

George Kuku

Shannon Murray

Arts 4010-01

April 22,

RESEARCH REPORT:

Official Title: The Arts Unveiled

Aims:

The research project was aimed at attaining from members of the various faculties of Arts.

1. Their sense or feel of the impact your courses (those in the Arts & Humanities) have on students.
2. The skills gained from the courses they teach, and
3. Their understanding, if any, of the distinction of teaching in the Arts and its position in broader society.

STATUS OF AIMS WITH REGARDS TO INTERVIEW SESSIONS DONE:

1. Sense achieved
2. Skills Noted
3. Understanding Related

BROADER OVERVIEW: The course project was invented with the purpose of bridging the gap between teachers' expectations and students' reality, due to the invariable fact that there are always two positions in any classroom: that of the teacher and that of the student. As such, there is always a gap between them, as there are things one ought to learn (expectations, what the teacher gives) and things that are actually learned (the students' reality and what they receive). There is also the experience factor to consider, in the sense that there is a transformation of some kind within students as they go from being beginners/novices in a course to experts or some kind at the end of the course. Thus, this project was also aimed at

discovering whether any meaning at all was attached to the experience of learning and its importance.

DISPERSEMENT OF RESULTS:

Evidence of the results stems from answers attained from the majority of the following questions. Some questions were omitted during the duration of a few interviews as a result of participants answering two questions with one answer.

PARTICIPANTS: There are a total of 11 participants in the project. Participants all stem from the Arts faculty, with members identifying across the English, Theatre, Philosophy, DSJS, ACLC, Economics, History, and Political Science faculties.

In this dispersion of results, participants will be identified by number, ranging from Participant 1 to Participant 11. The numbers have no meaning or order to them, as they are just handles used instead of the participants' names. What will accompany them is the primary faculty to which the participant belongs, to better understand where their answers might stem from. An example, Participant 4, may be identified as: "Participant 4, who primarily identifies as a member of the English department."

As a Note, there is no consistency among the identity of participant numbers. That is, Participant 1 in question one is not Participant 1 in the following question. The numbers vary and are interchanged with answers to keep participants' identities anonymous and their answers hard to follow.

QUESTIONS:

The following questions were asked in the interview process.

QUESTION 1: “What is it like Teaching?”

QUESTION 2: “Did you imagine you would always be a teacher?”

QUESTION 3: “Do you think that teaching is a profession that is essential and integral in society?”

QUESTION 4: “What are the skills of a teacher, would you say?”

QUESTION 5: “Beyond just the content, do you think there is a difference between teaching in the Arts-related field and in the STEM fields?”

QUESTION 6: “If there is a difference, does it translate to learning? Is there a difference when learning in the Arts field and when learning in the STEM fields?”

QUESTION 7: “Is there a particular course or subject, or field you enjoy teaching most or have a natural affinity for? If so, what about that field? Why do you like that field?”

QUESTION 8: “Do you think there is a profession that a teacher in your department/field could easily transition into?”

QUESTION 9: “If you were not a teacher, what else would you be?”

QUESTION 10: “Does the teaching profession, in general, have any transferable skills?”

QUESTION 11: “When you teach, what do you hope most happens to students?”

QUESTION 12: “Would you want students to be defined by the experience of your teaching, or to know well enough the course material you intend to teach?”

QUESTION 13: “Do you think students leave with something after classes?”

QUESTION 14: “Do you think it would be better if students had course goals given to them for every course they took?”

QUESTION 15: “What about course goals? If students had course goals, do you think it would take away the experience of learning?”

QUESTION 16: “With course goals, do you think they would or should be directly beneficial to the student in terms of life after graduation, specifically?”

QUESTION 17: “Does a first or second year course have as much influence on a student as the fourth or third year courses?”

QUESTION 18: A list of courses they teach is given to them: “Please pick one of the courses you teach. What would you say students leave with most from this field?”

QUESTION 19: “How might that thing taught or learned be identifiable as a skill?”

QUESTION 20: “Do you see the application of the skills/lessons acquired in the Humanities in persons participating in occupations outside the educational institutions? What occupations are those?”

QUESTION 21: “If you once took the same course or that of its manner, are the lessons learned then, and thus the skills acquired then, still the same today as they were then?”

QUESTION 22: “Do you think the skills acquired in the Humanities are looked down upon in general? –If they are, why do you think that is? – Were they looked down upon in your days as a student as well?”

QUESTION 23: “Do you think the skills of a Humanities student can be gathered by experience, as they are perhaps taught in the classroom? That is, can one learn humanities skills without ever setting foot in a classroom, do you think?”

QUESTION 24: “Do you think there is an empirical data acquired from experiencing the Humanities and its content that cannot be replaced when taught?” * After the very first interview, this question was revised to...

QUESTION 25: “Do you think there are skills/lessons that can only originate from experience?”

QUESTION 26: “How might, do you think, the experience of the Humanities be improved for the student?”

ANSWERS:

QUESTION 1:

What is it like Teaching?

Participant 1, who identifies as a member of the English department, said that teaching is like “baking a cake” in the sense that baking a cake allows them to give to people; to give something that makes them really happy. As such, teaching is the medium through which they give things. The participant also went on to note that in teaching, they bridge the gap between teachers and students.

Participant 2, who identifies as a member of the Theatre department, answered that teaching is “about a journey, to help students get somewhere,” even though they may not know where the student wants to go. They added that teaching is personally fulfilling as they “take great satisfaction in the success of others.”

Participant 3, who identifies as a member of the History department, recognized teaching as “enjoyable” because it gives teachers the opportunity to play with ideas, those being of research. They went on to note that they find it “rewarding” because they get to see students grow over 4 years, especially in smaller institutions compared to larger ones.

Participant 4, who identifies as a member of the Language department, explained teacher as a craft they had always had from a young age, which they used to “accommodate” their younger siblings. They went on to elaborate that teaching is an effort to be “accessible” to everyone independently.

Participant 5, who identifies as a member of the English department, explained teaching as being no different from talking. That it is an effort of inquiry and dialogue, through which they extend curiosity. They also went on to say that teaching is in that effort, always learning, that a teacher is a “learner amongst learners.”

Participant 6, who identifies as a member of the Economics department, described teaching as an “outlet of intellectual curiosity.” They explained that teaching grants them an opportunity to delve into a variety of subjects that can “broaden the horizon” of their students.

Participant 7, who identifies as a member of the Philosophy department, theorized teaching as

something that doesn't get easier with age. That they look out for "Incremental progress" with it, and aim for relevancy to students.

Participant 8, who identifies as a member of the Applied Communication, Leadership, and Culture department (ACLC), described teaching as an "adventure." As something that raised excitement level when they were younger, but is now moreso about dealing with "competing interests." Those of both the teacher and student.

Participant 9, who identifies as a member of the English department, identifies teaching as a form of Questioning.

Participant 10, who identifies as a member of the History department, defines teaching as something that makes a difference. As something that has an impact and meaning in people's lives.

Participant 11, who identifies as a member of Diversity, Social Justice Studies (DSJS), explains teaching as "the best job in the world." They explain that they love the job that they do, and the "ideas" they teach. More specifically, they love it because of the age group they teach.

QUESTION 2:

Did you imagine you would always be a teacher?

Participant 1, who identifies as a member of the English department, said that they did not always imagine themselves to be a teacher.

Participant 2, who identifies as a member of the History department, explains the same: they were tricked into being one after coming across some inspiring professors during their undergrad and wanting to do what they were at the pulpit. They further explained that they expected to be entirely during research before they ultimately added teaching as a field.

Participant 3, who identifies as a member of the Economics department, shared the same reality: they did not expect to be a teacher, but were backed into it after an adventure in the public sector. In particular, their journey into economics was a third educational trial after previous journeys had been unsuccessful.

Participant 4, who identifies as a member of Diversity, Social Justice Studies (DSJS), like the rest, did not imagine becoming a teacher. Their initial aspiration was that of being a lawyer (because it sounded fancy), but they pursued educational studies after traveling for a year upon undergrad completion. They elaborated that they were a teaching assistant during their master's before they decided to go fully into teaching.

Participant 5, who identifies as a member of the English department, contrary to the rest, explained that they always knew they were going to be a teacher. Particularly because, at a kindergarten age, they used their toddler sibling as practice for their teaching skills.

Participant 6, who identifies as a member of the Theatre department, like the earlier participants, did not imagine becoming a teacher. Instead, they presumed they'd be lawyers because their family (nuclear and extended) was full of lawyers and judges. However, they pivoted to becoming one while in grad school, after someone (likely a classmate) pointed out that they spoke just like their professor.

Participant 7, who identifies as a member of the Applied Communication, Leadership, and Culture department (ACLC), explained that they, at first, could not bring themselves to become a teacher due to anxiety and expected to be a technical writer. However, they say that

after a visit to a friend doing their PhD, where they were the victims of an assumption of writing because they had read a list of books, they decided to get their PhD.

Participant 8, who identifies as a member of the History department, aligns with the general sentiment that they did not expect to become a teacher. However, much of their surrounding family were teachers. And so, after they earned their degree in English Literature from grad school, they moved into History and fell in love with the academic life of the university: the idea of students having options whether to come to class or not, as opposed to the optionless experience in high or grad school.

Participant 9, who identifies as a member of the Language department, explains that they always knew they would be a teacher, as they were teaching at the age of ten. That they fell in love with the idea of relationships. However, they did not expect to go so far as becoming a Professor.

Participant 10, who identifies as a member of the English department, goes to great lengths to convey that they did not think they'd become a teacher, but preferred to be a vet or an artist. However, they decided against the first because they were "no good at looking at the inside" and at chemistry, and against the second because they had nothing to say and could not stand being poor.

Participant 11, who identifies as a member of the Philosophy department, narrates that they went to university to study business with the dream of going to Detroit and becoming a millionaire. They left business, however, because their professor hated teaching, and delved into psychology, before going into English literature, out of an aspiration to become a writer. Ultimately, they found themselves in philosophy after thinking of themselves as a "misfit," but nonetheless faced challenges after school when trying to get a job because there was a promotion of women in philosophy going on, and they thus hired more of them.

QUESTION 3:

Do you think that teaching is a profession that is essential and integral in society?

A participant from the English department did not face this question.

Participant 1, of the Language Department, agrees that teaching is a profession that is integral and essential to society. They say they do not think “any society could function without some kind of transmission of knowledge and skills,” arguing that that is what they do as parents.

Participant 2, of the English department, argues the same, that “indigenous cultures have teachers.” They explain that learning is ever-happening and that it is a form of Adaptability.

Participant 3, of the ACLC department, advocates that teaching is one of the many things that are essential now. They continued by highlighting personal problems with the current educational system and the rise in homeschooling. They finished by pointing out that teaching is in a “precarious moment”, particularly because parents have competing values for what their children should learn.

Participant 4, from the Economics department, affirms the same and goes on to present evidence that people need some form of guidance, and that is where teachers come in.

Participant 5, of the Philosophy department, does think that teaching is essential and integral to society, and that effort should be made to “weed out the people that are just there for the money,” because teaching “is a job where you can get burned out.” They highlight their experience when teaching during the Pandemic, how frustrating it was, and ultimately calls it to teach students in person, because “that’s where you get the passion back.”

Participant 6, of the History department, laments that teaching is essential, especially as they are surrounded family-wise by teachers. They note the current problems of misinformation and media literacy, then pay homage to the Liberal Arts education for tackling them.

Participant 7, of the English department, answers the question by first explaining the significance of teachers: that without them, “the accumulation of knowledge and the training of the next generation is completely half-hazard. It’s just whatever you happen to come across.” They explain that every society values teachers, but how they value them “is correlated with the

value they assign to the people being taught.” The example they give is how valued STEM is today; thus, we value STEM teachers. They add unto their answer that “we don’t recognize sometimes, the value that teaching has in other societies or in other cultures, because we call it the wrong name,” in a bid to prove their in-depth understanding of the question. In essence, they say, “We can say teaching is a reflection of societies.”

Participant 8, of the Theatre department, agrees that teaching is so, “because we learn from people, not technology or books.” They add that teaching “probably” happens both ways; that “on a good day,” they learn as much as the students.

Participant 9, of the DSJS department, admits the same and adds that an educated populace is one that “can ask questions and challenge power.” They say that teaching is about asking questions that they may not have answers for, and that ultimately, teaching is what holds communities together.

Participant 10, of the History department, is on the popular bandwagon that teaching is essential and integral, highlighting that all societies have teachers, educators, inventors, and mentors. They finish by reiterating that society doesn’t function without them.

QUESTION 4:

What are the skills of a teacher, would you say?

Participant 1, English department, says that the skills of a teacher are listening, being open, and adaptation, among a host of others.

Participant 2, History department, says that the skills of a good teacher lie in doing the craft well, and understanding who they're teaching and their needs. They say that the good teachers are those good at communicating, being honest, and humble. Those who don't try to pretend that they know things which they don't, teachers who are curious and passionate, because passion radiates.

Participant 3, of the Language department, argues that one of the skills of a teacher is being knowledgeable and flexible to have different approaches to teaching. They argue that teaching is more like a dialogue where they pace themselves according to that of the student. They also point out that teachers have to make their teachings enjoyable.

Participant 4, of the Theatre department, notes that Listening is a big part of teaching. Preparation as well as openness and integrity (in the sense Parker Palmer talks about it). Through the last skill, they emphasize the importance of the teacher to be "authentic" and not to play the part.

Participant 5, English department, started by noting that a teacher should understand how their profession works, and the example they used was writing: they did not understand much about writing until they started teaching it. The next skill they talked about is humility, because "you're going to be wrong all the time." They emphasized that humility is "a recognition that you're not gonna get it right all the time." A good teacher will also "recognize the advantages and the limitations of their methods," be reflective and creative, and, like the group they are teaching, in the sense of the situation in which they teach them. Furthermore, they stated that a teacher should be "happy or proud" of what they are teaching, and that they should also develop skills in "memorization, repetition, scholarly stuff, quick feedback, long feedback, slow feedback, etc." They went on to add that a teacher "should always be doing something that they struggle with in their own lives." In essence, a teacher should have the skill to understand the mindset of a student. Finally, they named the skill of Acknowledgment as

that of a teacher.

Participant 6, of the Philosophy department, attributed the first skill of a teacher as being organized. Followed up by “knowing both sides of arguments” and having a good memory. They went on to point out office skills as being part of the skills, as well as listening, researching, and typewriting, “being your own secretary.” Lastly, they mentioned people skills as being a necessary skill of a teacher.

Participant 7, of the English department, highlighted Flexibility, calmness, a lack of anxiety, and a love for the craft as the skills of a teacher. When speaking of the last of the mentioned skills, they highlighted how teaching is like making music.

Participant 8, Economics department, noted communication as the most necessary skill of a teacher. Behind that were good judgment, empathy, “material-related skill,” and intellectual curiosity.

Participant 9, History department, started by pointing out that teachers are never taught how to be one in the first place. They went on to note Empathy as a skill, along with introspection, the ability to keep up with trends, research skills, the ability to give feedback, intellectual curiosity, and finally, the ability to spread and sustain enthusiasm among students.

Participant 10, DSJS department, answered the question first by telling a story of the struggle they faced during the COVID-19 breakdown, as they were forced to go online. They then highlighted teaching as a relationship where one recognizes the other, and thus the skills of a teacher are empathy, relationality, passion, enthusiasm (the spread of it), and lastly, the ability to care.

Participant 11, from the ACLC department, noted listening as the top skill for a teacher. Followed by the ability to comprehend information received as a result of listening, as students all come from different situations and backgrounds.

QUESTION 5:

Beyond just the content, do you think there is a difference between teaching in the Arts-related field and in the STEM fields?

Participant 1, of the History department, agreed that there is a difference. However, that it is “not always a clear line,” and they in the department like to think of History as being closer to the STEM fields due to the “empirical balance” found in the craft. They went on to highlight a key difference as being “Iterative Learning”, which is found in the Arts but suffers in the STEM teaching, as well as the ability to communicate, which is taught in the Arts but not in STEM courses.

Participant 2, of the Economics department, began with a “No” as the answer, but highlighted that they teach the more scientific part of Economics differently from the more Art side. They noted that they teach the artistic side more as a result and highlighted volume (amount) as one of the differences. Added to that was the fact that the theory side of Economics is more “abstract” and that it also allows for other fields to be interwoven in the course, i.e., history.

Participant 3, of the Philosophy department, highlighted that they had never taught in the STEM field before. However, to answer the question, they used their observations from teaching STEM students and pointed out that they were more obedient to the demands of the course. They called this difference a cultural one, as the STEM students are more objective, while the Arts students are more creative and spontaneous.

Participant 4, of the English department, noted that there is a difference. A first being that in the STEM field, information is categorized as “Necessary,” which is something not found in the Arts. And neither is Memorization, which is crucial in the STEM courses.

Participant 5, of the Theatre department, acknowledged a difference, by pointing out that the Arts department does not have a “roadmap” to learning, whereas the STEM is built in stages. They explained that they are a teacher who emphasizes skills over content. They lamented that the arts “make meaning,” “create pattern,” while STEM study passes more so as being “linear.” Finally, they spoke about the expansiveness of the Arts person, highlighting that they have a “little bit” of many things, and that “the kids who get radicalized, all engineering students?” is due to the linearity of their studies.

Participant 6, of the DSJS department, iterates that there is a “scaffolding necessary” in the STEM fields, in the sense that one cannot be in fourth year engineering if they haven’t done the first year courses. They note that the same is not possible in the arts fields, but highlight that in art classes, students from various years can be found, as well as students from other faculties. Lastly, they noted that they hope the skills of a teacher they earlier mentioned are found everywhere across the teaching board.

Participant 7, of the Language department, began their answer by stating that art is “very broad.” They stated that their department is trying to be “more fluid,” and that the arts “trains people to be better people.” While in other courses, their training is more narrow, which they find a problem with. In essence, they state that in the Arts, the disciplines are catered to making great persons, and are not more so “discipline-related.”

Participant 8, of the English department, expressed that there should not be a difference. However, they went on to say that STEM courses have an “emphasis on acquiring materials, skills, and expertise in a very compressed period of time,” which is not found in the Arts. To close their answer, they nonetheless reiterated that there should be no difference between teaching in the arts and in the STEM fields.

Participant 9, of the History department, noted that the difference is “not as much as people talk about.” They emphasized, however, that, with the Arts, the purpose “is to make us think critically about society,” which is unique to the Arts. Thus, Purpose is the difference.

Participant 10, of the ACLC department, suggested that the difference “comes down to the professor.” They stated that in STEM, there is a notion of necessary knowledge, which is not quite found in the Arts.

Participant 11, of the English department, suggests that science relies on Analogy (image, but not fiction as in metaphor), while the arts do not.

QUESTION 6:

If there is a difference, does it translate to learning? Is there a difference when learning in the Arts field and when learning in the STEM fields?

Participant 1, of the ACLC department, highlights his love for having science students in his creative writing class because they bring with them a strong sense of knowledge. In essence, that there is an attachment to knowledge from science students that those in the arts do not associate with. The example they gave was with the structure of a cell; a science student has a strong fascination with the structure of a cell. Whereas an arts student would say, “someone made up names for these parts. They’re not actually those parts.”

Participant 2, of the DSJS department, began by sharing what they love about the arts, which is its “incredible broadnet.” They then state their intention for teaching in general, which is that “the more any teacher can take what’s happening in a classroom and make it apply to the world outside the classroom, the more students, but also everybody else, will come to think of education as not just a credential, where we like to soak as much money out of you as we can. But as an investment in the future of a society.” In essence, they express their desire for there not to be a particular difference but rather “commonalities” in what teachers do, even though they do them differently.

Participant 3, of the English department, notes that the Arts moves from “macro to micro to macro studies”, while the science moves from “micro to macro.” Thus, in science, it is a case of keeping up or getting bumped out. Whereas, in the arts, they say that the experience matters more so. They end by advocating that STEM students should do an arts course and vice versa (art students should do a STEM course)

Participant 4, of the History department (Chilton), starts by noting the necessities of learning: curiosity, discipline, and consistency. They note that the difference lies in where the curiosity is: that arts disciples are curious about human beings, while STEM disciples are curious with regard to their specificity (e.g., “chemistry, it’s about organic and inorganic matter. Biology, it’s about physical systems of living things.”)

Participant 5, of the Economics department, thinks that STEM-related things are more “straightforward” and “less technical.” While there is a lot more nuance to arts-related things,

such as History, that requires context.

Participant 6, of the English department (Shilton), thinks that the difference in learning can be found in Simplification.

Participant 7, of the Theatre department, says that they are not “100% sold on different types of learning,” that “learning is learning.” They highlight that the difference lies in what each individual is “predisposed to a particular way of thinking through whatever encounters you’ve had leading up to that point.”

Participant 8, of the Language department, does think that people who study arts learn differently from those who study in courses like statistics. They note that it takes “a less broader range of array of skills” to be really good at statistics, whilst more skills are required to succeed in the Arts, because of its fluidity. That students from the arts “are probably more ready to face society challenges and diversity” more “than students in the sciences.”

Participant 9, of the Philosophy department, notes that the difference lies in the jargon, “language” of the discipline. In Philosophy, they say the jargon is light and that it is better when a layperson can understand philosophy. Whereas “only the scientists know how to speak in this, in this way, and whatever be truly objective.” They say that in science, there is no personal reaction, and that it is all about the facts, which is not the case in the Arts.

Participant 10, of the English department, highlights a difference, which is that there is a lack of PowerPoint presentations, which students like.

Participant 11, of the History department, does think that there is a difference, which they experience when they ask their students to do “a bit of learning that you would ask the status-based majors to do.” Such learning includes “adherence to facts, better memorization, and knowing the information around your field inside and out.” The difference, however, is that “there is much more emphasis on playing with ideas, on testing ideas,” in the Arts, which is done in science through the use of hypothesis and scientific experiments; however, in the Arts, they engage with materials which “are harder to digest,” and “do not tell you what to think.” The materials in the arts are pieces of “academic literature” that require engagement with skills acquired, thus making them less straightforward than they would be in STEM fields.

QUESTION 7:

Is there a particular course or subject, or field you enjoy teaching most or have a natural affinity for? If so, what about that field? Why do you like that field?

Participant 1, of the DSJS department, claims not to have a natural affinity within their discipline. They state that despite the broadness of their discipline, they make courses based on identity, knowledge, and inclusion. An example of such a course is one titled *Monstrous Freak, Cyborgs and Zombies*, which focuses on the history of putting race and disability on display as freak shows.

Participant 2, of the Philosophy department, has a natural affinity for radical philosophy and considers themselves to be an anarchist; however, a partial one. They justify their affinity by noting their belief that “mainstream civilization has gone in the wrong direction,” in the sense that there is a “bias in favour of the greedy person or whatever you want to call it, the person that wants to accumulate wealth, and not generous enough to people that struggle and are impoverished or discriminated against, for whatever reason. So the successful people and the elite have had their way for a long time and have dominated.” They note that radical philosophy is a way to challenge the equation and “challenge mainstream assumptions.”

Participant 3, of the English department, has a natural affinity for Academic Writing, Rhetoric, Literature, and Narrative as an Art of Care. They say that their affinities tend to delve into currency, into courses that allow them to teach content that is current.

Participant 4, of the ACLC department, has a natural affinity for creative writing because they can do so without any preparation, “aside from spending a lot of time with my students’ work.” They say they can do so because the course isn’t about expertise, and that “a lifelong immersion in the creative acts” gives him confidence to respond to whatever question arises.

Participant 5, of the Language department, has no natural affinity to a particular course or subject, because they are “good at teaching everything.” The reason being so is that, in the language they teach, they teach a variety of things, ranging from short stories in the said language to indigenous writings in the language to women’s writing in the language in question. They do, however, note that they are specialist in “adaptation studies in film studies.”

Participant 6, of the History department, is a historian who is interested in the lives of ordinary people. Thus, they prefer to be called a social historian, who is not interested in “the wealthy, not the elite, not the powerful, but ordinary people. the choices that people make, and why they make them, and what their relationships are. I would describe myself as an historian of migration.”

Participant 7, of the History department, is a historian of China, who nonetheless likes working on humanistic historical topics such as gender, race, and identity. They do so because they find such topics to be “valuable sandboxes” of ideas for students to play through.

Participant 8, of the English department, has a natural affinity for Renaissance Literature.

Participant 9, of the Economic department, has an affinity for non-traditional fields of economics, such as sports, beer, and crime and punishment. The reason being that such fields allow one to show how “you can apply a wide variety of economic tools or thinking to a subject.”

Participant 10, of the Theatre department, has a natural affinity for theatre courses because each time, the courses feel different. The students, who come in with their different life experiences and creativity, make it feel different, they say. But they also have an affinity for film studies because of the “great” discussions and the “really cool ideas for film clips to look at,” which students brought.

Participant 11, of the English department, has a natural affinity for linguistics because: it is “an extraordinary field,” “There is no human community without language. No human community without culture,” and “language is how we convey our ideas to one another.” Besides this, they also state that “pursuing a degree in literature, with no training or no education, or no exposure to linguistics, is like trying to do, for example, architecture, without any understanding of how materials operate or tensile strengths, or trying to do fashion without understanding how a bias works, how cutting on the bias works. You don’t need to be an expert seamstress in order to be a brilliant fashion designer. But if you don’t know how fabric works, you’re gonna fall into the ground.”

QUESTION 8:

Do you think there is a profession that a teacher in your department/field could easily transition into?

Participant 1, of the History department, does not think so. They point out their work done with DSJS and ACLC colleagues, thus interdisciplinarity, but believe that it would be “presumptuous” to think they could “wake up and teach an entire DSJS course.”

Participant 2, of the English department, thinks that they could transition into fields of communications and training, because that is what teachers already do. They, however, noted their adoration for interior designing.

Participant 3, of the English department, noted that they once transitioned to working at Indigo, and could do so at a library as a Librarian. In addition, they mentioned they could work as Professional Development Facilitators because it is much like teaching.

Participant 4, of the Philosophy department, noted that they would have been a journalist or served in a public service role. Philosophy-wise, they said, they would be what they call an “Ethicist,” which is a newly rising position. An ethicist is someone who advises other professionals on ethical issues. They did point out that, nonetheless, philosophy as a discipline is shrinking in universities.

Participant 5, of the History department, noted that going into law would have been an easy transition for them. In particular, the work done in the Archives involves “thinking about what came before,” using skills to “synthesize information and communicate.” They also mentioned that historians get into journalism due to the skillset of writing. And lastly, the job of Administrators, the participant notes that historians do venture into this role.

Participant 6, of the ACLC department, noted that they did some work as an instructional designer in the private sector; that the skills of a teacher carry over from the university classroom to that job. They note that “people who are in need are from a business or an arts background, but need to know enough about the content to explain to an organization what they’re getting into.”

Participant 7, of the DSJS department, noted that they could transition to fields in government

or in businesses related to DEI. They note that their graduates have gone into non-profits, provincial governments, local businesses, and even grad school to become social workers or lawyers. They end by pointing out that business leaders “tell us that they want art students because they’re the ones who have the broad range of thinking skills, and the oral and written communication skills.”

Participant 8, of the English department, joked that they could transition into a carpenter or home builder of some sort. However, they did note that they could transition into some job involving Rhetoric, because that is what is at the core of universities: language and rhetoric. They emphasized that language structures logic, not the other way around.

Participant 9, of the Theatre department, highlighted a previous job they had done as a technician in the theatre field. They elaborated that they could work as a director, or go into publishing, or government policy analysis. They emphasize that their skill set is transferable.

Participant 10, of the Language department, noted that being bilingual in a bilingual country gives them the opportunity to do “pretty much everything” because it is more appealing to employers.

Participant 11, of the Economics department, noted that they could transition into a policy-related job in government. They added that more quantitatively-oriented economists do work for banks. Furthermore, economists with their credentials could become researchers and could also work for International Organizations. Lastly, they added that the job market for economists is a lot better than that of other areas, such as History and English, at the moment.

QUESTION 9:

If you were not a teacher, what else would you be?

Participant 1, Theatre department, joked they'd be a carpenter because they like using their hands. However, they did continue with "publishing" as the preferred option.

Participant 2, Language department, was not asked this question.

Participant 3, DSJS department, due to their love for cooking, joked that they would be a vegetarian chef if not a teacher. Then they said they would like to run a campground. They, however, ended their answer by stating that they would get involved with a political party, "given the state of the world," and also because they love organizing. However, they would not get involved electorally, so they said, interestingly. "We need good people. But that won't be me."

Participant 4, English department, answered that they would still be teaching in some capacity. They offered examples of working in Voluntary Services, Caregiving, Working with Physicians, and Chemo patients.

Participant 5, English department, noted that they were unsure of what else they would be if not a teacher. They expressed that they would be in the education field in some measure.

Participant 6, English department, noted that they would be in the fields of communications and training if they were not teachers.

Participant 7, Economics department, referred to their previous answer to serve the same function for this question.

Participant 8, History department, answered that they would be a freelance writer who would be in advertising. They did share their desire to write for popular magazines such as National Geographic.

Participant 9, ACLC department, cited their previous job experience as a freelance writer working with a movie production company. They expressed admiration for the job because it was fieldwork that involved being around people, which they found rewarding.

Participant 10, Philosophy department, explained that they would have been a carpenter or ended up in manual labor if not a teacher, because in the early 1990s, it was hard to get a job even with a PhD. An example they used was of a situation where they applied to over a hundred competitions, and only got shortlisted for interviews in four or five of them.

Participant 11, History department, gave public history (heritage sites, museums) as an industry they would have delved into had they not been a teacher. They also expressed the option of Journalism due to their affinity for writing.

QUESTION 10:

Does the teaching profession, in general, have any transferable skills?

Participant 1, of the Philosophy department, pointed out organizational skills, as well as research skills, and the ability to handle pressure (especially given the timing of the interview) as transferable skills that the teaching profession offers.

Participant 2, of the ACLC department, talks about the ability to not just peak interest, but also foster immersion as a transferable skill of a teacher. They note that a teacher has the ability to bring people's curiosity to the surface, which in turn, fosters contribution in a classroom.

Participant 3, of the Theatre department, mentioned communication, mentorship, interpersonal, independent work, and collaborative skills as those transferable from the teaching profession. They backed up the claim by explaining why the government hires a lot of people with teaching degrees: because of the said problem-solving skills.

Participant 4, of the English department, named Understanding of the profession, humility, determination, creativity, responsiveness, feedback, and reflectivity as the transferable skills from the teaching profession.

Participant 5, of the History department (Larkin), highlights the ability to connect, communicate, and solve problems as the transferable skills of a teacher. They emphasized how the teacher maneuvers a class consisting of ideologically different students as evidence of the already-mentioned skills.

Participant 6, of the English department, highlights communication, the ability to think and write critically, as transferable skills that the profession has.

Participant 7, of the History department, highlights human relations as a transferable skill, in line with social capability, communication, and organizational skills.

Participant 8, of the DSJS department, highlighted how their brother had advised them to be a teacher because they could "do that in all kinds of other, like in the business world, you could be a consultant and teach." They mentioned relationality and communication (especially when dealing with subtext) as the transferable skills of a teacher.

Participant 9, of the English department (Shilton), using the example of the course they teach (Narrative as an Art of Care), highlights the employment of caring as a transferable skill that teaching as a profession has.

Participant 10, of the Economics department, highlighted communication and disciplinary skills as those transferable from the teaching profession. An example they used is that an economics teacher can go on to become an economist elsewhere, so the knowledge itself is a skill.

Participant 11, of the Language department, highlighted knowledge and empathy as transferable skills of the teaching profession. They noted that being less prone to brainwashing and more tolerant are skills that result from being knowledgeable.

QUESTION 11:

When you teach, what do you hope most happens to students?

Participant 1, from the Economics department, hopes that most students show up to class, calling it “depressing” when they do not. They add that what they teach in class “goes well beyond what’s in the book or what’s in the readings.”

Participant 2, from the English department, hopes most for an improvement in students’ ways of thinking from their teaching.

Participant 3, from the History department, hopes most that students become more curious through their teaching, and that they learn more. They hope that students will “think harder rather than just swallowing information.” That “it’ll get them, that curiosity, and they won’t not just blindly consume stuff without asking questions.” And finally, that “ I hope when I teach people that they’re going to, um, come out feeling better about themselves.”

Participant 4, from the History department, hopes most that students stay awake when they teach. That they get most satisfaction “when they can actually take the critical concepts that we’ve learned and use them to think differently about the world,” and “challenge some of the preconceptions that they’ve had.” They point out that a teacher has failed when a student shuts down from seeing “something that’s so complicated.”

Participant 5, from the DSJS department, hopes most for “those moments” when students are “understanding what arguments are” and thinking about their “implications and applications.” They hope most that “people grab ideas and run, that they see their applicability in the world in some way, that they get excited by what seems like, um, an esoteric series of some sort.” They go on to elaborate on the phenomenon of the “shadow class,” which is “ all the people who aren’t in the class, but who are kind of in the class because you all, at the end of the day, go tell your family and friends the things that you did in class today. or what you talked about.”

Participant 6, from the Language department, hopes most “that the student is proud that they came and happy about how they used their time today.” They note that the money spent in university is the student’s money, and hope that after class, students feel that “this is money

well used.”

Participant 7, from the ACLC department, starts by talking about “these really good moments where you get a particular topic opens up into something much larger. And everybody’s present.” They hope for those moments of immersion “where people’s curiosity is taken over, and their investments have come to the surface, and they also feel like they have something to contribute.”

Participant 8, from the Philosophy department, says: “I wish students would participate more,” especially because the student generation today “has been extremely distracted by technology.” They note that philosophy in particular, allows you to “develop creative skills, writing skills, organizational, how to organize your writing, and edit, and things like that.” That philosophy, due to the jargon, demands students “learn to digest things more” and “take more notes, perhaps.” Through the discipline, “You’ll be a clearer writer. Philosophers are very concerned about clarity.” And you will be “able to see reasons from both sides of the area.” That philosophy teaches you “to be more objective in your judgment, but objective in a kind of a much sense, where you’re able to manage your personal biases.” And thus, this is what they hope most happens to students when they teach.

Participant 9, from the English department, referred back to their answer to question 4, where they stated their skills of a teacher, and thus, hoped that students picked up the benefits of having a good teacher who possesses the qualities of: understanding how their profession works, humility, ability to recognize the advantages and the limitations of their methods, reflectivity, creativity, pride, and acknowledgment.

Participant 10, from the English department, hopes most that students are excited, connected, passionate, and want to know more. They talk about “The Awakening” as something that happens within them when they learn how to use the text to grow and ultimately feel better and welcome, because their enthusiasm has found a place in the teacher’s class. Ultimately, they hope that students become more of themselves.

Participant 11, from the Theatre department, hopes most that students get whatever they want/come for from the class they teach. They emphasize that teaching is not really about the teacher, but about the student being the best that they can be.

QUESTION 12:

Would you want students to be defined by the experience of your teaching, or to know well enough the course material you intend to teach?

Participant 1, of the History department, sided with the experience, which they regarded as “the softer things rather than the material.” However, they went on to say that they “hope that that they (students) come out with a better understanding of the material as well. Because I think the materials are important. I don't think it's unimportant. I think it's very important.” They note that they pick their material “carefully,” which is why they hope that students come out with “an expanded and more intelligent understanding of what I've taught them, as well as those other things.”

Participant 2, of the Theatre department, reiterates that it is not so much about the content, but the positive experience of learning. They highlight that “the material is not as important as the experience of it,” because “I change up content all the time.” They add that they “would argue I can get you the same skill set with almost any piece of literature. Or at least set you up with skills that would allow you to analyze any piece of literature.”

Participant 3, of the Language department, notes that “the course material will evolve depending on their (students') evolution.” They note that they are not reliant on total absorption of course material, because even 2 out of 3 readings done is sufficient. They narrate the importance of “flexibility” when it comes to course material because students are not a 100% throughout the whole semester. Thus, their option is the experience of learning.

Participant 4, of the DSJS department, identifies that there is no difference between course material and the experience of their teaching to them. They state that “if I'm gonna get people to care about the state of the world, then I have to care about the state of the world.” And that would “come through in my teaching, which will hopefully end in the readings and the curriculum and everything else is going on in the classroom.” The intention, according to this participant, is that students end up caring about the world as much as them, which can only be done through both the experience of teaching and course material.

Participant 5, of the ACLC department, would rather want students “to be defined by their experiences of each other,” because they are “just one person.” They point out that the work

they do is invincible, and that if “you add up the total years of experience in the room, it’s really students that, like, that have the most to offer.” They round it out by naming a teacher’s talent as being able to get two people to “learn from each other.”

Participant 6, of the Economics department, notes that “it’s not so much the course material as the, um, sort of lessons that you learn from that,” because “a lot of course material is just examples of stuff.” They cite an example of a student who does not attend class but relies on the textbook and argue that it depends on the nature of what is being taught, whether that student can actually say they took something from the class. In essence, they highlight the point that experience is just as important, if not more than, content.

Participant 7, of the Philosophy department, gives an answer that blends the two options. What they say they do is that they “try to be objective when I describe the contents of what, you know, the readings and that, but I almost always make an argument out of it as well, which is not pure descriptive.” With philosophy, through their teaching, it is not a case of one or the other because they give “interpretations” of the content they teach. “One interpretation among possible, many possible ones, and I don’t take it to be authoritative in any overriding way. You need to, if you want to compete with that, you’ve got to read the book and, you know, come up with your own.”

Participant 8, of the English department, chooses the experience over course material, because, “if people have a good experience with you, then they trust that no matter what they are taking from you, that you will be able to give them, not only a positive experience in the classroom, but that they will feel that they have learned something or that the experience of learning, as well as the skills they’ve required, has been worth it.” Notwithstanding, they do highlight the caveat to their preference, which is that “there are sometimes profs who give a positive experience by lowering their standards right down to the floor level, and people go, great, I can keep going with that one.”

Participant 9, of the English department, notes that “Material is the medium” through which they teach. They emphasize that using texts helps students “become more of themselves,” and what they focus on is reaction to texts. In essence, students learn why they react the way they do.

Participant 10, of the History department, emphasized that the ideal preference is a “little bit of

both,” content and experience. While they do want students come away with a positive learning experience, they “firmly believe that what we select for our course material, how we teach it, how we sort of generate those conversations, even if students don’t agree with the content or the politics of it one way or another, matters.” The two options, they say, are “interrelated problems,” which is why “at universities we’re all researchers as well, because we have to remain active in the way that the discourse around our profession is going.” They end by pointing out that they “don’t think one is more important than the other.”

Participant 11, of the English department, does believe that the course material is important, but sides more so with the experience of learning. They use the term “The How” as being more important than “The What”, in terms of being able to “read carefully and meticulously.”

QUESTION 13:

Do you think students leave with something after classes?

Participant 1, of the English department, emphasizes that they hope that students do leave with something after class. They note that the use of the reflective essay at the end of the course is how they gauge whether students did or did not.

Participant 2, of the History department, rather hopes that students do leave with something after class. If not, “I haven’t done my job with them.”

Participant 3, of the Theatre department, “hopes” that students leave with something after class. They hope that “leave with skills that they didn’t have or improve skills that they did have.” They hope that students have a positive learning experience, so they can end up as lifelong learners who embrace curiosity and no longer feel a stigma about learning. They note that “the students who benefit the most are the ones who come here looking for an education,” and so, they should “focus on the process, the product takes care of itself.”

Participant 4, of the Language department, does think that students leave with something after classes.

Participant 5, of the DSJS department, starts by pointing out the fact that students are not always free to study, because they have other commitments such as work or volunteering. They extend a desire that “if education were free and available to everyone, and we had a basic income so that people didn’t have to worry about rent and so forth, then the dedication people could put towards, first of all, they would self-select differently, right? But the dedication they could put towards what they’re doing here, and they wouldn’t be sort of, you know, squished into this, like, impossible schedule, and so forth.” They then note that they see people leave with some excitement, even after two hours of class.

Participant 6, of the ACLC department, noted that the best thing students can leave with is “the desire to continue the work on their own.” They metaphorized the situation as the teacher just icing the cake, whilst the student is the one who bakes it. Furthermore, they lamented on the situations: where children are not exposed to much words at a young age (because it’s been proven that those exposed from an early age excel educationally better than others), and where

colleagues feel like they've stopped learning (because they underestimate how much learning can happen in the years beyond school). In essence, they hope students leave with the passion to never stop learning.

Participant 7, of the English department, does hope that students leave with something after classes. They expressed their hope that they, in particular, would take away the "knowledge of literature" and the "experience" of learning it.

Participant 8, of the Philosophy department, thinks that students do leave with something after classes because, "I see some of them come back as well, thinking they might have missed something is what I always think."

Participant 9, of the English department, thinks students "should" leave with at least a good learning experience because "if they have experience where they feel undervalued or they feel pushed or they feel disrespected or they feel whatever, then it doesn't matter what I talk." However, if students had a positive experience with them, "they were ultimately able to achieve their goals." "And a positive experience doesn't mean that they're happy all the time," they add, but rather "that you believe that the effort you put in was valuable."

Participant 10, of the Economics department, hopes that students leave with "some insight into ways in which, sort of thinking about the world like an economist should think about the world. That might help them actually better understand the world."

Participant 11, of the History department, hopes that students leave with something after class, but is optimistic that they, in fact, do. "I think they do, you know? On like a macro scale, I, honestly, we see that they do because the ways that universities reshape, sort of, you know, society is measurable." They add on that they "know from the stats that students that come through the university experience become better citizens, as it were," which serves as their evidence that students do leave with something.

QUESTION 14:

Do you think it would be better if students had course goals given to them for every course they took?

Participant 1, of the History department, is torn on the matter. They concede that “it’s definitely nice to hear what students expect to get out of a course,” but are weary to the truth behind the saying, “you don’t know what you don’t know.” In essence, they do not want students to define their own course goals because then “we would risk missing content that is actually critical.” They note that it is a dialogue between both parties as teachers provide the “bracket within which to operate,” and only after can students “contribute in some ways to that.”

Participant 2, of the English department, narrates the three types of goals: discipline goals (goals of the course), the educator’s goals, and the student’s goals, and notes that the last of the three matters most.

Participant 3, of the History department, agrees that course goals are a positive for students. They note that “there are general ones and then there’s sometimes more personal ones for individual students,” and often, both overlap.

Participant 4, of the Theatre department, answers in the affirmative that it would be better if course goals are given to students. They, however, highlight the problem with it, which is that “it presupposes that they didn’t know something walking in. Which has not been my experience. Students walk in with varying levels of knowledge and skills. So I don’t know if you can predict an outcome.”

Participant 5, of the Language department, does think that students should have course goals because they are “course related, not so much discipline related.” The course goals, they say, help students to “know what is expected of them,” which is necessary because they are “anxious to perform well.” They rhetorically ask, “If the different aspects of what it means to perform well in a class are not stipulated, then how can you know ever that you perform well or not well? How could you improve?”

Participant 6, of the DSJS department, starts by pointing out that they “resisted the idea of

learning outcomes for a long time because it felt really prescriptive.” They add that they do not want to “dictate what people get out of a class.” They prefer to leave it wide open, that “it’s useful for all of us to articulate some broad ideas about what we want to learn by the end of this semester.” Nonetheless, they do point out that most people “don’t know how to write them, probably including me, and they just become cliché.”

Participant 7, of the ACLC department, finds that course goals are effective for “a particular kind of training.” They cite the example of driving a car, and add that learning objectives give students “something to look toward.” Nonetheless, they add that the problem with learning objectives is that “we hold them in common. And most students really should be thinking about what their own goals are.” In essence, they call for personalized goals from the point of students.

Participant 8, of the English department, was not provided with this question.

Participant 9, of the Philosophy department, notes that they do not put course goals on their outline. They are in opposition to them because using course goals is “a kind of pedagogy I don’t like.” That the course goals should be fairly obvious from the syllabus, and that they do not give students “explicit goals,” because “philosophy is a little bit more nebulous than that.”

Participant 10, of the English department, thinks that everyone has course goals.

Participant 11, of the Economics department, notes that they are “not horribly explicit with, of course, goals. I just sort of say this is what we’re going to study.” They note that such a way as theirs makes goals “a little bit more obvious.”

QUESTION 15:

What about course goals? If students had course goals, do you think it would take away the experience of learning?

Participant 1, of the Economics department, thinks not so, that it “depends on how you present them, basically.” They say that “if you present them, it’s just, you know, a few boxes that they have to tick off. Yeah, then you might get them targeted in that kind of way.” But “if you put it in terms of, okay, we’re going to study the economics of beer, but, you know, the actual goal is to get you some understanding of these sort of areas of economics and how you can apply those to a real world situation.” They note that “the point is not necessarily just to come out of it with a whole lot of knowledge about beer. But with some knowledge about how you can apply economics to a variety of things that might apply to any particular industry.”

Participant 2, of the History department, does not think that course goals can take away from the experience of learning. Rather, they think that course goals “would probably actually generate more buy into the course, right? Especially if there was something that the instructor engaged with.” However, they note that they (course goals) can be hard to implement, “depending on the content.”

Participant 3, of the English department, agrees that course goals can take away from the experience, and notes that the real text happens through class dialogue. They emphasize that “the experience cannot be replaced,” and that ultimately, what is important is “being there, participating and engaging.” They call it a process and a “coalition.”

Participant 4, of the History department, does not see a separation between course goals and the everyday learning. “The course goals, I would say, involve everyday learning. I wouldn’t separate those out; I would say that the course goals are about building, adding to the everyday learning. I wouldn’t separate those things out. I wouldn’t say that they’re different.”

Participant 5, of the Theatre department, notes that they do have a problem with course goals when they are too specific. “But when people talk about those specific outcomes. I always have a, I always struggle with that because I find it narrow as things when I want to be opening things.” They point out that they are rather “focused on the human potential of the students and what do they got to bring? What are they going to add to the world around them?” And

disagrees that that can be quantified.

Participant 6, of the Language department, does not believe that course goals would take away from the experience of the learning. They are “persuaded that with a goal, you will focus more on your learning,” because, “You will know what is intended to be learned.” They give an example of how a course based on history would not have an objective to know the precise dates of events, but “whatever that we learn is in having a good sense of the different movements throughout the centuries as they relate to the arts and culture of Quebec.” In summary, they say that “having precise objectives will enhance the learning rather than make it not as..” but do highlight that sometimes “objectives are really badly written, and is more confusing to students.”

Participant 7, of the DSJS department, notes that if course goals become “prescriptive,” then they can take away from the experience of learning. They note that a main reason why people set course goals is because “you want to ensure that your assessments match up with your goals.” They yield that, in some broad way, it is useful. However, “they can feel prescriptive sometimes. People can leave with completely different stuff than what I thought they would leave with, in good and bad ways. I can't; teaching is not about control. And I don't want to test compliance, right?”

Participant 8, of the ACLC department, is affirmative that course goals can do so, because “you end up in a transactional situation, right?” They highlight the phenomenon of “lingering,” which happens in Arts classes as a result of an investment in the discussion topic. They note that lingering can be “a sign to me that this person is going to have success.” The phenomenon is used as evidence (a naturally occurring event) of what can happen when course goals are not a priority.

Participant 9, of the English department, does believe that course goals can take away from the experience of learning. Especially when they are “Nebulous.”

Participant 10, of the Philosophy department, thinks that if course goals are “overstated” or “too specific,” then they can take away from the experience of learning. They note that they've always had “suspicion is a better word of people that express their goals too concretely. in philosophy, courses at least.” They themselves are rather explicit on “course requirements” and “criteria for marking.”

Participant 11, of the English department, does not believe course goals would take away from the experience of learning because “I think everybody’s got a goal when they go into a course.” They note that every course has goals specific to them, and that “how people understand their course goals is gonna have huge amounts of variations.” And that “the more aware you are of it, the more conscious you are of it, the better you are, the more likely you are to adjust those course goals as you go along. Either to reinforce them or to change them.”

QUESTION 16:

With course goals, do you think they would or should be directly beneficial to the student in terms of life after graduation, specifically?

Participant 1, of the English department, believes that “the idea that all of your knowledge should be immediately utilitarian is misguided.... Mostly because you are assuming you know the value... And it means that you are limiting your ability, your capacity, to essentially continue to learn, or to redeploy or reapply the stuff that you’ve learned.” The example they use is the course of Crime and Detective Fiction, saying that “do people need to know about crime and detective fiction in order to go and work in law office, or to work in, I don't know, to go running a company? No, they don't. But what they, what I think is useful is to see the ways in which crime has been understood and responded to over a long period of time. That makes you a better citizen. And that's always gonna be the case. And I think it makes you better, citizen, if it makes you more likely to hold off on your immediate responses to crime.”

Participant 2, of the Economics department, acknowledges that “it’s hard to say,” and that “it depends what the benefit of a course is.” They used the example of a course on Excel, and spoke about how that course might have directly beneficial goals, whereas a course on Elizabethan literature might not have such obvious goals. However, they say that courses such as the latter “better allows you to understand civilization, where thinking has come from, and so on. I mean, there’s a benefit. You know, anything you learn is potentially going to be a benefit.” They summarize by noting that with the economics of beer course, “it's not so much the specific information about beer and the beer industry. It's the way that you can explain what's happened or what's happening in the beer industry by using some economic concepts. And again, you know, you may never have any employment in the beer industry after you graduate, but that doesn't mean that you can't apply that to some other science thing.” Which is to say that with course goals in economics, they are not so directly beneficial in life after school.

Participant 3, of the History department, does not necessarily think that they should be directly beneficial in that manner. They say that having the ability to “conduct independent research when you see something that you find suspicious on the internet, that's a skill that you can take forward,” and go on to mention other skills as well. Their point is that the course

content “is really a vessel for engaging with more abstract, more abstract skills, more abstract goals.”

Participant 4, of the English department, narrates that they do not know if course goals should be so. They “think in terms of the outcome of the experience,” that students “carry that naturally,” when speaking of the skills they pick up from courses. They note that the skills acquired from Rhetorical studies are evident in everyday life, which is why they are not sure if course goals should directly be beneficial in terms of life after graduation.

(Subject matter relies vastly on what/the kind of things the arts professors are teaching)

Participant 5, of the History department, began their answer with “absolutely.” Nonetheless, they note that “it’s too big to imagine that every single course is going to hit every student in a way that’s like life-changing. You know, it’s too much to expect.” They prefer to think of courses as “building components,” in the sense that “if you are taking a history degree, each of the history courses should be giving you a set of things that can be built upon over the course of your fourteen courses in the history degree.”

Participant 6, of the Theatre department, thinks that course goals should be beneficial to life after graduation for the student. They emphasize that that is the point why students are in school in the first place. “If we’re not giving you something that will help you when you’re not here, then we failed.” This, they say, is why they rely less on content, “because that stuff is cheap and easy to come by.” To wrap up their answer, they note that they are “making people, we’re making citizens, however you want to define what we do. That’s our job. That is so much our job.”

Participant 7, of the Language department, does think that course goals should be directly beneficial to life after graduation for the student. They note that they devise course goals as such because teaching is a life journey where students give their time and must get something back. What they get is to “learn how to be a learner,” how to be “critical,” “empathetic,” and how to be “knowledgeable.” They note that their course goals are aimed at making the student a better person after the class.

Participant 8, of the DSJS department, does not believe so, because “it feels like I’m trying to control learning.” They exemplify with a situation where they have four goals for a 12-week

course, and add that “that just feels kind of like this lovely myth we tell ourselves that they will learn all this in 4 weeks.” They note that “everything we do is useful,” and “I don’t know that we can control that in every class.”

Participant 9, of the ACLC department, acknowledges that course goals should be directly beneficial “to the extent that they lend structure through work life.” They used the example of a job interview they had fresh out of college, where they were asked the trick question: “Where do you see yourself in three years’ time?” They answered with an “I don’t know,” and lost out on the job, and thus noted that “in our project-oriented society, task-oriented, you need to acknowledge the need for goals,” before pointing out that some people do forget to set “care goals” like “Today, I will invest today. I will sit, and I will look at the world, and I will experience a few moments of this.”

Participant 10, of the English department, thinks that course goals should be beneficial to life after graduation.

Participant 11, of the Philosophy department, notes that they still think of the Arts as “exploratory as opposed to job training.” They add that “people could take some of the content that we give them in philosophy classes in ethics and political stuff and bring them into whatever, another job. But it wouldn’t be as direct as I think is your question implied.” Their main point is that “I don’t believe arts, liberal arts education should be closely tailored to job activities,” because the liberal arts historically, “would really give you the basic skills that would then qualify you to go on to become a medical doctor or a minister or these other things.”

QUESTION 17:

Does a first or second year course have as much influence on a student as the fourth or third year courses?

Participant 1, of the Philosophy department, starts by explaining why they no longer do seminar classes for third and fourth year courses even if they should be: “ I didn't have good experience in terms of the students weren't doing enough work for my liking, at least. And I thought that I could do more. There's a lot of skill involved in class presentation, and professors that have been doing it for a lot of years can do it the right way if they've put the effort in and the time. And students to learn on the job, you get mixed results; some do very well. Some not so well.”

Participant 2, of the English department, does think that a first and second year course has more influence on a student than a third or fourth year course.

Participant 3, of the Economics department, acknowledges that it is “hard to say” on the matter. They note that first and second year courses have a type of “path dependency” influence on the student in the sense that they enable students to develop a passion for the field. They recall their own experiences as a student when they took five first-year courses and ended up doing economics as the final option. The opposite of path dependency influence, intellectual stimulation influence, is what they got from economics only in grad school.

Participant 4, of the History department, says a first-year course is “really valuable for generating buy-in interest, getting students passionate about a topic. Second-year courses, they're kind of a building block, a foundation, where they provide a fluency in the content that you need to take forward. And then 3rd and 4th year courses tend to be where you can take that content, and you can really sort of drill into it and get a much deeper understanding of both it, but what it sort of means within the wider sort of world of ideas.” They note the impossibility of taking third and fourth year courses without the prerequisite knowledge gained from first and second year courses, and add on top that students ultimately attain different things from these courses, especially in the History program. Finally, they agree to the statement that first and second year courses are more like “building blocks” but affirm that no one learns “things that are useless to them.”

Participant 5, of the English department, affirms that a first or second year course can have that much influence.

Participant 6, of the History department, notes that “sometimes” a first or second year course can have as much influence as a third or fourth year course. They note that both pairs of courses “should be designed differently. The expectation should be different. And what students get out of them should be different.” They add that their most important courses are their first year ones, like Canadian History Survey, because “It helps students to become university students and history majors. And so if you take that course, you’re going to learn a lot about how to be a student, how to be a good student.” Furthermore, they note that such courses are designed to “peak interest, but also teach some skills. Encourage students to feel like they should and should want to engage in verbal participation.”

Participant 7, of the Theatre department, notes that there is a difference between the pair. They say that first year courses “encourages student,” when “they don’t really know what university is. or what they want or may they may not even know why they’re here.” However, with third and fourth year courses, “it’s different, because you probably have a somewhat established relationship over the preceding years. We’re such a small school.” They emphasize that students want different things from them with regard to the difference in class levels. And finally, they note that while it is great when a first-year student enters the university with a clear idea of what they want to major in, it has a downside, which is that “you’re shutting yourself off from potential. Finding the thing that really turns your crack. That reduces that exploration type. I find maybe I open students’ eyes to something that hadn’t thought about it. which is good. Fourth-year students, it’s about supporting them for the transition away from being a student.”

Participant 8, of the Language department, answers, “yes,” because with first and second year courses, students “can decide if they’re gonna continue with us or not.” They note that first-year students “are very naive,” and teachers have to “help them decipher, and so many drop university because of bad experience in first year.” They ultimately think that first-year courses are the most important because teachers “really have to captivate the students and show them that all the money they’re gonna spend on the university is not wasted.” To add, they note that, depending on the instructor, students can often remember their earlier teachers

more than their later ones.

Participant 9, of the DSJS department, starts by noting that the influences are of different kinds. The first pair (first and second year courses), they say, are done to “captivate them with like ideas and so forth,” while the second pair (third and fourth year courses), “you’re probably getting a little more focused. You expect certain kinds of knowledge or abilities in a classroom.”

Participant 10, of the ACLC notes that both pairs do different work. They say that a first-year course is about “orienting students towards the goals or the standards of university,” while a second-year course “is about continuing that process, and it’s often, in my mind, skill development. “ A third and fourth year course, they say, “is really up to the student to make decisions on what they want those years to look like,” citing the word “enrichment” to describe them.

Participant 11, of the English department, does believe that first and second year courses can have as much influence as third and fourth year courses. The major influence in question, they highlight, is “Humility.”

QUESTION 18:

A list of courses they teach is given to them: Please pick one of the courses you teach. What would you say students leave with most from this field?

Participant 1, of the English department, chose the Intro to Shakespeare course (ENG-2550) and highlighted that it gives students a “familiarity with great texts.”

Participant 2, of the Philosophy department, chose the Animal Ethics course, which is a prerequisite for the veterinary program, and the course introduces students to “all kinds of arguments about animal rights, arguments about, you know, Vegan diet, arguments about animal consciousness, animal minds. What’s the best, what principles are most relevant? And, you know, the meat industry and basically human behavior in regards to animals.” In essence, students get an understanding of “of the issues associated with those ideologies (vegetarianism, meat activism, etc.).”

Participant 3, of the English department, chose the two Linguistic courses, ENG 2550 and 2560, and said that students leave with “an intelligent and brand new appreciation for language.”

Participant 4, of the Economics department, first chose the Introduction to Micro Studies course, and emphasized that students come out with “some appreciation of the way that...sort of more micro side of the economy works. And how we model that. And what some of the limitations of that are. And what some of the issues are. But mostly, you know, those kinds of concepts, opportunity costs. decision making at the margin, specialization, gain to exchange, stuff like that.” With Macro studies, students get “how the economy as a whole works,” “a bit of understanding of what kind of problems can arise,” “ways that the government can try to ameliorate... a bit of policy stuff.” With the Methodology course, they note that students get the ability “to sort of do economics, how to research things, how to think through, topics or problems or issues. How to present things. How to communicate stuff. A good bit of how to assess or appreciate or not appreciate stuff that gets presented to you. I think that’s as much something I try to do in that course is sort of prepare students for dealing with, um, some of the bullshit that they’re going to get thrown at them.”

Participant 5, of the History department, chose American Immigration (History 3950), a

course in which they study migrant experience in the United States to “try to explore it from all sides and sort of what the groups involved were experiencing, what this can tell us about the development of US immigration law experiences, culture, what have you.” What students gain from the course is an understanding of how immigration becomes a container for a whole range of societal problems, is a scapegoat for problems around housing, employment, equity, around income, around access to healthcare. In essence, students learn how immigration has been villainized. Added to that, students gain a “critical ability to unpack what the actual issues are that are being masked under rhetoric.”

Participant 6, of the English department, did not receive this question due to a lack of time.

Participant 7, of the History department, chose the History 1010 course (Canadian Studies), which, as they say, is “setting them up for a good experience. And I’m trying to I’m trying to help them to understand how to be a good university student.”

Participant 8, of the Theatre department, chose the Theatre Practicum course (TST-4440-01) and highlighted that the grade of the course is secondary because the course is about “getting something out of the experience that you can take away. That’s how we design the practice.” They note that students can take away an array of experiences, like the business side of theatre or marketing, depending on which area they choose. A second course they chose was the Intro Course, which grants students writing skills, because they write reflection papers at the end of the course, just to name one.

Participant 9, of the Language department, did not receive this question.

Participant 10, of the DSJS department, chose Food and Cultural Studies, adding that students get an understanding of “what you eat, how you eat, when you eat, what you eat at, what times of the day you eat, how you prepare food, where food comes from, the politics of food production.” They point out the early experiment they do in the class where students name their favorite food, and most times, it’s food attached to women (that mothers, grandmothers, etc) make.

Participant 11, of the ACLC department, first points out the Creative Writing course and opes that students “have a greater appreciation for the power of community to advance their creative lives,” because throughout high school, “it’s highly individualistic.” The second course they

pointed out was the Practical Course of the ACLC department, which they are “proud of because it does two things. It gives students the opportunity to build a professional network and to gain a sense of what different workplace cultures are like.”

QUESTION 19:

How might that thing taught or learned be identifiable as a skill?

Participant 1, of the English department, names the skills as Critical reading, the ability to question beliefs, humility, and better Understanding abilities.

Participant 2, of the Philosophy department, names the skills as: the ability to penetrate ideology, to penetrate ideological distortions, to think more clearly, to be more reasonable, and to speak more vaguely. In Philosophy, it gives you the ability to “understand the options, you understand whatever you want to call it, the background. And that clarity comes from work, not because you’re a brilliant thinker. It comes from having considered the relevant arguments and digested them, I guess, as a processor.”

Participant 3, of the English department, whilst they did not name a skill got from their chosen course, did identify that it will be “harder to be a racist if you are a linguist.”

Participant 4, of the Economics department, named the skills acquired as: Critical thinking, Judgment skills, and Economic analysis skills.

Participant 5, of the History department, identifies those skills as those of Media Literacy and Empathy, with the former being really important because “we encounter so much crap online at this stage that being able to sort of wade through it and determine what actually has value, what needs to be engaged with, what's just trying to play at your emotions, I think this is a critical skill in whatever field you want to be in because it sort of it helps sort of shield you, it provides you armour against I guess a whole range of misinformation.”

Participant 6, of the English department, did not receive this question due to a lack of time.

Participant 7, of the History department, named the skills gained as the ability to synthesize information and that of communication.

Participant 8, of the Theatre department, names the skills as Problem-Solving, Collaboration, Communication, Analysis, Public speaking, Independent-working, Empathy, Emotional, and Intelligence, all of which they call “human skills.”

Participant 9, of the Language department, did not receive this question.

Participant 10, of the DSJS department, named the skills gained as: the ability to not take things for granted, and to ask good and complex questions. In essence, Critical thinking.

Participant 11, of the ACLC department, names one of the skills the Practical course gives you as “the ability to interpret art is fundamentally a comfort level with ambiguity.” A second is the “ability to inhabit different perspectives.” With the creative writing course, they say students gain “practice, commenting on work that people are passionately invested in. Yeah. And then also converse the preceding feedback on work that you’re passionately invested in.”

QUESTION 20:

Do you see the application of the skills/lessons acquired in the Humanities in persons participating in occupations outside the educational institutions? What occupations are those?

Participant 1, of the ACLC department, notes that everybody has to develop some version of the skills they teach. They recalled their chat with an emergency room physician, where the physician expressed a demand for “leadership, communication, culture. That’s exactly what we need in the healthcare system.”

Participant 2, of the English department, notes that he does see the application of these skills in other industries. They note that many professions require people to “read carefully” and “think critically.”

Participant 3, of the Philosophy department, was not asked this question due to a lack of time.

Participant 4, from the English department, noted that Linguists are employed in Forensic Linguistics, Speech-Language Pathology, Voice Projection, Translation, and as aids to open-brain surgery because “language maps the brain.”

Participant 5, of the Economics department, did not receive this question, because an answer to this can be found in their earlier answers.

Participant 6, of the History department, answers this question with an “Absolutely,” because, as they further say, “whatever field you go into after this, you still have to engage with, you know, the world as it is. And typically you have to do research, you have to keep yourself abreast of the topics within your field, the things you’re interested in, whether you’re a journalist or a nurse practitioner, it doesn’t really matter.” An example they add is that of their partner, who is “an anthropologist by training,” but is now in “corporate leadership. She uses her anthropology skills every day as a way of building connections within her team.”

Participant 7, of the English department, did not receive this question due to a lack of time.

Participant 8, of the History department, notes that the skills they teach is “useful for almost anything you would do.”

Participant 9, of the Theatre department, begins their answer with “Find me a job where you get to work by yourself all the time.”

Participant 10, of the Language department, notes that the skills taught by them are necessary for everyone in today’s world, especially due to A.I. They note that because what they teach is mostly literature and visual studies, skills like empathy, critical thinking, such skills are necessary, especially when relating to the political sphere of life.

Participant 11, of the DSJS department, notes that we actually see a lack of the skills in Politics, a field where we should be seeing them. In particular, the skill of Self-reflection, they point out, was lacking.

QUESTION 21:

“If you once took the same course or that of its manner, are the lessons learned then, and thus the skills acquired then, still the same today as they were then?”

Participant 1, of the DSJS department, makes their point through a story. They recall their undergrad time at Concordia, Montreal, where they took the English program, and read texts written by “almost exclusively white European men, “ and that “I never noticed. And nobody mentioned it. Because it wasn't part of our kind of popular discourse.” They emphasize that “there's no way that I could give that syllabus to any of the students, maybe in many courses, certainly in DSJs, courses. They would notice immediately. Right? Because they've learned the lenses through which they see the world are different than the lenses that through which I was seeing the world 40 years ago.”

Participant 2, of the ACLC department, agrees that the skills acquired are the same as yesterday because “they're fundamentally what we would categorize as soft skills. Soft skills tend to be a little bit more, I would say, I don't want to say they're unchanging. Um, but there's a timelessness to them.” They wish that courses like those they teach were available to them in their time, “because there were a lot of things. that I think I knew intuitively, but would have benefited from having the opportunity to articulate.”

Participant 3, of the English department, notes that these things have “definitely changed,” and in fact, the lessons are more personal now than before.

Participant 4, of the Philosophy department, noted that they created the Animal Ethics course and never took it whilst a student.

Participant 5, of the English department, thinks that the epistemological knowledge of what they teach has not changed, but the way it is taught has.

Participant 6, of the Economics department, notes that a lot of the teachings of economics have stayed the same over time. They note that the core of Economics was built in the late 1800s.

What has changed, they say, is “the way we model things... I think we'd become more mathematical. The macro guys keep changing their minds about how the economy works, but yeah, I'm not a macro bass.” They emphasize that “economics used to be, you know, until

maybe the 70s anyways, used to be very sort of rigid. Like, you got your basic theory stuff and kind of metrics. And then you've got like, I don't know, 8 or 10 sort of standard fields." Meaning that over the last fifty years, economics has diversified into "a wide variety of stuff."

Participant 7, of the History department, notes that the skills and lessons are not the same. They note that they came up in a world "where the grading scheme was much more focused around fact-based learning, like how much you could memorize and how much you could regurgitate." However, "the internet's changed things, right?" Today, they say, "I don't need my students to memorize all of American history anymore because they can find competent resources online to support that learning. What I now ask more of them is the ability to actually disentangle truth from these resources." Because now, "we're kind of actually working with too much information, and the skills have shifted to *how do we manage that?*"

Participant 8, of the English department, was not asked this question due to a lack of time.

Participant 9, of the History department, answers the question with a "not necessarily" and goes on to state that the process of learning history has changed. It is no longer "memorization," but comprehension and "understanding how history works" because the latter "is much more important than memorizing pieces of information." They justify this claim by adding that "you can't understand the world that we inhabit right now, who don't know where we came from. And I think that studying history makes people more open-minded, more intelligent in general."

Participant 10, of the Theatre department, notes that they did not have the opportunity to take courses as students, such as the ones they teach. They note that the ones they took were very "lecture-based." They note that they did take a public speaking course, and that "would be the same." They theorize that "Even theatre skills to a certain point would be the same. I think what's different in theatres is the way we approach it. The way we teach it." Furthermore, they say, "I would hope they are, but they might be better. We may not have abused as many people." Following that, they give an example of a situation where a student failed at something and was expected to get yelled at. The participant's response in that moment was, "I don't yell at students. You're here to learn. Make mistakes as part of learning. And as you've heard me say, I'm, you know, did you die? No, we can fix it. So, since you're still, like, as long as no one died, we're okay. Everything's fixable unless you're dead. You know, make your mistake, it's okay."

Participant 11, of the Language department, notes that they were taught very differently during their days as a student. They quoted their first learning experience, which occurred during the COVID period, where they were forced to teach through online methods only. They add on that as of now, they are not “training the same way nor the same things. I think our dilemma right now is to encourage people to wanting to learn.” They justify that statement by adding that AI “give the impression to people that they don’t need to learn anymore because the AI can really do the work. But people forget that their brain is the most efficient muscle in their body and that if they’re going to want to be really good at sports, for instance, they need to train their body. If they want to be any good at thinking, they need to train their brains.” They are looking into “how to cultivate a desire for the hard exercise we’re asking our brains to do.”

QUESTION 22:

“Do you think the skills acquired in the Humanities are looked down upon in general?
–If they are, why do you think that is? – Were they looked down upon in your days as a student as well?”

Participant 1, of the Language department, begins her answer with an “of course.” They add further, “it’s the hardest that you’re doing in the humanities. It’s the one that will imperil your identity.” That the arts, “teaches you flexibility, teaches you, how to, you know like, transfer skills from one discipline to another. It teaches you how to do the hard thing of thinking.” They further express an outrage on the fact that people look down on the arts, simply because “we don’t have enough money,” and because “we cannot teach properly what we have to teach to a one thousand people covered, because as I said, we are giving you as an individual, not as a class... according to the university, we don’t generate enough money.” The participant says that in their days as a student, the sentiment was still there as people constantly questioned the point and elevatory ability of researching in the arts. Nonetheless, they still affirm that the attitude was better yesterday than it is today.

Participant 2, of the DSJS department, begins their answer with a story. A man getting their room redone spoke about the interest of his daughter, and said that she would only pursue that interest after she had learned a trade job. The participant narrates that those in the arts, “We’re terrible at articulating what we do,” before going on to agree that “they are looked down upon by some people, definitely. Until they need them.” When answering whether those skills were looked down on in their days, the participant says, “It felt like universities weren’t as tight for money as they are now, and certainly colleges are even worse off, but they weren’t as, as, so that the, when people think about cutbacks now, they think automatically of arts, right? That’s one of the 1st places where the cuts happened.”

Participant 3, of the ACLC department, starts their answer by saying that “we often underestimate the value of other professions and other course paths.” They note that “anything that’s threatening is gonna be scrutinized. And we live in an instrumentalist world where things are typically valued for what their financial worth is. And so when you talk about citizenship, and you talk about empathy, these are things that complicate and complicate what people want to be like, easily remedied situations.” In essence, the teachings of the arts are “not always welcome in the conversation. So I think that sometimes people underestimate the value of the humanities background.” Those in the arts, they end their answer with, “we’re quick to embrace, I think this again goes to a comfort level of ambiguity, but we’re quick to embrace, like the multitude of different identities that people can possess. And that can be really unnerving for people, especially if they’ve always known, if they’ve always lived their life

between really narrow borders.”

Participant 4, of the English department, agrees that the skills of the arts are looked down upon because “of much emphasis on training for jobs.” They note that people do not understand the relationship between writing, speaking, and thinking. In their days as a student, they note that the arts were also looked down upon “to an extent.” However, there was still “a greater understanding of the importance then.”

Participant 5, of the Philosophy department, did not receive this question due to a lack of time.

Participant 6, of the English department, has a “yes” and a “no” answer to this question. They note that in practice, everyone values the skills taught in the arts. However, “they are looked down socially, and culturally” because of the acquisition of power and resources, the treatment of life as having no accountability beyond “this world”, and the idea of life as a zero-sum game.

Participant 7, of the Economics department, notes that there is a bit of “extra disparaging” when it comes to economics because “of not really understanding economics. That would come largely from the people that take a very superficial understanding of economics and assume that we’re, um, you know, completely pro-worshipping at the altar of private markets. So and so forth, which is just not the case.” They note that most economic models “have pretty good predictive abilities. Yeah, you know, so we’re sort of simplifying things.” However, they confess that “we don’t have a great track record in terms of predicting stuff. But, you know, that’s largely because there’s so many things that can run you off the rails, and you’re sort of predicting what’s going to happen in the world.” An example they give is that “most economists will have completely missed what the macroeconomic results for 2026 are going to be. Why? Because they didn’t predict that Trump was going to be a complete idiot and run the world off the rails.”

Participant 8, of the History department, begins their answer by noting that “for people who argue that we are sort of like teaching you all how to, you know, how to write, how to communicate, how to sell yourselves, we’re pretty notoriously bad at standing up for our own profession.” They emphasize that “I think that has an impact upon us. I mean, we really suck in communicating to the public why what we do matters.” The onus, according to him, is not on society, but on the artists themselves. Nonetheless, they note that “The face of our field is changing, for instance. All of the people that I did my PhD with are now going on. They’re not

professors, but they're, um, they're activists, they're public historians. They're in the media. They're publishing widely in like popular outlets. They're getting much better at reaching a public." This change is, however, "not helped by the fact that the entire subset of generations before me, they just wanted to publish in academic journals. They just wanted to talk to each other," the participant adds.

Participant 9, of the English department, was not asked this question due to a lack of time.

Participant 10, of the History department, notes that only unintelligent people sometimes do look down on the skills acquired in the arts. They add that "one of the questions that people often will say is like, what job can you get with a history degree? My response, and I've already indicated that to you, is like the skills you learn from doing history are transferable, applicable in just about every area of life." They point out that the former "it's an ignorant question in a way."

Participant 11, of the Theatre department, argues that the skills of the Arts are not looked down upon, at least "Not anymore." They think that "the wheel is turned, and everyone recognizes that what they used to call soft skills are really hard to develop. And they see the value in it." This turn, they say, is "because of the AI and the technology and... what are the things that isn't, what are the things that are not getting done? Because people don't have people skills, right?" An example they give is that "Computer programmers can't sell their own programs, so they hire English majors to sell the program for them. They can't tell stories, so they have, right? I want to build a computer, a video game. They hire English majors to create the story." Adding to their answer, they note that the skills of the arts were looked down upon because "they're often pejoratively referred to as soft skills, not hard skills like math. And it's because they're hard to quantify," and also because of Sexism. Women typically are really good at some of these skills. And because men don't feel threat, or they might feel threatened, they might have looked down on these skills because they were seen as women's skills or feminine skills."

QUESTION 23:

"Do you think the skills of a Humanities student can be gathered by experience, as they are perhaps taught in the classroom? That is, can one learn humanities skills without ever setting foot in a classroom, do you think?"

Participant 1, of the Theatre department, began their answer with an “Obviously,” before adding that “I’m a big proponent of experiential learning. You learn by doing. Writing is learning by doing. Right? Once you learn the rules of rhetoric and you apply them to your writing, your writing gets better.” However, their answer changes with “I think there’s certain things we do that you can’t just get, like having a job and doing stuff. Like, I think you need both. And it’s the balance. Yeah, right? Shape the body, shape the mind. And one shapes the other sometimes. I think it’s a balance.” Thus, whilst they think experiential learning can get you those skills, it is the balance of both that completes the education.

Participant 2, of the Language department, affirms that the skills can be gathered by experience, although they say that they “wouldn’t restrict my teaching to taught in a classroom because in my classroom, I allocate time for students to learn experientially, I guess, with their peers.” They state that they inculcate work on exercises, reflection, lecture, debate, research, or writing in their classes to keep the class going.

Participant 3, of the DSJS department, notes that “it is possible.” They emphasize that “there are lots of knowledge in the world and ways of knowing that are not reflected in this particular post-secondary space. which is not to say that there isn’t a lot that this space can contribute to that. But is it the only way? Of course not.” They add, “I think our life experiences can bring us to all kinds of knowledge. Of course. Um, I think one of the things we do here is we can, um, give language and lenses through which to understand some experiences.”

Participant 4, of the ACLC department, begins their answer with an “Absolutely!” Furthermore, they say “we sometimes use this word practical, which is a misnomer for what we’re trying to do. It’s not practical. It’s a type of phenomenology.” What they do in the arts, they say, is “throw your students into something, they encounter a problem that’s interesting. They theorize it, and then they find a solution. So you still get the concepts. You still get all the intellectual energy. It’s just, you just reverse the process a little bit. And so, yeah, absolutely, experience is pretty key.”

Participant 5, of the English department, agrees so. They note that someone interested and curious can learn these skills by experience alone.

Participant 6, of the Philosophy department, did not receive this question due to a lack of time.

Participant 7, of the English department, does think that the skills of the arts can be gathered by experience, because they are “cultural.”

Participant 8, of the Economics department, admits that some, but not all, skills of an economist can be gained from experience alone. They note that it took a lot of clever people for economics to get to where it is today, because “the way economists think and the way they sort of have to think to be an economist. is a little twisted.” “If you’re not looking at the world that way,” they add, “you’re never going to get it.” Finally, they say that “if you really grasp something that sort of core economics from experience, it’s gonna be because that was a particularly enlightening experience and you’re having like some kind of eureka moment. But that very seldom happens.”

Participant 9, of the History department, notes that the possibility depends “on your ability as an individual.” They say that they “provide a space within which everyone can come and sort of, you know, gain a supportive experience working through these ideas. There is really a value to having, you know, experts in the field. about the things that you’re trying to learn about.” However, “if you are a self-starter, if you’re capable of doing the reading on your own, if you’re willing to ask those questions as an individual, like there’s no reason you can’t develop these skills. There’s plenty of good writers that didn’t go to school, you know.” Nonetheless, their sentiment remains with education. “I think that’s not the common pathway. I think most people do need a bit of support in their learning. They need feedback. I mean, we all thrive through critique. And universities provide that service in so many ways.”

Participant 10, of the English department, was not asked this question due to a lack of time.

Participant 11, of the History department, firmly believes that “the stuff that we teach in university context, in the humanities, is the result of so much reading and thinking and work, you know, like it’s not stuff that people can get just by living.”

QUESTION 24:

“Do you think there is an empirical data acquired from experiencing the Humanities and its content that cannot be replaced when taught?” * After the very first interview, this question was revised to...

~~Participant 1, of the History department, was not asked this question due to a lack of time.~~

Participant 2, of the History department, was not asked this question due to a lack of time.

Participant 3, of the Theatre department, thinks that the experience “can’t be replaced. Because it’s making meaning, as I said earlier. It’s creating understanding. AI can’t really do that.” They add further that “people understand people. And how do we learn? The study of history is more than knowing a bunch of dates. It’s understanding why things happened in the past. With the idea of maybe we don’t want them to happen in the future. How do we learn about people? Well, they leave literature behind. They leave something they wrote or created behind. Right?” They lament that “No one is sitting around reading economic statements from Sophocles. What did he write? He wrote plays. To talk about ideas. Ideas we’re still fascinated with 2500 years later.” Their answer ends with “We remember the people who wrote. We remembered the leaders for their successes and failures. Right? It’s philosophy, literature, Languages, if you want to learn ancient Greek. All here in the arts faculty, right? So what we offer is it’s never going away. That’s my belief. I might be wrong.”

Participant 4, of the English department, notes that there is an experience that cannot be replaced. They highlight *episteme* and *techné* to highlight that there is a difference in knowing something and in experiencing it.

Participant 5, of the Economics department, was not asked this question due to a lack of time.

Participant 6, of the ACLC department, answers this question with a story: “A few years ago, I got asked to, like, we were off from reviewing Shirk applications, like, cooking a research project, and there’s a group that made at McGeil. And what people are doing is they’re wearing these, um, the sensory apparatus on their faces, and they give them a dozen poems to read, and then they measure their physiological responses to the act of reading poetry. And, um, what’s really cool about that is that it does provide some empirical evidence that is a transformative effect of reading on a person. And then to go even more narrowly to the actor reading poetry. It has an effect on you. Yeah. I think we all think those studies are really cool.”

Participant 7, of the English department, agrees that there is an empirical data acquired that cannot be replaced. They note that experiencing the arts is “a different way of looking at things,” such as “the habits of the mind.”

Participant 8, of the Language department, notes that the empirical data can be omitted by

some, which would cause them to miss the point of the arts; however, “the fault is not theirs,” they say. “If the objectives are not clear,” is a stipulation they cite as a reason why some can omit experiencing the arts. They subsequently add that, “it’s not really a matter of necessity. Like, should you learn? I’m not a judge. I’m not supposed to tell you what you should learn,” which highlights their thought that though the experience can be skipped, it is not necessarily a matter of grave importance.

Participant 9, of the DSJS department, notes that “all experiences are specific to their moment.” They highlight that “every time, no matter how often I teach the same course, it goes in completely different directions because the experiences about the people in the room and the relationship amongst the people in the room, and therefore what they bring to the same freaking text...” is different. They give an example of a fourth year course they teach, saying that “And 2 years ago, last time I taught this class, the things they did with the same material, just completely different than what this year’s class is doing.” They note that they “love that because it doesn’t matter in some ways what the text is about what the people in the room make of it.”

Participant 10, of the Philosophy department, was not asked this question due to a lack of time.

Participant 11, of the English department, was not asked this question due to a lack of time.

QUESTION 25:

Do you think there are skills/lessons that can only originate from experience?

Participant 1, of the ACLC department, begins their answer with “one of the phrases we don’t like to use in this faculty.” The phrase students use is “now that I’m in the real world,” referring to life after graduation. This, the participant attacks because, “You were always in the

real world when you were studying at university. I think that sometimes, like invariably, the work environment is a hugely dynamic one with different personalities and different challenges, all of which are unfolding at once.” Their answer ends with a positive answer to the question: “There's things you're going to learn through those experiences that we can't easily sign, like, you can't really replicate in the classroom.”

Participant 2, of the English department, was not asked this question due to a lack of time.

Participant 3, of the Language department, was not provided with this question.

Participant 4, of the Economics department, was not asked this question due to a lack of time.

Participant 5, of the History department, while objecting to the question, with the example of critical thinking, they do concede that some knowledge can be gained from experience alone. “People can be good critical thinkers. Good to, you don't have to be literate to be a good communicator. You can be an oral communicator who's very, very talented at communicating with people. So for sure, you could learn those things. But the package of things and the knowledge is very...” Nonetheless, they reiterate that “the package of things and the knowledge is very... I think, I don't think you can get that package of insights and, um, such without, without the education.”

Participant 6, of the English department, agrees that some skills can only originate from experience. They gave the example of soldering.

Participant 7, of the Theatre department, agrees so, stating that such skills “are often things you learn when you're a child. Don't put your hand on the hot stove. You can only learn that by putting your hand on that stove.” They note that “I think those are important, I mean, that's irreplaceable,” before going on to highlight a challenge with learning. “I'm not sure we've ever found a way to measure learning. Really. Grades. You know, grades are grades. Does it measure what you know, what you learn? I'm not sure.”

Participant 8, of the Philosophy department, first starts by explaining a new phenomenon of our world. That we are in a “media saturated world where lived experience now competes with videotapes of other people's lived experiences,” which means that “there is a lot more that we can learn from media experiences, watching someone else do something than we have realized in the past.” This new experience, they call “pseudo experience,” but nonetheless emphasize

that “some skills are not peculiar to experience alone.” They use experiential learning as a subsequent example, which they worry about because “The logistics are not good when we have zero budget and no support, and really, very little time beyond, you know, the classroom that we’re allotted time.” They note that experiential learning with the Animal Ethics course, “would be good to go and visit the animal shelter, take the whole class, or go and visit the zoo in Moncton, you know?” However, “the current, what would you call it, a budget for university and philosophy is almost zero. So you don’t have money for a bus to go to Moncton. Or even to take them to the animal shelter.” Finally, they conclude that experience can replace the lessons from the classroom, yet they think “experiential education is overrated in the sense that people can always do this on their own time, but when you try to get the whole class to do it, then you immediately have a big financial burden.”

Participant 9, of the English department, agrees that some skills can only originate from experience, in line with the notion of episteme and techne they mentioned before.

Participant 10, of the History department, highlights that with these skills and lessons, there “might just be more trial and error, right?” Using themselves as an example, they say, “if I wanted to sort of tease your example, like open a bakery, for instance, about, you know, business or, uh, like outsourcing resources or filing taxes, for instance. I might screw it up a few times. Yeah, too. It doesn’t mean I can’t do it. It’s just going to take more time.” Whereas, within the educational route, if you write something for me and it’s not quite right, I need targeted feedback on where it’s not right,” and that is what the route provides.

Participant 11, of the DSJS department, highlights that “The best academia learns from what goes on outside of academia too,” after affirming with a “probably” on the question. They note that “When we talk about decolonizing research, this is about working with people whose version of what they need to know, and how they need to know it, is not what you’re coming in with. And that’s why people talk about bringing the research back to the community to make sure the community’s okay with it, et cetera.”

QUESTION 26:

How might, do you think, the experience of the Humanities be improved for the student?

Participant 1, of the English department, stated that the experience can be improved by “getting rid of technology,” adding that “Google is not research.” Their second suggestion built on top of the first, which was that they desired “machine-free students” because machines are a distraction and they replace learning in class. Finally, they added that the experience of actual research, going to the library, picking up a book, and reading it, actually matters.”

Participant 2, of the Philosophy department, laments that “too many students are working because they have to pay the bills.” This, they say, “doesn’t give them as much leisure to hang around and to, you could say to have some other experiences with their, with their colleagues, not supervised by the professor, but hang around, talk to their fellow students, go to a poetry meeting, whatever, you know, whatever’s offered for free. Films, et cetera.” In place of the problem, this participant suggests “cheaper educational costs” so as to allow “more students not to have to work. remove the necessity. And some way of supporting students in those leisure activities so that they do get a chance to have more, whatever it is, educational experiences.” They follow up by lamenting that “a lot of administrative austerity, is what you can call it, has undermined university, whatever it is, routine life.” And by administrative austerity, they mean “academic budget cuts” which has resulted in a case where in “philosophy, we haven’t hired a professor in philosophy, a full-time professor in 26 years.”

Participant 3, of the DSJS department, begins their suggestion by stating that “I think too many of us care too much about our own disciplines.” They note that for students, “your major is 14 out of 40 courses. The other 26 are not fluff, right? The other 26 are just as much part of your education. And so everything about the structure of a university that has, and, you know, students need a major. It’s in the university, it’s in the university acting provincial legislation.” As such, they would “like us in arts to think much more broadly about what do we do together, and how do we sort of... how do we map that out, and how do we articulate that and make that make sense to students. Well, obviously to our colleagues and administrators, but to students and to students, families, and friends who are not in arts.” In short, they would “like us to be much more articulate,” and “to think much more about connections. And I think there’s much about the structure that privileges not thinking about connections. And so a lot will need to change.” Intersectionality is the main advocacy from this participant.

Participant 4, of the ACLC department, provides an answer through the statement: “Any effort we can make to encourage students to see the connections between and among different courses they’re taking.” They note their love for designing models, and thinks that “these can be wonderfully supportive documents. And I think they can address a real problem, which is that as it has, you know, to go back to our start our conversation, is that today’s student is a little bit different in that, um, in that they’re just being asked to do a lot, not just in terms of finding the money for school, but we live in a much more perilous world than we did 30 years

ago.” In essence, the participant advocates for more practical learning and less non-educational work for students so that they can focus on their education.

Participant 5, of the History department, begins their answer by admitting that “We’re at this kind of like, I don’t want to call it a breaking point, but like a wall really between us and you guys where we need you to do certain things.” That wall, they say, is targeted at because “we keep getting demands to reduce that course load, to change the way that we’re assessing.” However, they say they understand where it is coming from, because students today “have to work far harder to be here than we ever had to because of the way the economy’s working and things like that.” Yet, despite all of that, “we don’t want to devalue your university degree,” they say in rebellion. As such, the change they’re asking for is reduced student non-educational activities, such as jobs, so that students can properly focus on their educational degree.

Participant 6, of the English department, mentioned the following ways the experience might be improved:

- I. Interdisciplinary structured courses (at least one required)
- II. Guaranteed smaller classes (Writing-intensive courses)
- III. More opportunities for students to connect with each other
- IV. More faculty-student interaction
- V. Collaboration in presentations among interdisciplinary students (i.e., History, English, and Politics students can collaborate on a project)
- VI. Strong support for good first-year language courses (more diversity in first-year learning)

Participant 7, of the History department, points out that “A lot of people learn best through doing or through, you know, applying it,” which is why they suggest “more applied stuff” as a way to improve the experience.

Participant 8, of the Theatre department, suggests that it depends on “the professors. You need to have professors who believe or are true believers in the liberal arts.” Their next suggestion is “resources,” which focuses on the lack of faculty members in the English department. Lastly, they call for an attention to the things that matter. “All I need is a classroom. I don’t need anything else.”

Participant 9, of the Language department, noted that the experience for students can be

improved by

- I. Putting them (students) in contact with each other. (Through cross-listed courses)
- II. Putting them in contact with each other. (Through fun activities like an Arts club).

The participant, however, recounted her experience of hosting free movie nights for students, and none would come. Sided with that was the experience of giving conversational classes for free, and none (students) would come. Lastly, they share for their own lost opportunities, as they themselves would “have died” to be given the kind of free services they were offering.

Participant 10, of the Economics department, begins their answer by noting that the experience might be improved if students showed up to class. Furthermore, they note that it would help if “1st year economics, just economics students. Okay. We’re sort of hampered by the reality that the vast majority, the vast majority of the people in our 1st year classes are actually 1st year visit students. And they’re there because they have to be.” Their reasoning being that “It certainly affects the size of the class. With enormous classes. Instead of what would be relatively small, comfortable classes.”

Participant 11, of the English department, suggests that the experience of the arts can be improved through:

- I. More institutional support
- II. More classroom
- III. Better technology
- IV. And that job-specific courses should not be specific

Lastly, this participant was asked how, in turn, the arts can be better advertised or encouraged among university students. Their answer was: “It is not my job to make that kind of argument. It is my job TO BE that kind of argument.”

REFLECTIVE ESSAY

Over the course of the interview process, one of the questions I was asked most was “How is it going? How are the answers?” I have to note that the question was not asked in terms of the general way in which the process was going. That is, they were not asking whether the interviews were going good or bad. No, the question was asked with a follow-up of this kind: “Are there any similarities among the answers?” And the answer is yes. There were. I often used the metaphor of a balloon to explain my answer.

A fully blown balloon is a closed object. Air has been blown into it, and it’s been tied and

sealed. The air is now locked. To prick at it with a needle takes precise skill and handling of the object to get it in and out without the balloon popping. That was how the interviews were for me. I was the balloon, my questions were the balloon, and the answers were, for the better part, needles poking at the object, all trying to go in without popping it. It is important that they were not trying to pop it; that is, they were not trying to go beyond the scope of their answers. I could find a scope, a sphere, where all their answers would be as a result of a stroke of similarity. All of this is to emphasize that their answers were needles poking at the same object, but coming from different angles.

I firmly believe that intersectionality is a necessity of the arts. The calling out of it when apparent, and the participation in it by students. All subjects in the arts are related, one way or another. In that same manner, most of the answers received during this process were just one variation or the other of the same type of answer; the same idea was prominent behind them.

There is an element of freedom that most participants call to, from my observation. When talking about the arts, they yearn for things and happenings that are not far from each other. Take their answers to the last question, for example: *How do they think the experience of the Humanities might be improved?* A handful of them made causes for intersectionality. Others asked for freedom of the student, a freedom from the shackles of extra societal demands. They called for more concentration on school, which is something I theorize would be dominant in answers from STEM professors as well. Nonetheless, for a field that is diverse and at the same time not very specialized, the call for more focus from students shows a firm belief in the education of the arts, even if the broad field is not an assured giver of jobs, not in the same way the STEM field is in today's world.

Previous questions were also answered with the idea of the arts teaching things like "soft skills" or "how to be a better person. Or a better citizen." One way or another, the answers to the interviews yield to a general idea behind this phenomenon. What exactly this idea is, I cannot name. I cannot give it a name; freedom is not enough. But being an arts student myself, I can identify that there is a similarity to their answers. The answer a participant gave was

“Purpose,” that the arts is different from STEM due to a “purpose” being attached to it. I am not sure whether I agree with that, because, surely, those in the STEM would argue the same for their field. Another said that in the arts, we “make meaning,” which I agree with, because another participant, in one of their answers, said that we in the arts are comfortable with “absurdity.” Well, only in a rotating sphere of absurdness can meaning be made. In a world where things do, in fact, make sense, meaning is not made, but rather discovered. This, I believe, is the prominent difference between the arts and the STEM field. I think this belief is heavily reflected in the answers of the participant.

Many make a case that the arts is built to make you a better person. Many make the case that though the skills are not as concrete as those from the STEM fields, job owners still seek the “soft skills” because, at the end of the day, it is still people they are dealing with. And who better to deal with people than those specialized in communication and critical thinking? One who thinks critically before they talk? I believe this is who the arts education makes of a person, and that belief, I think, is reflected in the answers of the participants.

As to why exactly I conducted these interviews, I will be honest in saying that I have a worry for my generation, normally termed as “Gen Zs.” My worry is that we are living in a different world, far different from that of our predecessors, and we know not how to go into it. We know not how to handle it. We are still test subjects for the right way technology, social media, and TikTok, and short attention span should be used in society. We do not know the right way to go, and we are feeling the effects of this. There has never been a generation with as many shy pupils as ours. Most of us have conducted our existence through the spectacle of a phone. We find it hard to make conversations with our elders, because we don’t relate to the same world as them.

There are negatives and benefits to this phenomenon, and I think this research was meant to make clear the negatives, especially from the point of view of our “intellectual predecessors,” I will say. These are critical thinkers, people with genuine care for those coming after them, and the kind of world they leave behind. The interview process would not have worked with any

other category of persons; teachers are a “necessity for society,” I believe, because without them, not enough care would be passed on in the world. You can teach someone how to be good at something, but if you do not teach them with enough care and desire for them to be good at it for the purpose of themselves, then they will not enhance themselves with whatever is taught, I believe. Teachers care for their pupils.

I told one participant that, to me, teachers are walking balls of knowledge, which I believe is true. However, it is not just that there are balls of knowledge, but that they are balls of knowledge that want to impact those coming after them. And so I knew, I expected from the get-go that a lot of professors would be willing to take part in this process. I hope the results have paid them back for their trust in me. I most certainly have taken a lot from this process, and I think the point of this project can only truly be passed down to students alone. My wish is that I would have had them as part of the process, so that they could be directly privy to the words and thoughts of those they depend on in the classroom.

I believe that if we (students) master the ability to exist with those who came before us, we can only be better for it. A good number of participants in this project lamented the lack of student-teacher relationships. It is evident and clear. Even from my experience in the classrooms. A teacher asks a question, and the whole room remains silent. I point it down to the fact that there is a lack of confidence among us students, which is why we are so worked up about speaking in class. I theorize that it is not that we do not know what to say, but rather that we are scared of what we say being wrong. And thus, we are scared of being shamed or embarrassed in class because we have created social identities through social media and have relied solely on posting the good, happy moments of our lives, not the bad.

What is the measure through which we can break down this wall of fear? I think a good number of us need to get loose in class. A number of participants in this project talked about the necessity of failing. Yet, as they noted, it is hypocritical of them because even they do not fail. Everyone is anxious about failing in society. But the classroom is where we are meant to fail. We should be vulnerable not just to our class atmosphere, but to our peers as well. I think

that is important. That is why I did this research project. To show students that professors genuinely care. And that they enjoy the job as much as we enjoy doing modern-day hobbies, such as playing video games or chatting on social apps. Education is enjoyable, especially in the arts, where we are blessed with the freedom to make our own meaning.

Nonetheless, I will point out a belief about what I think is missing in the arts. Participants from DSJS and Philosophy spoke about this in their answers. I believe that with great freedom comes great responsibility. If the identity of society were simply universities churning out students for jobs and jobs only, we would have a society of ardent workers and no thinkers, because everyone would be a victim of specialization. Everyone would work behind their desk or wherever, and would live life to the tune of political power wielders. However, those in the arts are taught the importance of reflection. Of thinking (critically as it is), and speaking. There is a responsibility that comes with being free (the arts) that I do not think is acknowledged. That responsibility, I think, is something that must be made known to students in the arts. If people do not feel crowned as a result of their freedom, then they will feel burdened by the abundance of it.

With our opportunity to be reflectors in society, it is mostly up to the soft skill wielders to keep politicians and power-claimers in check. Because, without reflecting on history, without making creative works that reflect society, without writing and performing plays that criticize power, without studying the language of cultures to see how they originated, without studying an economy to know where it is going, without making an argument and seeing it from the other side of the board, there would be no “choice” for the wielders of society. There will be no freedom. The arts students and staff, graduates, are the gatekeepers of society, simply because we have the opportunity to self-reflect and make revelations. I think young people need to be burdened with this responsibility, to understand the cause that studying in the arts yields. I say this because, in the world today, there is a vast consolidation of power that is resulting in a gap between political leaders and the proletariat of countries. From those in the “elite” class to politicians themselves, a large number of people are consolidating power because those in

society are too distracted by the enjoyment found in their everyday lives. We see this through the simple fact that not everyone is a critical thinker. And we know this because critical thinking is in fact a skill one develops in the university, meaning that thinking critically is not a naturalness.

The problem of democracy has long since been noted by Socrates, as the man himself pointed out in his discussion with Ademanteus, that just as we would not allow anyone control a vessel at sea, so too should we not allow just anyone to have control over who should rule a country. The problem is that the skill of choosing a leader is degraded as being a skill, so everyone can have their say. And the price of it is that every say, though not being from the same intellectual background, is ultimately of the same measure in society. The price of it is that just anyone can rule a country if they are convincing enough. Those of the arts, from a political standpoint, are gifted with the ability to critique leadership and those contesting for it in ways that those outside of it might not be able to. And that evidence needed to prove this fact lies in the fact that those outside the arts are never taught the same skills that those within it are. STEM students are not taught philosophy, or early theatrical plays that have something to say, or works of the great thinkers of early societies. They are not taught to formulate opinions or to make meaning from an abundance of it. They are taught to mostly specialize in crafts that will get them a job after school. As such, society today is being made up of ardent workers but not enough thinkers and self-reflectors. And if you cannot think and self-reflect, how then can you make out a demagogue in the guise of a charismatic leader?

The summary of it all is that there is a responsibility that comes with studying the arts, which should be known to the student. I think something like that can propel students back to the arena of participation in the classrooms. Especially early arts students, those in their first and second year. It is my belief that a call to responsibility can result in action just as much as a choice made in freedom.

Besides this deepest desire of what I think this project can yield, why I did it, I also did it to enhance my skills as a listener. Conducting interviews, I find, has given me the extra ability

to be comfortable in patience. I found that the urge to speak, usually aroused in arguments, the urge to make a point, is calmed when conducting interviews because the point is to listen. It allowed me to formulate follow-up questions that came out in a much better manner than they would have if I had given yonder to the sudden urges.

I found myself invested in the conversations with the participants, mostly because their discussion points were points I had thought of throughout my time in the university. The brain is like an excretion machine; it receives information and gives back reactions in the form of questions. This was the major reason why I expanded the questions beyond the topic of skills. It felt utilitarian to just ask professors to name the skills their course gives. It felt like I was asking them to justify their expertise. Whereas, I believe the bill of questions put out in the final form allowed them to expand the realm of their answers with themselves. That is, the questions were tailored to make the participants feel like they had a stake and thus say in the answers of the interview. I did not want it to just be a case where they gave me objective answers in the sense that they were naming facts. I wanted personalized answers in order to lend credit to their objective answers. What this looks like is the questionnaire first asking them questions about teaching before asking them about the main topic of skills. I found that by allowing participants to put themselves in the line of answers, I got what I believe were better results because they enjoyed talking. And there was always the silent confession of “that’s a good question” when something had them thinking. Sometimes, however, I reached the conclusion that teachers had set the bar low for what to expect from students when I heard that comment, simply because I’d like to think that these are questions other students just have, at the very least, thought of asking. I do not know if that is true or not, and while I was flattered by the comment, the other side of the equation has to be a worry about what the expectancy is from students. Of this argument, I do not know the true answer.

What I do know is that I enjoyed the interview process and wished I had done this with a larger scope of a target audience than what I got. I did try to diversify my participants. Yet, I failed to get participants from the Religious department, Sociology department, Anthropology

department, and Political Science department, just to name a few. I think that will be with me for some time. Nonetheless, I am much satisfied with the results I got. I got lots of information that has allowed me to understand the minds of those much older than me in society, and that understanding I can carry with me into society.

Even though the limit of my participants was made to art professors alone, I think I have a good sense now of how older generations think, and I can use that in society. The interview process, or at the very least, a one-on-one experience with professors, is an experience I would recommend for all students, just so they can get some expertise on what it is like to talk to someone much older than them in experience and age. It teaches decorum, it teaches patience, it teaches resiliency, humility, and it teaches contentment. There was also a great deal of satisfaction I sensed from time to time when I got the answers I was looking for. I was looking for them, or expecting them, not in the direct sense, but in the sense that those answers answered the question, and one expected such an answer when formulating the question. Again, it was like needles poking at a balloon, except you knew that the balloon was going to be poked. What you did not know was where the poke was going to come from. From what angle. And with the final result, they came from many angles. The last thing I learned was time management as well, and to a great degree, I did fluster at that discipline. However, it is something I can now get better at through the product of this process.

Work Cited

Waterfield, Robin, editor. *Republic*. Translated by Robin Waterfield, Oxford University Press, 1993.