

Deep approaches to teaching:  
Integrating theory into practice.

(i) **Background** - At times it seems that research into teaching and teachers does not or is not translated into practice outside schools of education. In so far as that is true, it may partly be due to the supposition that it is difficult to apply the knowledge of research into practice. This paper integrates some the theory of teaching produced in the research findings into the practice of teaching in higher education.

(ii) **Aim** - The purpose of this paper is to show how findings from researching into teaching and learning in higher education can be integrated into practice.

(iii) **Methods** – this paper is the product of a long review and implementation of aspects of the research literature on learning and teaching in higher education. It is, in some sense, a participant-observation study combined with professional reflection.

(iv) **Outcomes** - If we integrate research higher education teaching and learning into class room practice, we can influence how students approach learning and that will increase their conceptual growth and change.

(v) **Conclusions** - Managing students' perceptions and experiences of learning and teaching will promote learning in higher education. To do that we must put aside the administrative conception of teaching. Effective teaching leads students to deep approaches to learning. I illustrate the case with reference to political theory.

Key words.

Deep approaches to learning, surface approaches to learning, and workload.

Deep approaches to teaching:

Integrating theory into practice.

Teachers don't teach,

but students learn.

Jacob Neuhauser

## I. Introduction.

Political theorists, like other teachers, often say that their goal as teachers is to arm students to think for themselves. One way to do that is by taking note of the growing body of research into teaching and learning in higher education. After all, approaching teaching in a scholarly way, mindful of recent research, making decisions based on evidence, seeking feedback systematically, and the like, parallels the approach we take as researchers. Thanks to Ernest Boyer's Scholarship reconsidered: priorities of the professorate (1990) this approach is widely known as the scholarship of teaching and learning.

These pages offer a brief tour of some of the theoretical and empirical findings in the scholarship of teaching and learning, outside the United States. Focus is on elements that have immediate practical implications for the classroom in humanities and social science. Some findings confirm common practice while other findings spotlight alternatives. Even where common practice is confirmed the process adds extra weight to it.

What do students and teachers say about teaching and learning? Both usually describe a good class in pretty much the same terms. More often than not, students and teachers say they want active experiences on a high level. Neither

wants passive and boring sessions where the inert hands of the clock droop like a Salvador Dali painting. Teachers say they want students to be responsive, and students say they want classes to be lively (Jackson and Prosser 1985; Jackson and Prosser 1989; Jackson 1990; Booth 1997; and Jackson 2006a). Despite this common ambition, students and teachers do not always find that classes work out that way.

Students in political theory, as in many other fields, require conceptual change and growth. In practice, with a teaching load to manage and other commitments, it can be tempting to approach teaching as information presentation and transmission, an administrative conception of teaching (Svensson and Högfors 1988). Sometimes this kind of administrative teaching just does not result in student learning. We may cover the ground with little effect.

Student learning goes well beyond completed assignments and grades to conceptual growth and change in the way students think. Student learning happens when the concepts that students use to analyze arguments and phenomena enlarge and change. At the start of a course on utopian thought my students make maps of the concepts they associate with utopia (Novak 1998). Their responses are largely predictable at the beginning, and they are relatively sparse, but by the end of the semester they have developed a much larger, more complicated set of conceptual relations. Of course there is variation among them on the degree of change and the success with which they master this change. There is also individuality along with much common ground that is now better understood.

Why spend precious time reflecting on teaching or seeking evidence at all? Why not just get on with the job? Commendable as that focus is, first, we do have evidence that there is teaching-without-learning, that not all students grasp the fundamentals we teach even in the most well organized lectures. Teachers often speak of their frustrations with students (as students do of teachers). Even academically successful students who can spot a faulty argument in a classroom apply less rigor outside it. Many economics graduates believe that production costs determine price (so do others Saunders 1980; Dahlgren 1984), while economists refer to the higher law of supply and demand. Howard Becker (1968) says sociology students likewise retain naïve misconceptions. In another example, the short film "A Private Universe" (Schneps 1988) shows Harvard University science graduates explaining the change of the season by the earth's proximity to the sun rather than to the tilt of its axis in stellar orbit. I know that my own students understand Thomas Hobbes's compelling arguments against the destructive power of opinion, but when they discuss contemporary politics, it is all a matter of opinion.

## II. The Administrative Approach to Teaching.

The administrative approach to teaching emphasizes order, validity, and coverage of the material presented to students. If students take accurate notes, if students study the PowerPoint slides posted on the web site, the information has been transmitted (Handal, Lauvå et al. 1990). The material moves students from like to like in small steps. This is the way Jean Piaget described psycho-motor

learning (Piaget 1956). However, conceptual frameworks are not increments of each other on the same plane. Some are antithetical to others; they assume what others contest. Post Modernism says all is opinion while empiricism kicks hard reality. Learning to appreciate what contesting conceptual frameworks have to offer takes more than small steps. It may take leaps to put aside one's own point of view to try another, and another. Information presentation cannot fill this bill, no matter how well done. Perhaps an analogy from sports helps. Learning to play different position on a team is best done by playing those positions in practice, not seeing information presented about the needs of different positions no matter how well done.

Nor is there is a bright line between the quality of information presented and conceptual growth and change in students (Marton and Ramsden 1988). Listening to ever more lectures on logic may not make the auditor more logical. Rather than place all our efforts on improving teaching, we could take some time to consider how students approach learning, and try to manage that.

### III. Surface and deep approaches to learning.

What is the distinction between surface and deep approaches to learning? A student taking a surface approach to learning is one who strives to reproduce what the teacher does without trying to understand why the teacher does it that way (Ramsden 1988a). If I put a passage from Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *Emile* on the screen this student will copy it down. While copying it this student may not hear the interpretation of that passage. This student assumes that if a

passage is selected and screened then it must be important in itself (Ramsden 1992). Yes, sometimes that may be true, but not always. Sometimes a lecturer singles out a passage to bring the class back to the text, or to make a transition to another point, or a comparison with a different perspective, or to note a singularly bad example, and so on. The passage can be a means to, not an end of, understanding the nature and limits of Rousseau's arguments and not simply to transfer received knowledge to the students' notes.

If a student adopts a surface approach, that student will focus on the signs (the passage) as discrete elements, memorize the information for examinations, and associate concepts and facts without the significance of context. Unaware of the topography of a field of study, such a student treats everything as though it exists on the same flat surface, and does not discriminate between different kinds of meaning (assumptions, concepts, theories, evidence, and argument) but treats each as equally arbitrary. Students who approach learning as an endless series of isolated lumps of material to be remembered will also be the most likely to perceive a large workload in their study. They lack principles, concepts, or theories in which to locate these lumps.

The magic of assignments and grades does not compel deep approaches to learning. A smart student using the surface approach to learning may well absorb enough information and command enough material to pass an examination. Some will boast of it. Many teachers see some of the longer term evidence of this surface approach to learning in graduates who a few short years later can barely remember what they did in university. Please note that a surface approach to

learning is not rote learning which has a place in learning multiplication tables, verb conjugations, the Latin names of bones, and the like. Nor is the surface approach an irremediable psychological attribute. It is a tactical choice, and as such may be influenced by teachers.

Going deep, students approach learning by concentrating on what is signified (arguments and conclusion) not on the signs, and try to apply the concepts being studied to everyday experience, distinguish argument from evidence, relate and integrate knowledge from a variety of sources, and try to organize material into structures with several dimensions. Of course, a student taking this deep approach may err, but this approach is the one that promises conceptual growth. That error occurs reminds why we teach, to identify and amend these errors. If they are never surfaced, they cannot be amended.

It is easy to blame the lack of deep approaches to learning on externalities. The usual suspects today are time-poverty identified by students and attention span deficient identified by teachers. Conversely, the argument here is that a student committed to a surface approach to learning will not go deep, no matter how much time there is, no matter how much concentration there is during that time. That is, the intention with which the student approaches a task is decisive, not time nor attention-span. There is ample empirical evidence to support this argument (Marton 1992; Prosser 1993). Students who read the story in a surface approach read the story time and after time to point reciting it word-by-word without yet grasping its meaning. Whereas other students instructed to look for the meaning, did so (Svensson and Högfors 1988).

The tragedy occurs when bright students alive with the excitement of learning and teachers possessed by a love of knowledge meet in mutual incomprehension with one side floundering with a surface approach to learning, trying to capture and reproduce everything, and the other bunkered in an administrative approach to teaching. The result is a mutual incomprehension as profound as that C. P. Snow saw in the two cultures of science and the arts.

Students' perceptions of learning are shaped by previous experience, contemporary events, peers, family, the school, the degree, the discipline studied, the physical character of the classroom, the timetable, and the idiosyncrasies of teachers. Causation here is, as always, multiple. There is a great deal on that list, but its engine is the classroom and it is there that lecturers can influence students' perceptions. Again there is encouraging evidence. Students, many of whom with no idea of academic governance, can perceive a learning environment in a department where instructors are broadly consistent in their approach to teaching (Bain and Thomas 1984; Lizzio, Wilson et al. 2002; David 2004). And education practice and research continues to identify a myriad of techniques to use in arresting and directing students approaches to learning, like problem-based learning, internships, case studies, discovery learning and the like (Cryer and Elton 1992). There is no shortage of techniques, but the suggestion in these pages is that the application of these techniques will have greater effect if it is informed by a recognition of students' approaches to learning.

An anecdote may assist. A colleague lecturing to a group of two hundred students carefully broke up the fifty minute session into two or three parts each time. At the end of each part of the exposition the colleague invited students to discuss the material just presented among themselves. This stop and start arose from a humane consideration of the length of attention span being about twenty minutes. Yet never did this colleague find out by any means what it was that students discussed among themselves in those pauses. From where the students sat, in tiers, the peer discussion was simply a filler, not a part of the learning experience. Why might one seek feedback from students in such pauses? It would be one way immediately to confirm conceptions and to identify and address misconceptions. There are indeed ways to do in a tiered lecture room from a simple show of hands to responses to slides among those many class room techniques available. The point of this aside is that in this case the technique is sound but it is at least partly wasted because the intention was merely to provide a pause not to capture and work with students' responses.

The one thing we have most control over is our own intentions as teachers. If our strategy is to promote conceptual change in students, then we are well advised to select teaching tactics that encourage and support approaches to learning that are associated with conceptual change.

Among the critical factors that shape students perceptions four stand out. They are the (1) course objectives, (2) assignments, (3) teaching methods, and the (4) workload. There is a research literature on these four which I will briefly sketch.

(1) Course objectives are critical. If an instructor spends half an academic hour saying why this course is important that will give students a compass. These objectives may be described within the context of the course alone. Why should a student take History of Political Theory 201 very seriously if that student is not a major or a minor? Why indeed? Some very good answers can be given to that question, and given they should be. The objectives can be intellectual, social, or moral; they can be the intrinsic satisfaction of understanding or the extrinsic use of clear thinking. With a set of objectives students can fix priorities, making it easier for them to navigate deep approaches.

(2) That grades motivate students is a truism, but what may be less obvious is that one empirical study found that “the majority of students reported greater use of transformational [deep] activities for the open-ended assessment [assignments] than for the closed examinations; and conversely less use of reproductive [surface] activities with the open-ended assignments than with the short answer and closed examinations” (Bain and Thomas 1984). Grades can encourage students to take deep approaches only if the assignments are conducive to deep approaches to learning. A true-false test is not conducive, but a term paper can be. If there are pressures to teach more students and to cut costs by using more examinations, then we need a rational argument with empirical evidence that open-ended assignments lead to better results for students, not simply assert that it is preferable, because it is the tradition.

(3) Teaching methods are the heart of the matter. Autonomy and responsibility fuel those students ready to take deep approaches, and give others

the incentive to try. If there is no free discussion, if there is no freedom for students to make choices, say about what to write the term paper about or what kind of argument to make, students are less likely to adopt deep approaches to learning.

When course objectives, assignments, and teaching methods align, they have the greatest influence (Kember, Ng et al. 1996). This is not always the case. In one department where I taught, the rhetoric rang of critical thinking and the like, but the reality was a curriculum cut into canonical stone with set essay topics and granite reading lists for each topic in every course. Students wrote essays by piecing together passages from the restricted list of reading.

Entwistle and Tait (1990) interviewed undergraduate students from more than sixty departments, and found that departments with assignments that placed a premium on factual information and gave students less freedom (and its twin, responsibility) led students to the surface approach to these assignments; as did another modest study (Jackson 2006b). In addition, feedback on assignments is another crucial element associated with the approach to learning taken by students in these departments. If the feedback focused on compliance and facts, the surface approach remained, as it did if there was no feedback apart from the grade.

One implication of the discussion to this point is that it might be more effective to manage students' perception of the learning environment than to concentrate on special study skills sessions, essay writing workshops, yet more PowerPoint slides, more self-paced web material, and the like. There are few

technical solutions to human problems. Students' 'perceptions of teaching and assessment methods [assignments] in academic departments are significantly associated with ... students approaches to studying' (Entwistle and Ramsden 1983 and Diseth and Martinsen 2003).

(4) Workload includes not only assignments, though they are crucial, but also the number of contact hours, duration of the classes, length of assigned reading, and the syllabus itself. If students perceive a heavy workload, and I stress 'perceive,' they are more likely to take a surface approach to learning to manage the volume of work. We all do the same when there is just too much to do. We know this and yet there are professors who set fifteen written assignments in a ten week quarter. Such an instructor grows exhausted reading and grading these assignments, the more so because most of them are superficial. Equally the nature of the assignments influences students' approaches to learning. Students will study for technical examinations by concentrating on the form of the material rather than its meaning (Ramsden 1988b). They can reproduce Platonic arguments in political theory but they cannot explain or evaluate them.

Students' perceptions of the volume of work are stimulated in the first instance by the syllabus itself. If it is long and detailed, it is easy for students to conclude that the workload is heavy. Before the end of the first class these students start the course on the assumption of a high workload and govern themselves accordingly by looking for short cuts. Teachers, who dedicate themselves to thinking of everything and setting it all out in the syllabus or on a

web site, may obey the law unintended consequences by discouraging deep approaches in students.

That students approach learning in different ways emerges readily in conversation, in research interviews, questionnaire studies of student descriptions of learning activities, and in one's own observations in and out of class (Gow and Kember 1993; Prosser, Trigwell et al. 2003). Fortunately, research has identified patterns in those approaches that we can use to good effect. Finding ways to manage that difference constructively is an opportunity to enhance learning.

#### IV. Conclusion.

Deep approaches to learning can be cultivated with reflective assignments so that students can think back about their own work (by revising an essay), or by comparing their work with that of peers by posting work on a web site. Deep approaches to learning can be legitimated by encouraging students to relate what they are learning in one course with work in previous or contemporary courses, rather than narrowing the focus to this course alone. Deep approaches to learning grow from encouraging students to apply what they are learning to their own lives, and to consider messy reality rather than sterile thought-experiments.

\* \* \*

Jacob Neuhauser (1992) put it best: "Teachers don't teach, but students learn. Students should ask their teachers: (1) Let me discover. Don't tell me things. (2) Give advice in my terms. (3) When my work is poor, tell me how to improve it."

## References

Bain, J. and P. Thomas (1984). "Contextual dependence of learning approaches." Human Learning **3**(4): 230-242.

Becker, H., B. Greer, et al. (1968). Making the grade. New York, Wiley.

Booth, A. (1997). "Listening to students: Experiences and expectations in the transition to a history degree." Studies In higher education **22**(2): 205-220.

Boyer, E. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: priorities of the professorate. Princeton, N.J., Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Cryer, P. and Elton, L. (1992). Effective Learning in higher education (Sheffield: CVCP Staff Development and Training Unit).

Dahlgren, L. O. (1984). Outcomes of learning. The experience of learning. F. Marton. Edinburgh, Scottish Academic Press.

David, K. (2004). "Interpreting student workload and the factors which shape students' perceptions of their workload." Studies in higher education **29**(2): 165-184.

Diseth, A. and O. Martinsen (2003). "Approaches to Learning, Cognitive Style, and Motives as Predictors of Academic Achievement." Educational psychology **23**(2): 195-208.

Entwistle, N. and P. Ramsden (1983). Understanding student learning. London, Croom Helm.

Entwistle, N. and H. Tait (1990). "Approaches to learning, evaluations of teaching, and preferences for contrasting academic environments." Higher education **19**: 169-199.

Gow, L. and D. Kember (1993). "Conceptions of teaching and their relationship to student learning." British journal of educational psychology **63**: 20-33.

Handal, G., P. Lauvå, et al. (1990). "The concept of rationality in academic science teaching." European journal of education **25**: 319-332.

Jackson, M. (2006a) "'Great class room teaching' and more: Awards for Outstanding," Teaching Evaluated, International Journal of Educational Management, 20 (2006) 4, 261-278.

Jackson, M. (2006b) 'Approaches to teaching and perceptions of learning: A

research note,' *Mountainrise*, 3,2, 20 pp.

<http://mountainrise.wcu.edu/archive/vol3no2/issue.html>

Jackson, M. (1990). "Knowledge for what?" *Australian quarterly* **48**(1): 4-14.

Jackson, M. and M. Prosser (1985). "De-lecturing." *Higher education* **14**: 651-663.

Jackson, M. and M. Prosser (1989). "Less lecturing, more learning." *Studies in higher education* **14**(1): 55-68.

Kember, D., S. Ng, et al. (1996). "An examination of the interrelationships between workload, study time, learning approaches and academic outcomes." *Studies in higher education* **21**(3): 347-358.

Lizzio, A., K. Wilson, et al. (2002). "University students' perceptions of the learning environment and academic outcomes: implications for theory and practice." *Studies in higher education* **27**(1): 27-52.

Marton, F. (1992). "Differences in understanding and the use of reflective variation in reading." *British journal of educational psychology* **62**(1): 1-16.

Marton, F. and P. Ramsden (1988). *What does it take to improve learning? Improving learning: new perspectives*. P. Ramsden. London, Kogan Page.

Marton, F. and R. Säljö (1984). Approaches to learning. The experience of learning. F. Marton. Edinburgh, Scottish Academic Press.

Neuhauser, J. (1992). "The social contract between teachers and students" in Lend me your ears: great speeches in history. Ed. W. Safire. New York, Norton: 1027-1030.

Novak, Joseph (1998) Learning, creating, and using knowledge : concept maps as facilitative tools in schools and corporations. Mahwah, NJ, L. Erlbaum Associates.

Piaget, Jean (1954) The child's construction of reality, translated by Margaret Cook. London : Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Prosser, M. (1993). "Phenomenography and the principles and practices of learning." Higher education research and development **12**(1): 21-31.

Prosser, M., K. Trigwell, et al. (2003). "Dissonance in Experience of Teaching and its Relation to the Quality of Student Learning." Studies in higher education **28**(1): 37-49.

Ramsden, P. (1988a). Studying learning: improving teaching. Improving learning: new perspectives. P. Ramsden. London, Kogan: 15-25.

Ramsden, P. (1988b). Context and strategy. Learning strategies and learning styles. R. R. Schmeck. New York, Plenum: 155-168.

Ramsden, P. (1992). Learning to teach in higher education. London, Routledge.

Saunders, P. (1980). "The lasting effects of introductory economics courses." Journal of economic education **12**(1): 1-14.

Schneps, M. H. (1988). "A Private Universe." Video tape. Cambridge, Harvard University.

Svensson, L. and C. Högfors (1988). Conceptions as the content of teaching. Improving learning. P. Ramsden. London, Kogan Page: 162-177.