Greg Light
Northwestern University
http://www.northwestern.edu/searle/

Pre conferences workshop - ISSoTL Liverpool, 19 October 2010

While our discussion of undergraduate research did not consciously refrain from reaching a consensus or any definite conclusions, the open process of the discussion lent itself to raising and examining a wide range of ideas and concepts without making firm decisions on one side or the other. The following notes are intended to reflect the spirit of that discussion.

1. The nature of undergraduate research

There was substantial discussion around the nature of undergraduate research. The early discussion focused on questions such as gauging undergraduate research experiences against the research experience of expert, practicing researchers be that professional, scholarly, scientific, clinical, artistic etc. Was the nature or structure of the learning essentially the same for the student and the expert? Inquiring, critical, creative, peer rich, problem focused. As such, were activities that engage students in inquiry learing and problem-based learning sufficient to be regarded as undergraduate research experiences? We discussed the potential differences between "research vs investigation vs inquiry" and the connotations of these terms in different disciplines. Different disciplines have different languages and discourses for what constitutes research and feel more comfortable with particular terminology. Is it just a terminology issue or is there more to it? Are there differences in this respect between faculty and students (relating to their identity as student or faculty for example)?

As such, we also looked at the relationship of the practicing researcher to the student. In what ways and how far might the the everyday research experience of the researcher provide a model for student researcher? For undergraduate research environments? How might it differ? Thus, for example, we discussed the distinction between having students engaged in doing 'real' or 'authentic' research versus learning a particular set of disciplinary (or even more generic) research skills, versus simply hearing about actual research experiences second hand.

2. The place of undergraduate research

Related to the authenticity issue, we also examined whether embedding undergraduate research in a credit bearing course undermined the experience for students or engaged them more fully through the traditional undergraduate educational formats and award structures they understood and felt comfortable with. Or was engaging students in an extra curricular format more likely to provide them with a legitimate research experience with more authentic motivations? In a credit bearing course, for example, do students tend to focus more on what might get them good grades or good marks versus the critical learning elements of doing research. There was a concern that students would become overly strategic in their learning. Moreover, the issue of credit bearing courses also suggested results for assessment. Did students need to obtrain meaningful ('positive') research results? Was going up a "blind alley" just as meaningful (even more meaningful) a research experience? Similarly, the issue of originality was also raised. Is the research experience focused on original 'product' or original thinking, or both? Are these distinctions, along with idea of 'originality', dependent on (or sensitive) to academic context and discipline? In what ways? Are they 'diluted' in a credit bearing course context for example?

3. Research as a community practice

We recognized that research takes place within research communities of practice. In addition to the disciplinary content, questions and methods with which these communities are concerned, they are also characterized by issues of peer review, shared problems, mentorship (mentoring as well as being mentored), ethics, interpersonal relationships, interdisciplinarity, multiple cultures and national identities. It was felt these issues might/should play a meaningful role in the design of undergraduate research experiences. We also raised questions about issues of functional vs disfunctional communities. In this respect, for example, we focused on issues of leadership and on international configurations of student-student; student-researcher, researcher-researcher, and even the question of international collaborations.