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For the first cycle I chose an issue that I had already tackled in my poster (see above), and which I had aimed at that time to build into my first exercise in reflective practice. As I have mentioned, the previous year I had taught a second year course over two modules (titled *Globalization, Digitization, Convergence*) on the Media and Communications degree scheme within the department of Theatre, Film and Television. In my own opinion this module did not run in a particularly satisfactory manner. In many ways, much of this was related to my inexperience as a teacher, but also to the fact that I had little time to actually design and prepare for this course previous to being hired by the University. As a consequence, I think that I was far too focused upon reading material, writing lectures, and gaining sufficient information on the subject, than I was with the actual organisation of the format of the lectures. I had come with rather fixed expectations of what a university lecture was, and had rather rigidly adhered to such expectations. So, whilst I had a rather small group (12 students), I had tended to give them 50-minute lectures to sit through because the slot was designated as a 'lecture' slot, and this was what I thought that lectures should be.

The training that I received on the **THE Induction course** would here prove to be useful in rethinking some of my assumptions (which were already in process, but in this context I could pay more attention to such thoughts). Three things emphasised within the course and accompanying literature that were helpful to me in rethinking the structure of lecturing for small groups were: firstly, continual reflection on teaching methods and adjustment of methods in light of such reflection; secondly, the promotion of active learning for students being more conducive to their learning that passive reception of information; and thirdly, leading on from the second point, a stress on the importance of interactivity not only within seminar situations but also within lecture situations. This last point was particularly important to me because, before I was hired by the University of Wales, Aberystwyth, I did not have as much experience in lecturing as I did with conducting seminars, and was not personally very familiar with the interactive mode of lecturing (when I was a student this just did not occur!). Thus, if it was thought that more interactive lecturing within large groups was more effective for student learning, then it seemed logical that I should develop my small group lectures within a much more interactive manner, giving students a more
active role. This belief was also supported by my own experience in that, my accompanying seminars for the *Globalization, Digitization, Convergence* module seemed to be more successful and sparked more interest in the students for the subject.

**Planning**

I took the same class of students that I had taught for *Globalization, Digitization, Convergence* for a third year module entitled *The Surveillance Society*, so the group size was the same. Again, the teaching time consisted of one hour lecture and one hour seminar per week, though this time the lecture and seminar were scheduled consecutively within the timetable in the same room, as contrasted with the previous year's course when the seminar and lecture were scheduled at different times of the week and in different rooms. As I had a two hour slot with a reasonably small group, and as I was geared towards a more interactive approach to lectures, I thought that it would make more sense to combine the lecture/seminar aspects into a type of 'workshop' format.

Before I could come up with specific ways of structuring the sessions, I needed to plan the course, so that the sessions could be designed in line with the aims and learning outcomes of the course. The course was split into ten sessions, which were:

- Introduction - defining surveillance
- Panopticism
- Conceptions of the 'private' and the 'public'
- Surveillance, the web and consumerism
- Identity Cards
- CCTV
- Performing the Self under Surveillance: *Big Brother* and reality television
- Surveillance in Media Fiction
- Resisting Surveillance/ Performing Surveillance
- Surveillance after 9/11

Whilst the Aims and Objectives and Learning Outcomes were as follows:

**Aims and Objectives**

- To explore how our lives are increasingly becoming subject to surveillance in a number of different areas, and to reflect upon the ways in which we are implicated in such processes.
• To think through some of the critical issues related to these processes: both positive and negative elements of surveillance, as well as issues of power in relation to the subject.
• To investigate the manifold reasons as to why surveillance has developed throughout society, and place such developments within socio-historical contexts.
• To explore the relations between technologies of surveillance and the social context within which they emerge. In particular, to think about the relationships between an increasingly digitized landscape and a 'surveillance society.'

Learning Outcomes
• Analyse and demonstrate awareness of how everyday life is subject to a broad variety of surveillance methods.
• Critically evaluate a range of materials relating to surveillance technologies and their implications.
• Demonstrate an understanding of the socio-historical development of surveillance and to investigate a specific issue in detail.
• Assess the implications of new, digital technologies and how they relate to questions of surveillance, and to think about issues such as 'resistance'.

I will illustrate how I carried my aims out mainly through one particular session, so that I can give specific, concrete examples of how I worked, though I will link this to the module overall, so that I can reflect upon how things progressed and how I developed, and also account for student reactions via feedback. The session that I choose to focus on will be the second session within the course. This is because, as the introductory session had to establish the aims and the expected workload, it was possibly not as representative a session as many others would be. Also, this session was a particularly challenging one, I believed, because it focused on the concept of 'panopticism' and the ideas of Michel Foucault. The accompanying reading for the students was particularly dense and was possibly the most 'challenging' piece of reading for the course. Yet, I believed it was necessary to introduce students to the work of Foucault because it was so prominent within a number of academic papers on various aspects of surveillance (more so than any other work in my reading), and constituted a core theoretical foundation of the subject of surveillance studies.

In preparation for the seminar, at the end of the introductory session, I told students that it was imperative that they do the required reading because the following session would be firmly based around this reading. I also warned them that this was quite difficult reading, but that they should stick with it. I asked them to think issues such as: what they believed to be the main arguments Foucault is making, why they think
that it has proven to be so influential within surveillance studies, the ways in which it can and can't be applied to contemporary surveillance, possible problems with Foucault's argument. As I knew that the literature was quite difficult, I also stated that if there were any points that they were not clear about then to note them down so that they could be opened up in class.

Application
As I decided to combine lectures and seminars, I planned to base the session around group activity, but intersperse this with talk from myself, which would introduce some relevant background information to the subject that we were discussing. In this way, I could thus base the sessions primarily around group work and class discussion. I have often found group work useful (though, of course, the usefulness depends on the way in which the instructions are framed and the further way in which such work is linked to wider aims). As Race and Brown (1998, chA) have pointed out, group work can facilitate interactive and collaborative skills, allowing students to exchange ideas in a sympathetic and critical manner, and enable them to think creatively and originally. My own feeling from experience is that such group work can also often act as an 'ice breaker' in that it allows students to think through ideas in a comfortable environment which may then give them more confidence in their ideas when discussing within a broader class discussion.

I thus decided to begin with group work in relation to Foucault's ideas. I planned the remainder of the seminar around a series of tasks, pieces of informative talk from me on selected issues (these were background to Foucault's ideas, as well as a broader development of surveillance technologies within society, which is something I wanted them to think about), and broader group discussion. I thus had an organisational framework to guide discussion and lead towards certain types of thinking, but this framework was not too tight - it allowed discussion to go into unpredictable areas if students discussed relevant issues that I had not specifically planned for. This is in line with theories that stress the importance of the teacher being a kind of 'facilitator' of learning, where the teacher carefully thinks about questions and comments in advance but does not necessarily know in what direction they will go (Cowan 1998: 48). I also thought it was important, in order to facilitate discussion of somewhat 'difficult' material, to steer groups in a 'collaborative', as opposed to 'cooperative'
manner (Cross 1998: 3), which is where 'students work in small groups to develop their own answer' as opposed to being steered towards a 'correct answer' (ibid). This was perhaps somewhat essential anyway, considering the nature of the material (i.e. there is no academic consensus about the merits of Foucault's work). Nevertheless, I wanted to remain open so that certain avenues of mental exploration were ventured rather than closed down (with the exception of cases where response was totally misguided or digressive, in which case I would have to try and guide the talk back into relevant areas).

I began by asking the class as individuals whether they found the reading difficult; the majority of the class claimed that they did find it extremely difficult and found it hard to understand in places. I then split the class into groups of four so that they could thoroughly discuss all of the issues that they did and did not understand, and to summarise the main arguments. As many expressed difficulty, I allowed a sufficient amount of time for ideas to be exchanged (ten minutes), whilst I jotted down some issues that I thought needed to be addressed. Despite the expressed difficulties of some students, the response was very good and the group discussion seemed to help some people come to terms with some of the ideas involved. It certainly wasn't the case that people developed a sophisticated understanding of the ideas, but they did grasp a number of issues that Foucault was addressing. These were sufficient enough for me to be able to ask further questions and to speak about certain elements that were not picked up upon. After a while we had a list of arguments that Foucault had made about surveillance; I was then able to draw up a number of main arguments that he made, and get the same groups to further probe these in more detail. Here, I not only wanted them to probe these ideas in more detail, but also to get them to think about some rather abstract ideas in relation to more concrete concerns, so that could think about them in terms that are perhaps more relevant to their own experiences. This was something that, I think, worked particularly well, as the linking of these arguments to concrete issues enabled students to not only understand their relevance, but to think about these ideas in a much more critical manner. There was certainly no consensus, and some inter-class arguments developed, but I really felt that an understanding of Foucault had developed by the end of the session and that, ideas that seemed to generate a fear in many at first, were being argued about with greater confidence towards the end of the session. Whilst I can't say that every element of the