The Initiative Aims:
To explore how the research-teaching nexus functioned within the Humanities and Social Sciences and how academics perceived its relationship to the enhancement research-based graduate attributes.
To establish an on-line repository for discipline-specific case studies and discussions

Approach:
This was a qualitative research project based on semi-structured interviews with 15 academics from the Humanities and Social Sciences. To strengthen the representative nature of such a small sample, the focus was divided into four areas:
- academics from ‘abstract’ Humanities (History, Classics, Literature);
- academics from ‘applied’ Humanities (Theology);
- academics from ‘abstract’ Social Sciences (Sociology);
- academics from ‘applied’ Social Sciences (Psychology, Public Policy).
Within these categories individuals were interviewed from a range of institutional backgrounds: 3 Ancients (St. Andrews, Glasgow, Edinburgh); 2 Modern (Strathclyde, Stirling); 1 post-1992 (Glasgow Caledonian University); at a variety of programme levels.

Key Findings 1:
The academics we interviewed:
1. favoured / privileged certain attributes more than others (see key findings 2);
2. considered the instructional environments they established to encourage attributes that were broader than necessary for becoming researchers within the discipline. (Though this perception was nuanced depending on whether the academics believed the process of attribute development to be explicitly or implicitly related to the research-intensive environment);
3. had no clear sense of ‘disciplinary specific pedagogies’;
4. used a range of teaching and learning approaches but underlying nearly all of them was the assumption of the importance of dialogue as the basic educational principle.
5. held the belief that further to this, the dialogic process was essential for the continued organic nature of the disciplines (see quote boxes).
6. did not find the current typologies available particularly captured ‘the whole picture’.

Key Findings 2:
Most Frequently Referred to Research-Type Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentioned by all the interviewees</th>
<th>Provisionality of knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formulating research questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing ideas in a dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informed by current debates in the discipline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Analyzing raw data
- Applying theory, interpretation of data
- Ability to orally present ideas and arguments
- Being able to start from a position of not knowing to engaging in a process of discovering answers
- Working collaboratively in teams

“Disciplines are thus dependent on novices as much as experts. Indeed, from another perspective the students are the subversives upon which critical reinterpretation is dependent, because they are not quite so dependent on established disciplinary paradigms.”

Key Findings 1:

- Disciplinary development occurs in relationship with novices because the incomplete nature of their acceptance of disciplinary norms enables challenges to ‘received wisdom’.

Contact: Dr Vicky Gunn, Learning and Teaching Centre, vgunn@admin.gla.ac.uk
On-line repository (work-in-progress): http://rtlinks.psy.gla.ac.uk/

Discussion questions:
1. Does the PhD process in the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences operate within a ‘hidden curriculum’ in which an over-emphasis on the importance of dialogue skews perspectives on what is most important in pedagogic approaches to the disciplines?
2. How can we roll-out authentic experiences of the research processes in these disciplines in a way that supports both weak and strong students all the way through an undergraduate degree programme?
3. When should our students be cited as co-authors in our research?

What does this mean for curriculum renewal designed to enhance graduate attributes?
1. Academics need to explore the impact of what they privilege in terms of research attributes and question whether these limit the opportunities for students to develop a wider range of attributes in the programmes they undertake.
2. Departments can change some of these approaches by explicitly mapping research practices and processes across the programmes. An example of this would be offering students the chance to act like research assistants who generate ideas as well as being recipients of research the individual academic is undertaking.
3. Institutions and Discipline Associations or Bodies should consider rewarding and recognizing academics who take on such a curriculum redesign at the same time as offering heads of departments professional development aimed at supporting the transfer of capabilities from champions to other departmental colleagues.