

Fostering Curiosity: The Importance of Research and Teaching in Law Schools. A Response to

Dawn Oliver

Dr Jessica Guth,^{*}

It is striking that, with nothing more than a few tweaks, Dawn Oliver's lecture on the integration of teaching and research in law schools could have been delivered today. Can it really be true that in nearly 2 decades almost nothing has changed? As I write, law schools have recently received the 2014 Research Excellence Framework results and have thus been released from the 'state of some suspense' in which Oliver wrote, as law schools then awaited the results of the 1996 Research Assessment Exercise.¹ It remains true that there are many excellent law teachers who do not engage in research activity to any significant extent and it is also still true that new universities on the whole carry out research activities which are more applied, teaching focused and still seen as less valuable. Other debates about the pressures of workload for (legal) academics, students as customers and whether or not law is a vocational discipline are all so familiar to me that it is hard to believe they were penned almost 20 years ago – a year before I started my law degree in fact.

The debates may not have changed but they have become more nuanced and our understanding of what legal education is, what research is and what teaching is has also developed. In addition the Higher Education landscape and the legal services market have changed, some would say dramatically. The purpose of this chapter is therefore to challenge some of Oliver's assumptions about research and teaching: I do not, as Oliver does, regard teaching and research as completely distinct and competing activities; I do not see the same tensions between them in terms of management and I see no reason why even the most vocationally oriented course (or student) cannot be research led or informed.

The Integration of Teaching and Research in the Law Department

^{*} University of Bradford School of Law

¹ Oliver, D. (1996) at (first page)

‘Whilst the *idea* of the university as a community of scholars engaged in the dispassionate pursuit of truth may never have accorded precisely with the reality, any semblance of the *idea* now seems to have gone forever as the market assumes centre-stage and governments seek to deploy universities for instrumental ends’²

The market has certainly taken over. Oliver wrote in the context of a reduction in HEFCE funding for research with many departments, particularly in new universities, possibly not receiving any; of significantly lower research activity in new universities than in old, of an increase in a consumer culture and linked to that, a deterioration in learning experience; of there being a focus on substantive knowledge sacrificing depth and understanding for breadth and memorising. She also notes the increase in student numbers and impact of staff student ratios as well as introduction of fees and the considerable pressures on academic workload. Most, if not all of those concerns are familiar to us now.

Curiosity: Alternative Views on Teaching and Research

Oliver’s lecture never fully articulates how she understands the relationship between research and teaching. She is clearly aware (and perhaps agrees) that some see teaching as something which gets in the way of our real work – research. This, in today’s HE marketplace certainly but maybe also in the past, makes no sense at all. The balance may be wrong but research and teaching are both part of what academics do and what universities are for. In my view, in a world where everything is about the market place and we have to teach ethics rather than expect ethical behaviour, we have a duty as law teachers to embed research into our courses; to base our arguments and teachings on well researched and well thought through evidence, to counter the information age where any question can be answered at the click of a button but is rarely understood. We also have a duty to show the impact of law both positive and negative and we have a duty to foster critical minds. Integrating research into our teaching is one way to do this. However even if your views of our duties is different from mine, embedding research in teaching exposes students to the intellectual endeavours we thrive on and the

² Thornton. M. (2012). *Privatising the Public University: The Case of Law*. Routledge.

curiosity we experience when we realise we have stumbled on something interesting we don't yet fully understand.

Before I go any further, I need to be clear about what I mean when we talk about linking research and teaching. 'There is a view that the link between teaching and research is what makes university education distinctive.'³ This is a point that Oliver seems to accept but she goes no further and this lack of exploration has implications for the arguments she makes. Perhaps the first point to note is that '[w]hether legal academics should research and what can constitute that research are and always have been deeply contested questions.'⁴ In the US context Tamanaha has suggested that 'an age old drift has bedevilled law schools from their initial implantation in universities up through the present. Law students attend law school to learn how to become lawyers. Law professors are academics.'⁵ This issue is not unfamiliar to the English context, though perhaps less acute given the differences in legal education between the two jurisdictions. Cownie for example found that:

'Research has come to play an increasingly important part in the culture of academic law, and the type of research which is valued appears to be changing, with less emphasis upon research which is oriented towards practitioners'.⁶

The point thus is that research is an integral part of university law schools and in fact one of what has been described as the 'twin peaks of excellence'⁷, the other being teaching. However, just because an organisation, in this case a law school, is engaged in two or more activities, in this case teaching and research, does not automatically mean that there has to be a link between those two activities. The question that therefore needs to be asked is this:

'What are the motivations for [bringing teaching and research more closely together]?

Is this just a bid on the part of research-intensive universities to prop up the research

³ Schapper, J. and Mayson, S.E. (2010). Research-led teaching: moving from a fractured engagement to a marriage of convenience. *Higher Education Research & Development*. 29(6), 641-651 at 644. See also Brown, R.B. (2005). Why Link personal research and teaching? *Education and Training*. 47(6), 393-407

⁴ Bradney, A. (2003). *Conversations, Choices and Chances: The Liberal Law School in the Twenty-First Century*. Oxford: Hart Publishing at 109

⁵ Tamanaha, B.Z. (2012). *Failing Law Schools*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press at 54

⁶ Cownie, F. (2004). *Legal Academics. Culture and Identities*. Oxford: Hart Publishing at 141

⁷ Insert ref – in one of the Australian papers - makes reference to Monash

enterprise, or a cry from less research-focused institutions to ensure that a wedge is not drawn between research and teaching institutions?’⁸

Or put differently: Why should our teaching be influenced by (our) research and vice versa?

I will return to my attempt at answering that question below. First however, it is worth noting that the literature in this area mostly avoids the question. Cretchley and colleagues simply state that ‘[t]he notion that teaching and research are complementary activities is entrenched in academic history and ideology’⁹ and Coate et al, considering the writing available in this area, come to the conclusion that ‘[t]his developing literature is strong on rhetoric and light on the empirical nature of the relationship between teaching and research.’¹⁰ They also note that ‘[i]f teaching and research are as inseparable as many participants claimed, the lack of explicit strategies to promote this synergy is interesting.’¹¹ What is clear, is that the relationship between research and teaching is very complex and that complexity is not acknowledged by Oliver in her lecture. This leads to a number of assumptions which are implicit in what Oliver says about the benefits of linking research and teaching, the challenges of making those links and the managerial issues which arise. She does what many others have also done and confuses research-led teaching and researcher-led teaching¹² or at least does not explicitly distinguish them. She also does not draw a distinction between research led and research informed teaching. But these distinctions are important because they can signal very different expectations to both staff and students as to how the activities carried out within law schools are conceived, linked and valued. As Coate et al rightly note:

⁸ Brew, A. (2003). ‘Teaching and research: new relationships and their implications for inquiry-based teaching and learning in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*. 22(1), 3-18 at

⁹ Cretchley, P.C., Edwards, S.L., O’Shea, P. Sheard, J., Hurst, J and Brookes, W. (2014). Research and/or learning and teaching: a study of Australian professors’ priorities, beliefs and behaviours. *Higher Education Research & Development*. 33(4), 649-669 at 650

¹⁰ Coate, K., Barnett, R. and Williams, G. (2001). Relationships Between Teaching and Research in Higher Education in England. *Higher Education Quarterly* 55(2), 158-74 at 159

¹¹ Coate, K., Barnett, R. and Williams, G. (2001) at 162

¹² Schapper, J. and Mayson, S.E. (2010) at 646.

‘Teaching and research can exist in a range of relationships with each other, and these relationships are shaped by the value-orientation of academic staff and the management of available resources.’¹³

The relationships are complex and have to be negotiated by academics on the ground. Schapper and Mayson identify a ‘large gap between institutional rhetoric of research-led teaching, accepted research findings and the reality that confronts academic staff who seek to make meaningful linkages between the two.’¹⁴ This gap, is in my view, at least partly because we have failed to engage with the complexity of what the various relationships imply and we have not fully recognised or accepted that

‘to develop closer links between research and teaching requires a well researched, sophisticated, broad based understanding of what research-led teaching is across diverse university contexts...’.¹⁵

However, I have avoided ‘the why question’. In acknowledging the complexities of the relationships between research and teaching I have not yet engaged with why we should seek to build positive relationships between research and teaching in law schools. I turn to this now.

‘Healy (2005a) [...] has reported that students perceive clear benefits from staff research, including enthusiasm, credibility, and the reflected glory of being taught by nationally and internationally known researchers.’¹⁶

So one argument as to why it might be worth encouraging researcher-led teaching, that is teaching that is delivered by people who are active researchers in that particular field, is that students like it. This is not, however, a reason to try and encourage other links between research and teaching which do not depend on the researcher themselves actually delivering the teaching related to their specialist

¹³ Coate, K., Barnett, R. and Williams, G. (2001) at 172

¹⁴ Schapper, J. and Mayson, S.E. (2010). at 642

¹⁵ Schapper, J. and Mayson, S.E. (2010). at 647

¹⁶ Wuetherick, B. and McLaughlin, L. (2010). Exploring Students’ Perceptions of Research in the Learning Environment: A Partnership to Enhance Our Understanding of the Undergraduate Student Experience. In at 190. Healy, M. (2005). ‘Linking teaching and research: exploring disciplinary spaces and the role of enquiry based learning. In Barnett, R. (ed). *Reshaping the University: New Relationships Between Research, Scholarship and Teaching*. London: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press. 67-78

topic. There are additional, and perhaps better reasons as to why links between research and teaching are valuable.

Bradney notes that ‘Because human beings are reasoning beings, human beings are researching beings’ and goes on to suggest that to foster reasoning and researching gives our students the best possible chance to, quoting Nussbaum, ‘call their minds their own’¹⁷. Nussbaum herself states ‘[t]he human spirit thrives on discovery. We must integrate discovery into all aspects of learning’.¹⁸ So one argument for making links between research and teaching, for introducing students to research, our own, that of colleagues or published work, or in fact simply the idea of research is that as human beings we will thrive on the discoveries which are to be made through such introductions. Cownie reported that in her research, ‘[t]he majority of respondents were involved in research, and were enthusiastic about it, particularly the opportunity it provides for the satisfaction of intellectual curiosity.’¹⁹ The majority of her respondents thrived on their research. This is something we should share with students.

This is perhaps what Healy, cited above, discovered the students respond to when they talk of enthusiasm. So as well as helping our students to thrive, engagement with research may also increase their level of engagement with their studies generally and help them to enjoy their intellectual journey. It may foster their curiosity. Embedding research into teaching – whether that is our own work or that of others allows us to show students that law is ever changing, evolving and that we do not have all the answers, in fact we do not have all the questions. It can show students that most areas of law are highly contested, that there is no right answer and that the study of law, far from being the pursuit of a right answer, is the pursuit of argument and critical thought.

As well as doing that, engaging with research, allows students to see for themselves the demands of academic study and the rigour required for such an intellectual endeavour. We encourage our students to read widely, build their arguments carefully and to provide evidence of their argument throughout

¹⁷ Bradney, A. (2003). at 118 add Nussbaum

¹⁸ Samarasekera, I. (2005). *Installation Address*. Edmonton: Office of the President, University of Alberta. Cited in Wuetherick, B. and McLaughlin, L. (2010). Exploring Students’ Perceptions of Research in the Learning Environment: A Partnership to Enhance Our Understanding of the Undergraduate Student Experience. In..at 185

¹⁹ Cownie, F. (2004) at 202

their work. We do not always hold ourselves to the same standards when preparing teaching materials or delivering teaching sessions. Using research, explicitly referring to it in our materials and in our delivery sets a good example. Research, as Bradney notes, mirrors what we ask students to do:

‘Research in the liberal law school makes the same demands of the academic as are made of the student except that the academic sets their own questions and their permanent residence in the law school allows for a more developed answer. In both cases of teaching and learning and that of research a liberal education involves no more and no less than the concentration of curiosity.’²⁰

If that is accepted, and you may of course disagree with me that we should be delivering a liberal legal education, then research should influence our teaching because it is through engagement with research that students develop an understanding of law that goes beyond learning legal principles and how to apply them.

In a world where answers to most questions can be found in minutes by the click of a button but where issues are rarely fully understood never mind thought through, highlighting academic research and explaining the process behind that research is crucial. Exposure to research can instil in students a more detailed and more nuanced understanding of legal principles and their application and, depending on the type of research, the impact of those legal provisions in certain context.

Ian Ward, quoting both Bradney and, interestingly Dawn Oliver herself puts it like this:

‘A liberal legal education, it has been argued, should seek to engage the ‘sensitivities of law students. And it should be critical; a law student ‘should not merely *know* or *know how to* but *understand* why things are as they are and how they could be different.’²¹

²⁰ Bradney, A. (2003) at 121

²¹ Ward, I. (2009). Legal Education and the Democratic Imagination. *Learning in Law Annual Conference Keynote Address*. At 3. Original footnotes omitted but see Bradney, A. Liberalising Legal Education in Cownie, F.(ed) and Oliver, D. Teaching and Learning Law: Pressures on the Liberal Degree’ in Birks, P. (ed) at 78

This is particularly the case if we agree that ‘the university is among the few custodians of the quality of culture and intellectual sustainability and depth.’²² Of course you may not agree that this is what law schools should be about. You may not consider a liberal legal education to be important and you may take a more vocational approach to legal education preferring to focus on the training of lawyers. If that is the case then maybe students do not need to understand why things are as they are and how they could be different; maybe knowing and knowing how to are sufficient for them to become little worker drones in large firms. However, I doubt it because finding solutions to often complex legal problems requires lawyers to think in a particularly logical, clear but also very creative way and if you are only taught to know legal rules and how to apply them rather than how to really think about them, you are likely to lack the creativity required.

There is an even more compelling reason to insist on students engaging with research and one which is linked to my own affinity to socio-legal research.²³ Ian Ward, writing in the context of terrorism, our legal response and our conceptualisation of civil liberties writes this:

‘If we are indeed serious about the role of HE in general, and legal education in particular, as a vehicle for nurturing the ideals of a liberal democracy, no matter how much we might choose to squabble about the niceties of particular ideas of liberalism, and indeed liberty, we must recognise an overarching responsibility to ensure that our students are encouraged to think long and hard about these challenges; not just their legal efficacy, the appropriateness of counter-terrorist measures as legal or extra-legal instruments, but also the broader consequences for the political society in which we live, and the culture which sustains it. The case for crossing cultural and disciplinary boundaries, in order to resuscitate our democratic imagination, has rarely, I would suggest, been stronger.’²⁴

This paragraph can, in my view be applied to most if not all major (legal) challenges facing us today, from climate change to economic crises to the erosion of human rights and the increasing

²² Pillay, G. (2009). Valuing higher education. *Higher Education Review*. 42. 64 – XX at 71

²³ Guth, J. and Ashford, C. (2014)

²⁴ Ward, I. (2009) at 17

securitisation of our lives. If we do not introduce students to a wide range of thinking, we cannot begin to hope that they will be able to put their minds to complex problems which their generation and generations to come will inherit.

Healy, cited above, also notes drawbacks to research and teaching links: ‘Disadvantages reported by students included staff unavailability, the lack of involvement in research activities and staff research taking priority over their learning.’²⁵ Demands on our time are many and varied and we need some way to decide how we prioritise our work. For some academics that undoubtedly means that research work takes precedence over other work – including work which benefits students. The balance of academic work changes over time generally but also for individual academics over their careers and over the academic year but the importance of research seems ever present. Coate et al put it like this: ‘The volumes and values of academic activities are not static and have shifted over time, although the high value accorded to research has been a conspicuous pattern for half a century at least.’²⁶ Schapper and Mayson argue that academics may have to serve more than one master: ‘From a policy perspective, contradictory demands are made on academics caught in the political contest between the institutional value of research *vis a vis* the community’s demand for teaching.’²⁷ So while universities and other academics assign value based on someone’s research profile, the communities which universities serve are more interested in what is offered to students. This can create tensions and those tensions need to be managed.

Adding to this tension is ‘The assumption that good researchers will also be good teachers has been described as a myth of higher education (Terezini and Pascarella, 1994), and so too is perhaps the belief that research enhances teaching’²⁸ Even if it is a myth that research necessarily enhances teaching, we should still try to link research and teaching, I have set out above why. However, it does mean that we need to think about how we link the two activities. Does it mean that there is no longer a

²⁵ Healy, M. (2005). ‘Linking teaching and research: exploring disciplinary spaces and the role of enquiry based learning. In Barnett, R. (ed). *Reshaping the University: New Relationships Between Research, Scholarship and Teaching*. London: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press. 67-78

²⁶ Coate, K., Barnett, R. and Williams, G. (2001) at 1163

²⁷ Schapper, J. and Mayson, S.E. (2010) at 646

²⁸ Coate, K., Barnett, R. and Williams, G. (2001) at 172. Terezini, P.T. and Pascarella, E.T. (1994). Living with Myths. Undergraduate Education in America. *Change*. 28-32

place for academics whose contribution comes purely from research, nor for academics who do not engage in research but focus on teaching students? This would not make sense. Not all of us are good at both and you do not have to be good at one to be good at the other. The extent to which law schools can and do ask their researchers to teach based on their research or ask their teachers to base their teaching on research (whether their own or not) or to introduce students to the notion of research within the curriculum must largely be determined by the law schools themselves. This should not be a decision which is based purely on resources though resources will of course be a factor. It is a far more fundamental question about what the purpose and value of a law degree is and what the ethos and culture of the law school should be. In making such decisions it should always be remembered that ‘Academic Freedom means freedom for us to do our work. It also means allowing other academics freedom to do their work.’²⁹ So while we must recognise that teaching and research are valuable to all law schools, the relationship between the activities is likely to be fluid and very dynamic and vary from law school to law school.

I have so far presented the relationship as rather one way. I have talked about research led or research informed teaching; I have assumed that it is the research that influences teaching. I have said nothing about how the relationship works the other way around.

‘... there is no suggestion that teaching might be valued independently from or even alongside research. Elton (2001) also notes that in this debate there is never a suggestion that research is best conducted in a teaching environment.’³⁰

This perhaps tells us something about the value placed on the activities. It perhaps suggests that research is the superior one. This chimes with experience of academics, particularly those seeking promotion. ‘If research is more highly valued and rewarded than teaching, academics may be less inclined to spend time on curricular developments or pedagogical approaches.’³¹ This is problematic for two main reasons – firstly, we have noted above that the integration of research into teaching is

²⁹ Bradney, T. (2003). On Academic Freedom. *The Reporter*. No 26 Spring 2003, 1-2

³⁰ Schapper, J. and Mayson, S.E. (2010). 646. Elton, L. (2001). Research and teaching: Conditions for a positive link. *Teaching in Higher Education*. 6(1), 43-56

³¹ Coate, K., Barnett, R. and Williams, G. (2001) at 170. See also Cownie, F. (2004).

complex and that for it to be effective it needs to be well thought out. This takes time – time academics seeking career advancement might feel is better spent actually doing research rather than thinking about how it can best be included in teaching. Secondly, it creates a divide between those academics who are focused mainly on research and those who are focused mainly on teaching (and puts those who try and do both in an impossible position). It establishes a hierarchy which is misplaced. This hierarchy is not only applied within institutions but also between institutions with those who achieve significant scores in whatever research assessment mechanism exists at the time, being seen as more prestigious and generally better than those who do not. This sort of hierarchy allows Dawn Oliver to suggest that research funding should (and of course is) concentrated in certain institutions allowing them to focus on research while others focus on teaching. A notion which is stated very clearly in the US context by Tamanaha: ‘Especially at lower-ranked schools where graduates have lower expected income, the students should not be made to bear the costly burden for faculty research’.³² While I agree that students should not bear the cost, this is not the argument I wish to make here. The point is the distinction between low and high ranking schools and the students within them. Given the case made for the integration of research into teaching above, it should be evident that all law students should benefit from it not just those who, largely by winning in the lottery of birth, secure places at elite law schools. It should also be clear that engagement with research should not be confined to students on postgraduate degrees. But research is expensive and resources are finite. Add to that the fact that students are paying for their higher education (not their degrees - yet!) and that other income, particularly income which is directly for legal research, is very limited, we do need to answer some serious questions about research and how it is funded, or more broadly, how universities are funded. Engaging with this important debate is sadly beyond the scope of the paper.

Dawn Oliver’s argument is based on an elitist view of what research is and how it links to teaching. Her view is shaped by the position she holds in a research intensive elite institution but it is not a view that is helpful to legal academics and law students across the country. An alternative view which sees

³² Tamanaha, B.Z. (2012) at 61’

learning and teaching and research as something that is a collegial endeavour and one which academics and students contribute to, allows us to see the value of research in teaching and teaching in research:

‘In order for this model of staff-student partnership to succeed, the hierarchy that is implicitly built into the organization of universities must be challenged, as must the definition of who can legitimately be a scholar. While ‘inclusive’ does not mean equal, Brew argues that it does mean ‘valuing the contributions of each person no matter what their level of prior understanding and knowledge’ (Brew 2006, p163). We must critically reflect on the ways in which we enable not only undergraduate students, but also postgraduate students and contract instructors, to be a part of this scholarly community’.³³

Not all law teachers are researchers. Even those who are, do not necessarily research in areas where they teach or teach in areas they research. It is therefore not always easy to use our own research in teaching. In addition, if we are teaching in areas where we are not also research active there might be little incentive to search out research work in order to use it in our teaching. We might simply not be interested enough in the subject or we might simply not have the time. The days, where we all just teach our specialist subjects, if they ever existed, are over. Many of us teach on core undergraduate courses and many perceive there to be little scope for introducing research into such teaching.

Students do not yet know enough, so the argument goes, to understand the research. They need to learn more law before they can make sense of the research on it. This is a stance which Oliver seems to support. However it strikes me as flawed.

It is possible to make use of research in all our teaching. It does not have to be our own research work, it can be any research on the issues we are trying to teach (it also does not have to be legal research of course, there are many disciplines where work is carried out which is of relevance to law students).

Good teaching surely requires us to go beyond a textbook in a given topic and to familiarise ourselves

³³ Wuetherick, B. and McLaughlin, L. (2010) at 194-195. Brew, A. (2006). *Research and Teaching: Beyond the Divide*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan

with the debates, issues and yes, the research in that area. We perhaps do not need to become experts on every aspect but we do need to do what we ask our students to do: read widely and justify our arguments using the evidence available to us – that includes research. In Coate et al's research 'a final year undergraduate engineering student suggested that non-research-active staff teach students to pass exams, whereas research active staff teach students the subject'.³⁴ Surely we should be aiming to teach our students the subject.

The notion that undergraduate students, and particular first year students, do not know enough law to be able to understand research makes no sense – taking this to its logical conclusion it would mean that any legal research should only be engaged with by people who hold law degrees and who have a good understanding of the particular area of law already. That is nonsense. Research can make law more interesting and exciting and therefore more accessible to students. Engaging with research can throw up questions for students or highlight issues which they can follow up and will lead to a better understanding of law. This does mean that we 'may be required to re-evaluate [our] curriculum using the concept of learning as the link between research and teaching.'³⁵ This is particularly so as reading journal articles and understanding research is a skill and it is one that our students do not magically possess or develop just because we give them a journal article to read. We therefore need to think carefully about what research we introduce them to; what published material we ask them to read and how we present information to students. We need to explain what research is, why we get excited about it, why it is important and what it can tell us. Without that students are not likely to fully appreciate the difference between reading a research paper on the rule of law and the Wikipedia entry on the same topic.

Curiosity. Not good for cats. Great for students³⁶

This chapter has sought to respond to a number of the points raised and assumptions made by Dawn Oliver in her Lord Upjohn Lecture. It has challenged the idea that research should perhaps be

³⁴ Coate, K., Barnett, R. and Williams, G. (2001) at 166

³⁵ Schapper, J. and Mayson, S.E. (2010) at 649

³⁶ Adapted from the TV Programme Numb3rs (2005). Dr Larry Fleinhardt in Season 2 Episode 8: Curiosity. Not good for cats, great for scientists.

concentrated in some elite institution and focused on postgraduate teaching. It has done so by setting out why research informed/led teaching is important and why it is important at all levels. The chapter has also highlighted some important questions which the higher education community must address, not least how higher education is to be funded in the future in order to safeguard all activities taking place in universities. If higher education generally and legal education specifically are about learning in a broad sense then we need to find a way to channel our students curiosity, we need to allow them to follow it in the same way that we seek to follow our own. We need to share our curiosity with them and we need to get excited about our learning together. Brown and Atkins suggest that Research is sometimes described as ‘organized curiosity’ whereas teaching is ‘organized communication’.³⁷ However, I would argue that teaching and research are both about curiosity and about communication and that, as Einstein told us, ‘the important thing is not to stop questioning. Curiosity has its own reason for existing’.³⁸

³⁷ Brown, G and Atkins, M (1998). *Effective Teaching in Higher Education*. London: Routledge, at 5.

³⁸ Attributed to Albert Einstein on various websites including Famous Quotes <http://www.famous-quotes-and-quotations.com/>