Interactional and emotional learning:
Evolving a teaching philosophy

I stand behind the lectern, looking down far-too-frequently at my far-too-detailed notes whilst clicking maniacally through my far-too-crowded PowerPoint, racing through the slides and leaving no time or opportunity for questions. My heart is racing, my palms are sweating and my stress levels are higher than normal. I am terrified that a student will ask a question to which I do not know the answer leaving me looking and feeling like a fool. I'm not a teacher, I think to myself, I'm just a PhD student.

This is an accurate depiction of the first lecture I held in 2013 which was a defining moment for me. Although I have spent the majority of my life learning this moment constituted the first step towards seeing myself as a teacher. It also represents my first step towards a student-centered approach to learning and teaching. This is because having reflected on this initial teaching experience afterwards, I came to realize that my focus had been on what *I* had to say, what *I* wanted to teach rather than on the students' learning. To put it bluntly, I was so focused on myself I forgot about the students.

Since this time my approach to teaching and learning has changed radically, from seeing teaching and learning as a one-way route – injecting knowledge into students like a hypodermic needle – to an interactive process. Additionally, I no longer consider myself as either a teacher *or* a PhD student – as mutually exclusive categories, rather I see myself as a teacher *and* a researcher integrating teaching into research and research into teaching.

In this text I will reflect upon how I have developed my skills and philosophy with regards to teaching and learning since this initial lecture, following the ensuing lectures, seminars, workshops, examinations and supervision sessions from undergraduates to doctoral students, along with my role as a leader on courses and programs as well as developing teaching tools. In particular I highlight the importance of emotions and interactions which constitute fundamental aspects of my teaching philosophy.

Initial Realizations and Reflections on the Road to Developing a Teaching Philosophy
The lecture I described at the start of this text was on the subject of emotion sociology, given as part of a social psychology course (SOCA13) at the Department of Sociology at Lund University when I was employed as a doctoral student. As I reflected more fully on this lecture afterwards, I realized that I had brought my earlier learning experiences from England with me into the lecture hall and fallen into a style I was familiar with: the teacher standing behind the lectern, relaying information to the students. It was a one-way process with no option of exchange, discussion or enquiry (Postareff and Lindblom-Ylänne 2011; Fox 2006). I left the lecture feeling that I had failed to create an open atmosphere in which the students could debate and discuss. I began to reflect upon this and soon realized several things.

First, I realized that that my earlier learning experiences could be used as a blueprint for *what not to do* as they were largely passive in style, entailing surface learning of declarative knowledge (Marton and Säljö 1976). Whilst learning word-for-word and memorization can be important at the early stages of a course where definitions and terms need to be learned before more in-depth understanding can be developed (Biggs and Collis 1982), in my previous learning experiences I often missed the "intentional content" (Marton and Säljö 1976, 6) of the theories and arguments presented by teachers and lecturers. I learned the text but lacked a deeper-level of understanding. I realized I was now setting up my students for making a similar mistake.

I realized further that by failing to give space for questions and queries if something was unclear I was preventing them from being actively involved in their learning – something of fundamental importance, not least when I explained complex terms or "threshold concepts" (Biggs and Tang 2011; Meyer and Land 2003) such as "symbolic interactionism" (Blumer 1959) which open up new ways of understanding society. I began to understand that I needed to move away from merely imparting information and embrace an interactive approach and started opening up lectures by asking students to say if something was unclear. I had thus begun to realize that the problem was me.

Lastly, I realized that the other part of the problem was also me. Not only did I need to construct a climate for learning (Biggs and Tang 2011), I also needed to ensure that my own emotional engagement with the subject and indeed, with the students, was in line with this. I needed to not be scared and nervous thereby inadvertently conveying this to the class and risk constructing similar emotions in them, instead I needed to cultivate a confidence and identity as a teacher which, in turn, could instill confidence in the students.

After this first teaching experience – and here I intentionally omit "learning" as I am hesitant to classify it as a learning situation for the students - I have endeavored to learn from my initial mistakes and continually reflect more upon how I can facilitate learning, how I can motivate, engage and include all students, how I think about teaching, and the challenges I have faced as a teacher and leader. I will return to these points in "My Teaching Philosophy".

Between 2013 – 2018 I continued to teach on the same social psychology course, gradually taking on more lectures for instance covering social media and society, and classic theories of social psychology as well as seminars, workshops and supervision. I also taught on several other courses at the same time, focusing on modern theories of sociology, as well as classic social psychology given as part of a range of programs such as Human Resources (HR), Behavioral Science, and Psychology. This first phase of teaching therefore entailed giving lectures and seminars on similar subjects in sociology and social psychology but to classes differing in size from 40 to over 90 coming from different disciplines and with different levels of pre-knowledge thus making it necessary for me to adjust the content, level and delivery of each lecture. During this time, I also learned the importance of context. For instance, when I lectured on the psychology program about emotion work, I exemplified how and why it is used by psychologists in therapy sessions, highlighted the sociological side of the theory and lifted the links to the psychological theories they had studied. In contrast, when teaching the same subject

on the HR program, I exemplified how and why emotion work is used by training and development managers, and presented both sociological and social psychological theories. Contextualising with relevant examples anchored in everyday life and their future employment is thus a key component of all my teaching and linked to creating a positive learning climate as I will return to shortly.

During this phase I also began giving lectures and holding seminars in methodology on the undergraduate program in Criminology, the master's program in Sociology and the doctoral program in Sociology – whilst writing my doctoral dissertation on defence lawyers' emotion management (which went on to win the Swedish Sociological Association's award for best doctoral dissertation). Here I began to develop organizational skills which I believe are central to being a good teacher: balancing teaching and research.

In 2018 I took on course responsibility for the Social psychology course (SOCA13), re-working the course literature, schedule, tasks, and examination and again, in 2019, after helping to form the new undergraduate program in Sociology, I created a new course in social psychology (SOCA30) complete with readings, tasks and so on. In 2018, I also took on course responsibility for the Sociology: Criminology (SOCA74) and began supervising undergraduate and graduate theses.

After my employment as a doctoral student came to an end in 2018, I started supervising undergraduate theses in criminology at Kristianstad University (HKR) before working as a temporary senior lecturer in spring 2019. Here, I expanded my base of subjects taught and examined to include quantitative methods, a wider range of qualitative methods (such as discourse analysis) and I also began teaching criminological theories. I additionally supervised and examined around 10 undergraduate theses in Criminology simultaneously. My period at HKR was very different to my previous experiences as the majority of teaching took place online thus requiring a different approach to teaching. I found that a clear and well-communicated course structure and detailed student formative feedback (Biggs and Tang 2011) were key – skills that I could draw upon again during the pandemic (as I will return to shortly). This teaching phase also entailed extremely high teaching loads (working, at times, over 180%) with little time to prepare on subjects which I knew little about, thus helping me to develop my organization skills further.

In 2019 I started as a temporary senior lecturer at the Department of Sociology at Lund University and in 2020 began as an Associate senior lecturer. During this time, I have continued to have course responsibility for Sociology: Criminology (SOCA74). From 2020 I have also had a leadership role on the program and undertaken other leadership roles during this time. Finally, in 2021 I began supervising a doctoral student.[1]

---

[1] Please see my CV and certificates in Appendix N for more detailed information about teaching and teaching hours.

As may be seen, I have developed from my first tentative steps of a single lecture on one undergraduate course, to teaching on multiple courses on different levels simultaneously, to online teaching – first at HKR and then during a pandemic – and supervising undergraduate, graduate and doctoral theses, to leadership roles and developing pedagogical tools accruing over 5,500 hours of teaching experience (see CV for details on subjects taught and examination formats). In the next section of this portfolio, I will reflect upon how my teaching philosophy has developed during this time, how I have changed as a teacher and leader.

My Teaching Philosophy
Reflecting on the evolution of my teaching philosophy has been a challenging yet satisfying process. As noted at the beginning of this text, I initially approached teaching and learning as one-way processes. Since then I have developed a student-centered approach and believe that teaching and learning are interactional, two-way processes whereby exchange, discussion and enquiry are central (Postareff and Lindblom-Ylänne 2011; Fox 2006). Thus whilst I still consider the teacher as an expert source of information, I no longer see my role as one of pure transference, rather one of guidance (cf. Fox 2006, 162) and as a facilitator of the learning process (Postareff and Lindblom-Ylänne 2011, 799).

Relatedly, I no longer view students as mere receptors – rather as interactants, actively listening, interpreting, internalizing but also actively engaging, enquiring and externalizing – both in terms of voicing and displaying such things as interest, uncertainty, but perhaps even boredom. It is in this interaction that teaching, learning and the construction of knowledge takes place. Thus, if the goal of higher education is to convey knowledge and skills and contribute towards students' ability to make independent and critical evaluations, as well as to identify, formulate, understand and at times even solve, societal problems, then my role is to help them learn and guide them towards achieving these goals (cf. Lachman 1997; Washburne 1936). Such a student-centered learning approach is linked with more positive teaching experiences than for those teachers who have a more content-oriented approach (Postareff and Lindblom-Ylänne 2011; Trigwell 2012). Indeed, I have grown to enjoy - rather than slightly fear – teaching, an enjoyment that is noticed by the students as reflected in course evaluations (Appendix A) and inspiring me to complete several courses in higher education teaching (Appendix B).

Interactions and emotions
I believe that interactions and the emotions within are central to embracing this student-centered approach. Indeed, I suggest that such an approach is only possible if the teacher clearly focuses not only on the sending and receiving of educational information, but also on the conveyance of social information as well as the construction and exchange of emotions in situations and interchanges with students. Thus, central to my teaching philosophy is an understanding of teaching and learning as an interactional accomplishment and an awareness of the role of emotions (Blumer 1959; Goffman 1959; Collins 2004; Hochschild 1983/2003). This means that I view teaching and learning situations as I do any other social situation – as consisting of interactions wherein meanings and understandings are constructed and where our actions are based on how we interpret these situations with emotions playing a central role in this. For instance, in a paper for a pedagogical course I wrote in 2014 (see Appendix C) I reflect upon

how positive "academic emotions" (Pekrun et al. 2002), such as enjoyment, hope and pride, support students to focus and achieve creative, flexible modes of thinking whilst negative such emotions – anxiety, shame, anger, and boredom – can instead stifle learning and inspiration. For me, emotions are central to learning.

A concrete example of how I draw on this is my use of *ice-breakers* at the start of the Sociology: Criminology (SOCA74) course where students present themselves and reveal why they chose to study criminology based on five (humorous) options (Appendix D). The goal of this exercise is to reduce inhibition, tension, and nervousness, which, in turn, can also help towards creating a sense of connection and community amongst the students (McKeachie and Svinicki 2014, 20-21; Chlup and Collins 2010). For instance, for socially anxious students, speaking up in a class of 90 can be a stressful experience and may become more intimidating as the weeks roll by. My intention is therefore to enable them to do this from the onset, however in an informal, lighthearted way. In turn, this may reduce future inhibitions of posing questions during lectures which, in turn, supports their learning process.

Linked to this, another important part of my philosophy is that teaching and learning should – at least at times - be fun. Having fun can increase intrinsic motivation to learn, reduce stress, and also lead to the suspension of social inhibitions – which, in a teaching environment can lead to even the shyest of students becoming actively involved in debate (Bisson and Luckner 1996). Ice-breakers are thus a fun way of reducing social inhibitions, and later in this text, I reflect on fun in seminars and examinations.

Another way in which the centrality of emotions in my teaching philosophy can be seen is in my strive to *read the emotional room.* This entails detecting when the mood and focus have dropped, reflecting over the cause and acting accordingly. This stems from my research interest and expert knowledge on emotion rules – which emotions we are expected to feel and how we should show them in any given situation (Hochschild 1983/2003) using an interactional perspective whereby we base our actions and self-perceptions on how we think others perceive us (Cooley 1922; Blumer 1959). I am therefore aware that students are interpreting what I do, including my emotional countenance, and acting based on this interpretation. This means that if I appear uninterested and unengaged in the lecture – deviating from, what I hope is the expected emotional display of interest and engagement by a university lecturer – then they too may act and feel uninterested, unengaged and in turn, unmotivated. This, in turn, can spiral into me *reading* them as such, thereby leading to similar feelings and actions in myself. I therefore believe that students are aware of, and are influenced by, my emotions as research also shows (Sutton, Mudrey-Camino, and Knight 2009; Sutton and Wheatley 2003). I have therefore had many lectures where I have worked on my emotions beforehand to bring myself into the appropriate role – a professional role expected, and deserved, by the students (Hochschild 1983; see Tsang 2011). This approach, of working up the appropriate inner feeling, rather than plastering on a smile, is linked with greater levels of teacher satisfaction and lower levels of burnout (Zhang and Zhu 2008) and I believe contributes towards constructing an environment conducive to learning.

This interest in emotions also means that I regularly draw on my own research when teaching about emotions and interactions in sociology and social psychology. It should also be noted that I also incorporate my research when teaching criminology, for example by exemplifying with my fieldnotes and interview extracts or when explaining the criminal justice system as well as the emotions within, and when discussing media depictions of crime as is my current research focus. I have found that integrating teaching and research in this way has led to a deeper understanding of my own work and also assists the students' learning.

My philosophy also encompasses an awareness students' emotions. This was the case during one recent lecture on the Sociology: Criminology (SOCA74) course where I noticed that the students were losing concentration. When I asked them about this, they replied that they were worried about the upcoming exam. We therefore talked about the exam, giving them the opportunity to voice their concerns and feel heard. I could therefore listen to their worries and calm them by explaining what to expect in the exam. After this there was a notable difference in the classroom with students once again able to focus and engage in discussions. Hence, seeing teaching and learning as an interactional accomplishment entails ensuring a focus and mutual entrainment – that is attempting to create a shared atmosphere of interest and curiosity in the classroom (Collins 2004). In turn, this creates motivation in the students to find out more – to ask questions, to delve deeper into the literature and to, hopefully also, continue their studies after course completion.

Furthermore, as noted at the start of this text, I believe that a student-centered approach means constructing a positive climate for teaching and learning. I do this by creating and encouraging student participation for instance by inviting discussions and questions during lectures, peer-to-peer interactions in seminars, workshops and breakout rooms and by giving formative feedback in lectures, seminars and assignments, as well as in summative feedback on assessment tasks (Biggs and Tang 2011) (see also Appendix P). I also contextualize and anchor criminological phenomenon in an accessible manner thus also contributing to a positive learning climate (as with the psychology and HR students mentioned at the start of this text). For instance, I recently included newspaper reports of a street fight in Lund which had happened the previous day when teaching on the media and moral panics (Appendix O). As these factors are also positively related to developing critical thinking this also helps to achieve one of the central goals of higher education (Smith 1977; Ramsden 1995).

A concrete example of a problem I encountered whereby emotions and critical thinking were interlinked is from 2019 on the Sociology: Criminology (SOCA74) course. I had noticed that students had missed a key aspect in the final methods exam when the course had run previously, namely lifting the critical aspects of the study they had designed for the exam. They were thus failing to reach an extended abstract level of learning (Biggs and Collis 1982). I discussed this with the current students and discovered that the exam had acquired an almost legendary status amongst previous students for being extremely difficult. Although the learning outcome and assessment were aligned, this had not been clearly communicated to the students. They therefore did not know what was expected of them and therefore found it difficult to focus equally on each of the three sections the paper required: background and problem, method,

methodological and ethical problems. This was a cause of stress for many, preventing them from developing their critical thinking skills fully. I therefore made a number of changes. For instance, I introduced a checklist of aspects that needed to be included in each section and gave a lecture on the different components of the paper and how to think about them with particular focus on how to critically evaluate study designs and theoretical frameworks.

Moreover, as a result of this, together with more general comments made in course evaluations about the want of more feedback on exams, I constructed evaluations matrices for each exam on the course (which consists of four sub-courses) and published them on Canvas at the start of the term (see Appendix E). Each matrix is clearly aligned to the course outcomes and the specific assessment task thereby increasing students' awareness and understanding of the course goals and transparency of the grading criteria. These matrices have become a tool for providing summative assessments that are much appreciated by both students as reflected in course evaluations, and teachers, as reflected in discussions at teacher team meetings. For instance, as teachers only have 30 minutes to grade each paper, which may consist of five pages of text, matrices enable us to clearly show which criteria have been reached and still make individual comments on each exam. Furthermore, as each teacher grades the question s/he has set, matrices enable greater grading cohesion and grading security. These matrices continue to be used and I have also shared them with the teachers teaching on the Sociology of law courses who had experienced similar problems.[2] The outcome of these changes, in particular on the methods course, was a distinct improvement in the quality of exam papers submitted and a lower level of stress amongst students as reported in the course evaluations.

Teaching and learning are for everyone
Having come from a non-academic background, another central aspect of my teaching philosophy is that learning is for everyone, irrespective of pre-knowledge or experience and that teaching should be tailored to this. The centrality of this was established when I embarked on the doctoral education program where many of my fellow doctoral students and colleagues came from families filled with doctorates and professors. I found it intimidating and, at times, overwhelming to lack the "cultural capital" (Bourdieu 1986) that many of my colleagues had and I felt, a "sense of difference or remove" (Lee 2017, 198) from them.[3] I therefore do not assume that the doctoral student I currently supervise, or indeed other doctoral students I encounter, already have knowledge of the unwritten rules of academic life which I believe are an important part of doctoral education and to a continued career in academia. Instead I attempt to open up a constructive dialogue whereby differences in experience and knowledge emerge which can lead to a greater understanding of each other, of academia, and also hopefully of the research (Norberg Brorsson and Ekberg 2012).

Indeed, this is something I attempt to do in all situations where students have different backgrounds and understandings. Another example of such diversity is amongst students

---

[2] I believe feedback to be a key part of teaching and learning as may be reflected in the paper I wrote on the course "Att handleda uppsatser" (see Appendix P).

[3] See "PhD Students of a Different Class" - paper completed for course in Doctoral supervision (Appendix F).

embarking on the Criminology program. Many are studying at university for the first time or studying criminology for the first time. They are thus at the pre-structural stage of learning (Biggs and Tang 2011).[4] It is also during this initial phase that students – and here I include doctoral, graduate and undergraduate – become aware of the "behavioral, attitudinal, and cognitive expectations" (Weidman, Twale, and Stein 2001, 12) placed upon them. Therefore, in the introductory lecture we talk, for instance, about the differences between high school and university studies, what they can expect of the program and what we expect of them, provide study tips (see Appendix G), and introduce Canvas. I thus remain cognizant of the inherent power aspect whereby those not *in-the-know* may experience being in a position of inferiority. My role is therefore to facilitate not only criminological understanding but also academic understandings whilst bearing in mind that there is a variety in experiences and pre-knowledge amongst the students – for some, this is old news. I therefore attempt to be as concise as possible and point students in the direction of more information available on Canvas if required.

Alignment, progression and a hands-on approach
I view my role as a course coordinator and teacher as ensuring there is a clear constructive alignment between learning outcomes, activities and assessments – that is *what* to learn, *how* to learn it, to what standard (Biggs and Tang 2011, 97-98), and that courses progress following the SOLO taxonomy (Biggs and Collis 1982). Using the Sociology: Criminology (SOCA74) as an example, this means that I structure the content, activities and assessments on the course to help students progress from being able to define and recognize key criminological theories and concepts that is, the unistructural level before progressing on to multi-structural learning enabling, for instance, the description of theories and construction of research questions, and onwards towards relational learning and an extended abstract level of understanding with increasing levels of independent and critical thinking (Biggs and Tang 2011; Brabrand and Dahl 2009). I communicate this alignment and progression in lectures and on Canvas, for instance by explaining they will develop from defining theories to applying and critically reflecting upon them throughout the course. Included in this, I explain that tasks will become progressively more reflective, investigative, and comparative – that is, that depth and higher order thinking is the goal (Hattie and Brown, 2004, 17-18). I also use rhetorical progression to highlight how students will develop throughout the program and indeed, how these skills will have relevance for their future employment.

I also ensure that I choose suitable activities for achieving learning outcomes and communicate their pedagogical function to the students (Biggs and Tang 2011). For instance, seminars are used at the start of the course to understand definitions and theories through social learning (Biggs and Tang 2011, 69), graduating throughout the course to using them as a forum for discussing and applying theories before then introducing workshops where qualitative and quantitative data are worked with and theories applied (Steinert et al. 2008). As already noted,

---

[4] Many students embark on the program with expectations of learning how to forensically analyze crime scenes or create perpetrator profiles. Therefore, I describe not only what they are going to learn, but also, what they are *not* going to learn (Hattie and Brown 2004, 2).

seminars also provide an excellent opportunity to create community and provide informal formative feedback (Biggs and Tang 2011).

Relatedly, I believe that "learning from being told is flawed as a general strategy" (Sadler 2010, 548), instead learning-by-doing is key. This means that I align and include tasks and assessments where methods are actually *conducted* and theories are *applied* to real-world situations and phenomena. For instance, when teaching ethnographic observations I give a lecture on the methodological theory, set a task whereby students conduct their own observation and write fieldnotes which they then work with in a workshop and which I then assess and give feedback on. Furthermore, as the program is a collaboration between two departments: Sociology and Sociology of Law, I also explain that on the second term held by Sociology of Law the students will conduct another courtroom observation which they will then analyze thereby highlighting a clear methodological progression and cohesion between departments on the program. Finally, I highlight that this is a method highly sought after by future employers.

Another example of such a hands-on approach is on the Sociology: Social psychology (SOCA30) course I constructed in 2019. I wanted to move away from the previous examination format of essay-style questions and discussion-question format of seminars and introduce a more applied approach. I therefore created a range of seminar formats (see Appendix H) where students were actively *doing* sociology. For instance, in one seminar students "speed dated" each other in order to observe each other's impression management strategies and reflect upon their own. I also constructed a new form of assessment which I published at the course start to give students a clear goal and something concrete to relate the course material to. The assessment entailed analyzing a short clip from the TV-series "Friends" using the theories taken up on the course (see Appendix I). This remains my favorite assignment as it enabled students to reach a deeper level of understanding as shown in the detailed analyses and reflections submitted. It was also a fun examination to assess and the course evaluations also reflected that the students found it enjoyable.

Related to my hands-on philosophy is therefore having fun. I believe that fun can be an integral part of teaching and learning as it increases intrinsic motivation to learn, reduces stress, and can suspend social inhibitions – which can lead to even socially anxious students becoming involved in debate (Bisson and Luckner 1996). I therefore integrate fun, yet pedagogical tools such as movie clips, music videos, memes, audio recordings, photos and more, all used to exemplify and contextualize theories (see CV and Appendix Q). I also hold a yearly spinning class with criminological quiz afterwards for members of the Criminologists Student Union (KuF) at Gerdhallen where I am a spinning instructor in my free time. I therefore take learning outside a formal teaching environment and combine it with fun and a touch of sweat (see Biggs and Tang 2011).

Pedagogical Approach in Practice: Examples from teaching during the pandemic
When the pandemic struck, the majority of my teaching was on Sociology: Criminology (SOCA74) thus my reflections will draw on this course. During the pandemic, the majority of teaching was moved online which I saw as an opportunity to take a step outside of what had

quickly become my comfort zone of face-to-face teaching. I reflected on my experience of asynchronous online teaching at HKR where many courses were entirely web-based with lectures in the form of handouts uploaded online, and where there was very little interaction with students beyond moderating online discussions forums (Biggs and Tang 2011, 71). I decided that I wanted to keep as much direct and synchronous student interaction as possible to enable motivation and focus, but still draw on what I had learned at HKR regarding the importance of clear communication and organization. I therefore chose to reshape the schedule to be in line with the new online context we faced and introduced a form of flipped classroom (Black-Schaffer 2013; Herreid and Schiller 2013; Abeysekera and Dawson 2015). Flipping the classroom meant that I video-recorded several lectures and uploaded them to Canvas which students watched before the scheduled class-time. Information-transmission teaching was therefore moved outside of the lecture hall in order to use in-class time for more active tasks such as discussions using break-out rooms and padlets to keep students actively engaged in their learning (Milman 2012; Andrews et al. 2011). Whilst this required a slightly higher amount of work from the students, the majority fulfilled the necessary pre-class activities and were actively engaged in class activities. I continue to integrate these films into my teaching post-pandemic and invite my teacher teammates to use them too.

I discovered that another advantage of partial flipping, beyond opening up for more active class-time, is that far more students asked questions using the chat function in comparison to lecture hall settings. The chat function thus operated as a safer space for socially anxious students and I see it as a vital channel of communication and strategy for increasing all students' learning and understanding. All this has led me to use video links more often in teaching.

Another way in which I changed my teaching during the pandemic was switching from on-site examination to an online format whilst following the course plan. I switched to an open-book format on HT20 and shaped exam questions that shifted a focus on memorizing definitions and concepts towards a more relational understanding by including a comparative element (Biggs and Tang 2011, 228). This also demanded a change in teaching content to include reference management. The exam answers indicated that students had achieved a deeper understanding of the literature, however that time management was a major issue. I thus extended the writing-time when the exam was given again HT21 and an even deeper level of understanding was attained as reflected in the exam answers.

In short, the pandemic provided an opportunity to shake up my teaching. Despite attending pedagogical seminars and courses, and organizing informal lunch meetings with colleagues to discuss pedagogy when teaching criminology (for more examples see "CV – Pedagogical leadership and development work), I realized I was risking becoming static and uncreative in my teaching (as was the subject of a paper I wrote on a pedagogical teaching course - see Appendix B). The pandemic thus served as a wake-up call and I grabbed the chance to try new things and strive to continue in the same vein post-pandemic too. For instance, we are currently awaiting the results of an external program evaluation after which the examination format may be changed in line with these positive student and teaching experiences of online exams.

Pedagogical approach and Teaching Tools

Another aspect of my teaching philosophy is to provide students with tools to take control over their learning journey which, in turn can benefit their cognitive processes and performance (Pekrun et al. 2002). For instance, on the Sociology: Criminology (SOCA74) course I provide the students with a list of "study questions" (see Appendix J) outlining the key themes, concepts and questions to be covered on the course and a "course bible" giving a detailed overview of the entire course (see Appendix K). I have also constructed a dictionary of Goffmanian terms as a teaching tool for his book on "Stigma" which I now use on social psychology courses (see Appendix L). This dictionary includes translations of the terms from Swedish to English (as the Swedish translation of the original text is poor) as well as definitions of each term. I created this in response to a number of students remarking that they found the number of concepts overwhelming and difficult to grasp. More examples can be found in my CV under "Pedagogical tool development".

On the topic of developing teaching tools, my doctoral dissertation (Flower 2018) has been used since 2019 on the Sociology of Law's course literature to teach qualitative methodology and my book "Interactional Justice" (Flower 2019) is used on Sociology: Criminology (SOCA74) to teach emotions, media and crime. I am also currently co-editing and contributing to a book entitled "Courtroom Ethnography" (to be published in 2024) which is a methods text aimed at graduate and undergraduate students in socio-legal studies, criminology, law and other disciplines and which draws on contemporary and critical perspectives of ethnography.

Leadership and Cooperation

Since 2020 I have been Chairperson of the Board on the undergraduate program in Criminology. When I was first offered this role, I confess that I hesitated. Although I have had course responsibility for several years, this felt like a big step: leading board and staff meetings, developing the program and ensuring it maintains a high quality and stays attractive to students (it is the most popular criminology program in the country), conducting evaluations (building on previous experience of conducting course evaluations see CV "Evaluations") and liaising with Criminologists Student Union (KuF) and so on. As previously noted, the program is a collaboration between two departments: Sociology and Sociology of Law thus this role also entails working and cooperating with around 25 members of teaching and administrative staff from departments and different disciplines. I have therefore developed skills of impartiality and diplomacy in order to act as a neutral representative of the program – rather than any one department. I also use these skills, together with sensitivity and discretion in bimonthly meetings with KuF representatives who provide feedback on courses which can include critiques of individual teachers which I then discuss with the teacher in question when relevant.

These skills were tested in response to an event in 2021 on the Criminology program when a teacher read aloud a text depicting fear and racism which included repeated use of the *n-word*. This led to me receiving a barrage of emails from students who were very upset and offended. I therefore talked about the balance of contextualizing events and protecting students' integrity with the teacher and directors of studies, as well as with the students. I believe I succeeded in creating an open climate in these talks which led to a constructive discussion with students,

after which they stated they felt I had listened to them and they were satisfied with how I handled the situation, as did the directors of studies. I also contacted my head of department to ask for a seminar to be held on trigger warnings which was then organized shortly afterwards leading to stimulating discussions amongst staff.

One of my strategic goals in leading the criminology program is to ensure the coherence of the program by increasing the methodological and, to some extent, theoretical progression (the latter of which being trickier due to the difference in theoretical perspectives between the two disciplines). I've used LU Box for this with teachers filling in course details of literature, library teaching, practical exercises, examinations, general competencies and program activities (the last of these entails course coordinators - including myself - inviting in external speakers to the program - e.g. representatives from the Prison Services, the Police, and women's shelters in order for students to understand how criminological theories and methods are used in work life, and to provide clear links to the job market). By creating a document that highlights the progression between courses, I can ensure there is a clear pedagogical development throughout the program, as per the SOLO taxonomy (Biggs and Colllis, 1982). Having this information readily available to all teachers in LU Box also makes it possible for them to use rhetorical progression by referring to texts and methods used on other courses thus increasing students' understanding of the relevance of the learning outcomes, tasks and assessments on each course and the program as a whole.

Another of my goals for the Criminology program, is to strengthen links between the program and future employers (which the aforementioned "program activities" contribute to). As part of this, in 2021 I instigated the inception of an established cooperation between the Police and Department of Sociology to enable – amongst other things – research-based Police work, thesis projects, and work placements for our students. I found this to be a challenging process as it involved becoming accustomed to institutionalized ways of understanding and speaking (*myndighetsspråk*), along with differences in the timescale of planning projects, decision-processes, and chains of command. This information has since come to use when I have taught about the Police, and when supervising students conducting Police research. I am also hoping to organize a "Police Day" whereby the Police are invited to the program to listen to students - and researchers - present their findings from crime and Police-based research. Again, this will not only strengthen external cooperation but will also support the Police's goal of research-based police work and provide important experience and contacts for students and indeed researchers (see CV – Societal contacts for more examples).

I have also extended the program's outreach by inviting in a wider range of presenters at the yearly "Current Work Life" which I organize. This seminar is attended by invited speakers, program alumni and, in 2021 it was attended by over 120 students (see Appendix M). This seminar has traditionally focused on representatives from various authorities however I have opened this net to include, for instance, the private sector and NGOs in order to broaden the range of career options presented to students and increase their understanding of how criminology can be used. Presentations are later published on Canvas and contact details for all

presenters are provided with students invited to contact presenters for more information thus creating networking possibilities.

I believe I have now grown into this leadership role and I have received positive feedback from staff members who experience less conflict between the departments and a good atmosphere at meetings (all of which inspired me to take on another leadership role as Chairperson for the University Network for Criminological Studies during 2020-2021). I have also refined my cooperation skills further as Contact Secretary for the Scandinavian Research Council for Criminology, where I contribute to creating and maintaining contacts between researchers and practitioners in Scandinavia and circulating current information on news, publications, and events.

I endeavor to teach, and communicate research, in a range of settings (see CV). For instance, I give lessons at Spyken, a local upper secondary school, on emotion sociology and criminology, and in 2020 I organized lectures for one of their classes held at the Department of Sociology. This, together with my participation in the "Doctoral students in learning" project (see Appendix S), has enabled me to reflect upon how best to communicate my research to younger audiences and, yet again, the importance of context and pre-knowledge when creating learning moments. For instance, in my lesson on emotion sociology for a lower secondary school I began by discussing what emotions are, what norms are, and included examples they could relate to such as from the cartoon *Inside Out.* I also needed to find ways to keep their attention by showing films, having discussions, and including visual aids more frequently than I would usually in a university lecture (which is around every 20 minutes) (Appendix R). I also adjusted my terminology and style of delivery. I found this to be a challenging process but incredibly rewarding. I hope to return to this in the future, in particular by visiting and inviting in schools where fewer children progress to higher education in order to present it as an achievable alternative. To this I can add that I have also presented my research in a number of non-academic settings (see CV) placing similar demands on flexibility and contextualization.

Final Comments

My teaching philosophy centers on student-centered, reflexive teaching – always moving forwards, always open to new ideas and approaches. I believe in fairness and openness, curiosity and respect, meticulousness and approachability, and appropriate amount of fun. I tell my students that however good they are, they can always become better. I try and live by this with regards to my own teaching too, keeping the educational spark alive because how can I spark others if my own flame has died out?

References

Abeysekera, Lakmal, and Phillip Dawson. 2015. "Motivation and cognitive load in the flipped classroom: definition, rationale and a call for research." *Higher Education Research & Development* 34 (1):1-14. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2014.934336.

Andrews, T. M., Leonard M: J., C. A. Colgrove, and S. T. Kalinowski. 2011. "Active learning not associated with student learning in a random sample of college biology courses." *Life Sciences Education* 19:394-405.

Biggs, J., and K. F. Collis. 1982. *Evaluating the Quality of Learning: The SOLO Taxonomy (Structure of Observed Learning Outcomes)*. New York: Academic Press.

Biggs, J., and C. Tang. 2011. *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Bisson, Christian, and John Luckner. 1996. "Fun in Learning: The pedagogical role of fun in adventure education " *Journal of Experiential Education*. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177%2F105382599601900208.

Black-Schaffer, D. 2013. Flipping the classroom in an Introductory IT Course by David Black-Schaffer. edited by KTH Media Production. Youtube.

Blumer, Herbert. 1959. *Symbolic Interactionism*. Englewoods Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* London: Routledge.

Brabrand, C., and B. Dahl. 2009. "Using the SOLO taxonomy to analyze competence progression of university science curricula." *Higher Education* 58:531-549.

Chlup, Dominique T., and Tracy E. Collins. 2010. "Breaking the Ice: Using Ice-breakers and Re-energizers with Adult Learners." *Adult Learning* 21 (3-4):34-39. doi: 10.1177/104515951002100305.

Collins, R. 2004. *Interaction Ritual Chains*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cooley, Charles H. 1922. *Human Nature and the Social Order*. New York: Scribner.

Flower, Lisa. 2018. "Loyalty Work: Emotional interactions of defence lawyers in Swedish courtrooms." Doctorate, Sociology, Lund University (120).

Flower, Lisa. 2019. *Interactional Justice: The role of emotions in the performance of loyalty*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Fox, P. 2006. "Personal theories of teaching." *Studies in Higher Education* 8 (2):151-163.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.

Hattie, J. A. C., and G. T. L. Brown. 2004. *Cognitive Processes in asTTle: The SOLO Taxonomy*. asTTle Technical Rport #43: University of Aukland/Ministry of Education.

Herreid, Clyde Freeman, and Nancy A. Schiller. 2013. "Case Studies and the Flipped Classroom." *Journal of College Science Teaching* 42 (5):62-66.

Hochschild, Arlie Russel. 1983. *The Managed Heart: The Commercialization of Human Feeling*. 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hochschild, Arlie Russel. 1983/2003. *The Managed Heart - Commercialization of Human Feelings*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Lachman, Sheldon J. 1997. "Learning is a Process: Toward an Improved Definition of Learning." *The Journal of Psychology* 131 (5):477-480. doi: 10.1080/00223989709603535.

Lee, Elizabeth M. 2017. "''Where People Like Me Don't Belong'': Faculty Members from Low-socioeconomic-status Backgrounds." *Sociology of Education* 90 (3):197-212. doi: 10.1177/0038040717710495.