relation to their intellectual capabilities and understanding. Here, they expressed concern that they had 'experts' (ie their tutors) in the room watching them and they were fearful of being seen as not understanding aspects of the module. Students appeared less concerned with feedback on organisational issues although they did recognise by the end of the year that they needed to think through how the different segments of their presentations or seminar tasks connected with each other.

Student energy and input for the sessions was very high except for the final one which occurred just after the Easter break when assessed essays were due. The issue of timing, particularly in terms of assessment deadlines, is clearly something to be borne in mind for future years.

(iii) Final Stage: Evaluation
The final stage of the project was designed in order that we would make time to engage with the relevant research literature. This was in terms of assessing the generalisability and specificity of the project findings. Originally, it had been thought that this aspect of the evaluation would probably focus more directly on pedagogical issues associated with peer teaching. However, as indicated above, analysis of data during the project indicated the significance of pleasure in learning. This aspect of the evaluation therefore has been exceptionally productive in intellectual terms and has enabled us to make contributions to the research community by drawing attention to this hitherto relatively neglected aspect of learning.

Our analysis indicates how attention to the intellectual life of undergraduate students is scant (Hughes 2007 (a), Hughes, Perrier and Kramer, 2007 (a) and (b) and Hughes, Perrier and Kramer, 2008 (forthcoming). By this, we do not mean that

attention to how students learn or their engagement in academic practices has been neglected. Clearly, given the plethora of writings on these subjects, this is palpably not the case. However, our analysis seeks to confound the notion that, mostly, undergraduate students in higher education today veer towards the anti-intellectual and primarily engage in education for utilitarian ends.

Our research demonstrates how analyses of pleasure remain relatively neglected in accounts of pedagogy (Hughes, 2007(b)) yet pleasure and displeasure are central aspects of the undergraduate student experience in terms of their engagement in the intellectual life of the academy. For example, drawing on Barthes' (1975) concepts of *plaisir* and *jouissance* we have explored those moments when student learning is such that they do not simply engage in deep learning but also engage in transformative learning through which they are able to challenge received cultural codes. This accords with the feminist and critical pedagogic aims of the module and in consequence bears much potential for contributions to this field of knowledge.

5. **Outcomes**

The evaluative tools used in this project have been focus group discussions and questionnaire data. These included self-evaluation questions through which students were asked to assess their own skill and knowledge development. In addition, observational data was collected by the project team. This included evaluations of the co-teaching sessions that was provided as feedback to students in terms of intellectual content, presentation and organisation. The data collected was broadly qualitative although a descriptive statistical cohort analysis of exam results was undertaken.

This data is drawn upon in respect of each of the project objectives:

Objective One: To provide an assessment of the skill sets required by students which facilitate their engagement in research-led curriculum development and delivery.

This objective is measured through questionnaire, interview and observational data. This indicates that the main skill sets that facilitate engagement in this pedagogical model are:

- Design, development and delivery of short lectures, including presentational and public speaking skills
- Design, development and production of handouts
- Facilitation skills in informal and formal settings
- Planning skills
- Research and information retrieval skills
- Time management skills
- Team work skills
- Interpersonal skills of delegation, negotiation, reliability
- Communication skills including listening
- Leadership skills
- Evaluation skills
- Reflexive skills

The co-teaching sessions demonstrated that students had excellent presentational and public speaking skills and research and information retrieval skills. Their skills of design, development and production of handouts were also quite well developed, as

were, on the whole, their time management skills. Students did not demonstrate any skills in conducting evaluations of their co-teaching, despite being reminded of the importance of this on several occasions. Issues of reliability and team work were varied across the cohort and are areas that prompt the most concern in students. Attention to this aspect of teaching and learning is very important.

Objective Two: To provide an assessment of the support structures which are necessary to enable students to successfully undertake research-led curriculum development and delivery.

This objective is measured through the interview data collected during the project and through staff experience. The major point to make here in terms of support structures is that this form of teaching and learning is not routinised in the Department of Sociology and consequently students are learning new skills and habits. This requires great investments of time and energy by all concerned. Because of this, the model requires an excellent level of staff resourcing in terms of staff-student ratios as the challenges of the pedagogical model require consistently moderate, and at times intense, inter-personal support to work through the inevitable tensions that arise. One of the benefits of Reinvention Centre funding has been the provision of research assistance. This has meant that the staff support ratio for enabling the success of the project was 1:8.   Should such forms of learning become routinised then one can imagine that the staff-student ratio can be decreased. Nonetheless, the pedagogical approach is primarily a model for small group teaching.

More broadly, the data indicates that this model of teaching and learning requires the following support structures to be in place:

- *Intellectual Framework:* This approach to teaching and learning is designed to facilitate self-direction in the student in order to enhance independence of thought and critical engagement in a relevant substantive literature. Nonetheless, students require guidance in terms of the intellectual issues and concerns of a specific field as otherwise they are potentially working within a vacuum. Accordingly, students still require tutors to provide guidance on the intellectual framework of ideas that they are expected to engage with. In practical terms, this means that students are provided with a module outline and lecture and seminar input from tutors. The development of the *Money Sex and Power* curriculum into thematic sections provided such a framework. Students were provided with a structured module and relevant bibliographies. Nonetheless, there is scope to lessen the tutor input and encourage students to engage in their own research-led teaching by seeking out topics that are of interest to them. This does require, however, that students are introduced to this model of teaching and learning earlier in their academic career. As it is *Money Sex and Power* is a third year module and there is, consequently, no scope to build upon it directly.
- *Pedagogical Understanding:* Co-teaching requires students to have some understanding of pedagogical principles. The module attempted to introduce the basic elements of this to students but the evaluation indicates that much more could be done. This, however, would require much greater investment at a Departmental level to introducing students to the rationale of research-led teaching that is the primary pedagogical model the department adopts.
- *Practical Support:* There are financial and time costs for students associated with this approach. The financial costs include producing handouts and other source materials. Potentially they could include research costs should

students seek to source original data. The project team were able to ameliorate these within the bounds of the project although at a wider level they should not be ignored. In terms of the time costs for students, the pedagogical model requires there to be recognition of the varying demands on students through the year. In addition, the 'standard' two hour format of teaching implies that there are no further timetable demands on students. This exacerbates the subjective and practical issues associated with time demands. This could be remedied by formally timetabling extra time for groups to meet to discuss co-teaching responsibilities and activities.

Objective Three: To provide an analysis of the impacts that can be discerned of these innovations in terms of the (a) enhancement of subject specific student learning and (b) transferable skills.

(a) Enhancement of Subject Specific Student Learning

This objective was measured in terms of a cohort analysis of student exam results (see Table 1) and through the qualitative data. The exam result data indicates that the proportion of first class results rose from 16.6% in 2005-6 to 25% in 2006-7. This certainly can be understood as supporting the value, in terms of quality of student work, which this pedagogic model has produced. However, the results in 2006-7 were also more variable than those of 2005-6. No students in 2005-6 were awarded a third class mark whereas one student achieved this mark in 2006-7. Also the number of lower seconds increased from 3.3% in 2005/6 to 13% in 2006/7. The proportion of upper seconds in 2006-7 was 56.5% compared to 80% in 2005-6. Clearly, given the small numbers involved, these results are indicative only of the impact of this pedagogical model.

In addition, given the changes that arose from a thematic reorganization of the curriculum, it can be argued that the module was more intellectually rigorous. Certainly, given the ways in which the assessment questions also required students to address their answers in a thematic, cross-curricular form, students could not simply learn discrete topics and expect this to be sufficient for assessment purposes. Indeed, it can be suggested that the intense learning and commitment across the entire module both inside and outside the classroom that this pedagogic model requires suits some students more than others.

Table 1: Cohort Analysis of Exam Results		
	2006/7	**2005/6**
First Class	26% (6)	16.7% (5)
Upper Second	56.5% (13)	80% (24)
Lower Second	12.5% (3)	3.3% (1)
Third Class	4% (1)	-
Total Number of Students Examined	**23***	**30**

- *One student suspended during the year due to personal circumstances*

The qualitative data also indicated that students considered their learning was deeper and indeed, for some transformative. As indicated above, we have analysed some of this data in terms of the role of pleasure as integral to student engagement in learning and teaching. Comments from students in this regard indicate that thematic organisation enabled them to have a better understanding of the module's intellectual content compared to other modules they were taking. It also indicated how the module had enhanced their sense of being self-directed and working independently. Indeed, some students admitted to working harder on this module. For some students there were new insights that were challenging and potentially transformative. Finally, tutor evaluations of the student-led teaching sessions indicate that the tutors were incredibly impressed at the standard of student work produced. For example, feedback to students on their work during Theme One includes the following comments:

Of Particular Note in Terms of Intellectual Content
- *There were some moments of pure bliss (from the 'teacher's' viewpoint) of some of the insights you had clearly developed (eg recognizing that a lot of the critique of gift giving was tending to undermine its positive features; that whilst there was a strong focus on monetary distribution (rather than gift giving) this in and of itself was not without problems; the complex ways we are each positioned as gift giver/receiver.*
- *The use of case studies worked exceptionally well. This enabled you to give an historical and an international perspective to the work.*
- *You had clearly done your homework on each of the three segments of the question and had provided the class with some wonderful resource materials.*
- *The seminar formats opened up the terrain very well to giving students the space to work through some of the issues. (Extract from Theme One Feedback to Students, 21.11.06)*

(b) Enhancement of transferable skills
In terms of transferable skills, one of the major areas of development was in terms of team and group work. The pedagogical model required students to work closely with one another out of normal class time and to produce joint outputs. The interview data indicates that generally students did extend, enhance or discover the importance of their repertoire of skills in terms of delegation, negotiation, time management, reliability, communication and leadership. For example, the students routinely divided up tasks. This required them to assess the set question in terms of its intellectual and practical components and to engage in dialogue with each other in the resolution of who did what. The dividing up of tasks was also viewed as a time management strategy and certainly students found the demands of the module in terms of time very exacting.

In terms of reliability skills, the pedagogical model certainly raised challenges as students discovered that some of their peers were less or more reliable. For example, students felt very let down on one occasion when some members of their group did not turn up for their peer teaching input. Indeed, because the peer teaching sessions were not included in the formal assessment of the module, this meant that we required commitment from students for its intrinsic rather than extrinsic rewards. Thus, we required commitment to the pedagogic approach because of its potential to enhance their learning and because of their growing and embedded commitments to one another.

Of note, is the recognition of the need to develop leadership skills. This issue arose towards the end of the year as students began to reflect on their experiences and there was talk of some students feeling included in tasks and others excluded. Nonethless, students also reported that they felt their communication skills had been enhanced. This was mainly in terms of enhancing their communication through formal presentation although it should be noted that for some students they considered their skills in communicating intellectual issues had been enhanced through teaching these. In addition, repeatedly having to organise a lecture and seminar also meant that students were trying to extend their communication skills to engage an audience

Finally, the pedagogical model enabled students to develop their inter-personal skills with the benefit of enhancing group interaction and sociability. Because they were required to meet regularly outside the seminar room, students reported getting to know each other better and found themselves mixing socially as well as in terms of the requirements of this module. Whilst this was certainly beneficial for all students, it is of note that this was particularly beneficial for Exchange students who were joining a group of students who had already been studying in the Department for two years as it meant they were more fully integrated, both intellectually and socially, into the module. This meant that the seminar room was experienced as a more sociable space with clear benefits for students:

6. **Implications**

- The assessment on this module remains based on written essays and examination which again can reinforce a surface approach to learning. It is imperative to explore, for example, how assessment can include co-teaching and learning approaches that are research baesd. Assessment might also include the assessment of skills development alongside assessing academic skills of, for example, critical analysis. We did attempt to link to module to the Warwick Skills Programme but this did not prove possible. More inter-linking of various University wide initiatives with specific modules could be explored.
- There is a strong interest in exploring innovative models of teaching and learning. Nonetheless, the 'standard' lecture/seminar format remains and students can perceive innovation in the curriculum as more risky both in terms of the likely grade outcomes and in terms of the demands on their time. It is important to consider how we induct students from the first year in terms of the variety of ways that we can learn. This should encourage an understanding that the binary of traditional-innovative is not helpful in this regard.
- This is not a model of teaching that allows abdication of responsibilities by the tutor. Encouraging excellent independent learning requires facilitation by tutors not abandonment of the student. Indeed, this model of teaching and learning is a more intensive and engaged pedagogical model of teaching and learning that requires both tutors and students to be working in dialogue with each other. For this reason, the tutor has responsibility to ensure that the intellectual and practical support structures are in place to facilitate the student's learning.
- Team work and reliability skills are a significant aspect of the success, or otherwise, of this pedagogic model. Attention to developing these skills is necessary.

7. Resources
The resources produced from this project are the following outputs:

1. Hughes, C (2007a) **Plaisir et Jouissance: Intellectual life, the student and pleasure**, University of Galway (Invited Lecture)

2. Hughes, C, Perrier, M and Kramer, A-M (2007a) Plaisir et Jouissance: Intellectual life, the student and pleasure in Deepwell F, Haworth J and King V (eds.) 2nd International Conference iPED2007: **Proceedings 'Researching Academic Futures'** 10-11 September 2007, Coventry University Technocentre. Coventry:CSHE. isbn 978-1-84600-0188

3. Hughes, C, Perrier, M and Kramer, A-M (2007b) **Plaisir et Jouissance: Productions of Pleasure in the Undergraduate Curriculum**, Reinvention Centre Conference, University of Warwick

4. Hughes, C, Perrier, M and Kramer, A-M (forthcoming) Plaisir et Jouissance: Intellectual life, the student and pleasure, in V King, F Deepwell, L Clouder and C Broughan (Eds) **Academic Futures: Inquiries into Higher Education and Pedagogy**, Cambridge, Cambridge Scholars Publishing

8. References

Coate, K (2006) Imagining women in the curriculum: the transgressive impossibility of women's studies, **Studies in Higher Education** 31(4)
Barnett, R (2000) **Realizing the University in an Age of Supercomplexity**, Buckingham, SRHE/Open University Press
Biggs, J (2003) **Teaching for Quality Learning at University: What the Student Does**, Buckingham, Open University Press
Boud, D and Feletti, G (Eds) (1997) **The Challenge of Problem Based Learning**, London, Kogan Page (Second Edition)
Costello, P (2003) **Action Research**, London, Continuum
Hughes. C (2000) Resistant adult learners: A contradiction in feminist terms? **Studies in the Education of Adults**, 1 April 2000, vol. 32, no. 1
Hughes, C (2007b) The Pleasures of Learning at Work: Phenomenology and Foucault Compared, **British Journal of Sociology of Education**, 28(3)
Smith, L (1999) **Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples**, London, Zed Books
Ramsden, P (2003) **Learning to Teach in Higher Education**, London, Routledge

9. Contact details

Professor Christina Hughes
Department of Sociology
University of Warwick
Coventry CV4 7AL

christina.hughes@warwick.ac.uk