From Mentoring to Collaborating: Fostering Undergraduate Research in History

Christopher R. Corley
Minnesota State University, Mankato

IN AN AGE when most university leaders and their history departments are trying to optimize faculty productivity despite budget reductions, utilizing faculty time to collaborate with undergraduates on faculty research projects might be considered a luxury rather than a need. On the other hand, a decade of scholarship on teaching and learning in higher education has outlined the student benefits of undergraduate research. Despite the increased interest in undergraduate research across the United States, humanists generally, and historians more specifically, have been slow to provide leadership in the movement. For historians, the impediments appear to be more than economic, and we have been slow to overcome them despite the fact that, as a discipline, history is well-placed to foster collaborative enterprises with undergraduates.

Interest in undergraduate research in the United States has existed since the 1960s, with momentum almost entirely emerging from the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields. The first center for undergraduate research emerged at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1969, and other universities followed suit in the next decade. A group of chemists developed the widely respected Council on Undergraduate Research in 1978. The National Science Foundation created its first Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REU) program in the 1980s.[1] Although scientists led the movement, departments throughout

university communities are embracing it. *Undergraduate research* is usually considered a short-hand term for the more inclusive *undergraduate research, scholarship, and creative activity*, defined as "an inquiry or investigation conducted by an undergraduate in collaboration with a faculty mentor that makes an original intellectual or creative contribution to the discipline."[2] Osborn and Karukstis argue that the four main characteristics of undergraduate research are mentorship, originality, acceptability, and dissemination.[3] Both definitions are inclusive of the humanities, but for several decades, humanists did not appear to take much of an interest. To my knowledge, neither the National Endowment for the Humanities nor the American Historical Association,[4] nor any of their affiliated societies, sponsor equivalent research experiences for undergraduates.

Historians do not appear to be opposed, in principle, to undergraduate research and many understand the benefits that accrue from it. Indeed, history journals have published interesting examples of undergraduate-faculty research collaboration at Davidson College and at Virginia Tech.[5] Nonetheless, there is no denying that the undergraduate research movement has been slower to develop in history and related disciplines.[6] At my institution, a public comprehensive university, five years of the university's annual Undergraduate Research Conference had passed before a single student from the History Department presented their work in 2004. This same trend occurs at liberal arts colleges; recent analyses of the National Survey of Student Engagement suggest that humanities students at liberal arts colleges "reported fewer experiences working with a faculty member on a research project" than did students in other disciplines.[7] The common perceptions among scholars appear to be, first, that fundamental disciplinary barriers exist in undergraduate research in the humanities that differentiate the process from what occurs in the sciences or even some of the social and behavioral sciences, such as psychology. Second, the process itself drains too much time and energy away from the major tasks of teaching and research.

In this essay, I argue that historians should join their colleagues in the sciences in creating supportive environments for undergraduate research. Despite the apparent hurdles to overcome, historians can devise effective undergraduate research experiences that mimic those occurring in the chemistry, biology, and psychology labs across campus. Like the sciences, undergraduate research in history can be successfully implemented in ways that positively advance a scholar's research and teaching agenda. My personal examples consider how to collaborate with undergraduates in the field of pre-modern European history, specifically the social history of France before 1800, an area of study perhaps more difficult for faculty to incorporate undergraduates into because of the specialized linguistic

training required to pursue research. Moreover, these examples will illustrate how undergraduate research typically fostered within a selective liberal arts college or a Carnegie Research I university can be facilitated at a comprehensive state university—an academic context typically perceived by faculty to be least amenable to undergraduate research, and one that is currently under fire from critics of higher education for not doing enough to engage its students.

Undergraduate Research and Student Engagement

For at least two decades, higher education institutions in the United States have been criticized for insufficiently carrying out their missions. Some critics focus on the difficulties universities have in retaining their students, while others point out that the students who are retained take far too long to graduate.[8] Commentators have criticized universities and their individual programs for not having clear learning outcomes for their students and/or for insufficiently preparing them for their careers following graduation.[9] A decisive moment arrived in 1998, when the Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University published *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities*.[10] The report found fault with the Carnegie Research I universities for not doing enough to engage undergraduate students in the institutions' avowed main strengths—their research enterprises. In 2002, the Association of American Colleges and Universities advocated for more focus on undergraduate research as a key means to engage students, and in 2007, it recommended undergraduate research as a key element in its report, *College Learning for the New Global Century*.[11] In 2005, the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) included undergraduate research as an indicator "on its enriching educational experience benchmark of effective educational practice."[12] For the past decade, colleges and universities—from research to comprehensive to liberal arts and, most recently, community colleges—have responded by developing centers for undergraduate research, by encouraging more undergraduate-faculty collaboration, by showcasing the research products at undergraduate fairs, festivals, and celebrations, and by creating journals of undergraduate research that highlight the most impressive work their students have created.[13]

These developments emerged alongside a growing research-based movement in teaching and learning methodologies that searches for ways to enhance student learning both inside and outside the classroom. Set alongside and even packaged with increasing opportunities for participation in learning communities, service-learning, and study abroad, undergraduate research provides one of many significant practices through which students

can deepen their educational experiences on their campuses. As one component of a larger corpus of pedagogical approaches, the process of undergraduate research "reflects the features of experiential learning, problem-based learning, and inquiry-based learning—models conducive to student learning and development."[14] The Documenting Effective Educational Practice (DEEP) study, led by George Kuh, showed that institutions with higher graduation rates established effective ways to incorporate undergraduate research into their students' lives—even in the students' first year of study. Kuh wrote that "it is hard to imagine a richer educational setting for student-faculty interaction than working side-by-side with a faculty member on a research project. Students not only observe an expert at work, but they also contribute to that work by applying in-class learning to the research project....Students who worked alongside a faculty member on a research project considered the experience the highlight of their undergraduate career."[15] Similarly, Richard Light's study of undergraduates showed that their most memorable learning experiences occurred outside of the traditional classroom, and often included significant projects in which they were mentored by faculty. One student, reflecting on his research project, wrote, "I was now truly responsible for course planning. I had to take some intellectual leadership....I began to think of this wonderful man [the professor] as my 'personal trainer'....I learned more in this one-on-one experience about history, about literature, and about my own capacities to stretch and grow, than in any other experience here I can think of."[16] Light argues that "one-on-one working relationships between students and professors provide opportunities for students to take some responsibility for planning and running academic projects. These experiences teach students something they may not be able to learn in standard classes."[17]

The scholarship of teaching and learning has also shown that undergraduate research helps socialize the students to the life of a university campus. Students who participate in undergraduate research have higher satisfaction rates and increased retention rates over other students who only see the learning process through large lecture halls.[18] Students who participate in undergraduate research see—first-hand—the professor as problem-solver and discoverer. Students work through problems. They discover that knowledge creation is never fixed and that the pursuit of knowledge is a community endeavor. They also witness the difficult side of research, including the disruptions and frustrations that accompany it. The students' witness to the pain and the satisfaction that accompanies research most likely humanizes the professor to a degree not previously understood by undergraduates, especially first-generation college students and other "at-risk" student populations.[19]

Undergraduate Research and the Historian

While few historians would criticize the pedagogical, engagement, or socialization benefits of undergraduate research, there are many good reasons why it has not taken off in the field of history in the same way that it has in the hard sciences. The most deeply embedded and complex issue is the culture in which historians are trained: as graduate students, we are taught to believe that historical research is inherently non-collaborative.[20] Stephens and Thumma assert that some historians "feel a certain repugnance toward collaboration of any kind…[and] profess that history is a "solo sport."[21] Many of us developed research projects in relation to those carried out by our mentors, but few of us contributed to their research such that we would co-author an article. Instead, we expanded the field of knowledge that our mentors first paved, and our mentors essentially did the same thing with their mentors. Historical research is thus deemed as something done alone; the monastic scholar sits in archives and various studies while developing the illuminated manuscript that promises to shed new light on the sacred past. For many, literature reviews, historiographic analyses, and conference discussions are as close as we get to research collaboration. As a result, it is rare to see multi-authored works in history, and the culture of solitary historical study is passed from one generation of scholars to the next.[22]

The cultural impediments to collaborative undergraduate research in history feed other, perhaps more apparent, factors in methodology and preparation within the humanities, generally. In an analysis of the problem, Mark Schantz wrote that most humanists believe their work "cannot be neatly segmented for students in tidy ways that research in the natural sciences can."[23] Undergraduates tend not to have attained the specific theoretical or linguistic skills necessary for diving into such a project for a semester or even a year. Only the most highly motivated undergraduates would capably develop these skills within a short period of time. Moreover, the culture of the science laboratory is not easily transferable. Results of historical "experiments" might not be as easily replicated as they are intended to be in a chemistry lab or a psychology experiment.[24] For the most part, humanities research tends to embrace imagination and subjectivity as key components of the development of knowledge.

The final group of impediments is professional, and faculty must weigh these impediments carefully as they consider the benefits of participating in research projects with undergraduates. Simply put, there are few established professional incentives to work with undergraduates, either individually or in small groups. Indeed, Stephens and Thumma note that

there are "serious disincentives" for faculty seeking to collaborate with undergraduates.[25] Faculty already have extended obligations, and spending individual time with students in addition to teaching large classes with heightened service expectations is not on most faculty's "to-do" lists.[26] In an era of declining resources for academic departments, few course releases or other forms of compensation are available for faculty who work with students. Essentially, faculty who choose to engage in collaborative undergraduate research accept an uncompensated teaching overload. At many institutions, the current administrative culture of rewards and incentives for faculty are based on research production and grants, rather than quality teaching. Teaching effectiveness is often measured in credit production or student evaluations, rather than in student demonstration of learning outcomes, and budgets (and faculty lines) are adjusted accordingly. In short, it will take open-minded colleagues, deans, and provosts to recognize the contributions faculty engaging in undergraduate research make to the culture of student engagement at their universities.[27]

In summary, while we can accept that undergraduate research is good for the students, historians have yet to make it an enterprise useful to the scholar of history. However, collaborations with students can contribute in innovative ways to the success of historians if the faculty are willing to embrace undergraduates as a mutually beneficial resource rather than a drain on their time.

Lessons from an Undergraduate History Lab

To overcome the hurdles associated with undergraduate research in history while contributing to the institutional momentum that fosters more undergraduate research collaboration and advancing their own teaching and research agendas in the process, historians might attempt to follow the model of their peers in the sciences. In other words, like scientists, the historian could indeed subdivide a complex research problem and then form a seminar as a "research team" or "lab team" in which students work together and with the faculty member to investigate a significant issue. Ideally, the faculty member would be doing research alongside the students, developing a bibliography and readings with them instead of for them. In this way, historians could consider their seminar rooms, libraries, and even archives their "science labs." As V. Daniel Rogers wrote:

> These are the places where we discover new information, test hypotheses, and uncover new fields of study....Just as undergraduates in the research lab learn skills and develop habits that will serve them in graduate school and beyond, the careful weighing of sources, meticulous categorizing of information, and the discipline to run down leads in an archive serve

humanities students as well. An important corollary is that just as universities and colleges provide start-up funds to equip laboratories in ways that encourage undergraduate research in the sciences, funds need to be available to get students to our "labs", the archives where much of our research happens.[28]

The most rewarding way to do undergraduate research is to get the students involved in direct archival research and to treat the experience as a lab with theories to be tested and problems to be solved. The conceptualization and operation of the projects might take many forms, depending on the faculty's goals and their context. Todd McDorman, for example, outlined three frames through which faculty could integrate undergraduate research into their courses. The first, called "Faculty-Driven Collaboration," has the faculty member designing a research project "while also relying on the students to supply meaningful contributions in the construction of the final project."[29] In McDorman's example, he outlined a research problem with a series of weekly readings for the students that tackled a significant problem. Over the course of the semester, he drafted an introduction to a research essay while the students each provided a case study. Although he had to continue the project after the semester ended, he eventually published the piece.[30] A second working frame is the "Faculty-Modeling Collaboration," in which a professor would design a project and include the entire class and work through the semester in a writer's workshop model. This resembles the history capstone seminar course, but in this case, the professor must personally exhibit the research process for the students by working through their part of the project as well, rather than just sitting as a passive but omnipotent bystander. The third model, "Student-Driven Collaboration," which is akin to "independent study," is the concept most historians are familiar with. One takes especially promising students from a course and encourages them to further develop their papers for presentation. In this framework, the student is responsible for most of the work and the faculty member serves as a supervisor.

In what follows, I will provide four lessons—mostly drawn from personal experience—for historians wishing to more concretely involve their students in undergraduate research. This will be followed by suggestions for how participating in undergraduate research can make faculty more, not less, effective in their day-to-day work. In the ten years that I have been teaching, I have mentored thirteen undergraduate students who completed research projects and then made public presentations of their results. To use McDorman's classification, seven of the projects were student-driven and six were faculty-driven. My ideal teaching situation eventually would be to merge the processes into a "faculty-modeling" situation that can be integrated regularly into a seminar.

I came upon the realization that I'd like to incorporate undergraduates into my own research a few summers after I completed my doctoral work during a research trip to Dijon, France. I met an acquaintance who happened to be in the archives for a few days. Over lunch, we discussed our jobs and our current projects and he mentioned that he had an undergraduate student simultaneously working on another aspect of his research project—in Paris. After a few seconds of stunned silence, I asked how he was able to bring the student to France. He explained that his private liberal arts college offered summer stipends for research trips to a few of their best students who wanted to work on undergraduate research projects with their professors. Although I couldn't imagine my institution being able to afford such an enterprise, our conversation in a cozy French café encouraged me to think about how to construct that experience for students of more modest means.

My first lesson involved identifying how to bring archival sources to my campus so it was within reach of my students, because none of them would be travelling to Paris on the institution's dime in the conceivable future. I decided that if I couldn't bring students to Dijon's archives, I could do my best to bring the archives to them. For the first time in my career, I intentionally conducted my own research with undergraduates in mind. When I came across documents of interest, I digitally photographed and catalogued them for future use with students. The first documents I photographed were eighteenth-century institutional registers—bureaucratic documents that extended over a period of time. Since the documents were far too detailed and lengthy for me to take notes on while in France, I photographed them for consultation in the United States. Records of youth abandoned at Dijon's local hospital, for example, included the names, family information, and frequently some justification for each young person's entrance into the institution.[31] Tax records recorded the name of the resident, their occupation, and their tax burden.[32] Revolutionary-era censuses recorded individual households and professions.[33] I even took photographs of extensive criminal court cases that involved young people.[34] These sources were complementary to my research, but would take me a long time to review in the archives on my own. With short research trips to France, photographing these records for later use proved the best use of my time. This first lesson taught me to figure out how to optimize my own research time and efforts by enabling my students to help review the archival documents.

My second lesson involved how to identify, recruit, and motivate the most promising students to work with me. In brief, faculty courses provide the best recruiting pool. I routinely ask students to complete a short survey at the beginning of the term, in which I pose several questions

about other history courses they've taken, their interests in Europe, and the extent of their second language competency. Students who have identified experience in French often get an e-mail or note from me indicating my own interest in getting students involved in my research. When I describe myself and my teaching and research to the students during the first day of class, I note that I enjoy working on my research with undergraduates and invite them to contact me if they would like to discuss further opportunities. I take other opportune moments in the semester to raise the different research opportunities available for the students. And when the course materials overlap with my research approaches, I frequently highlight the different ways one could work with interesting source material for social and cultural historians, as well as the previous work my students have done in their research projects. Near the end of the semester, I send all talented students a note on department letterhead congratulating them for their skills and performance. In the letters, I describe the skill sets students in history develop and the diverse professional opportunities that exist for these students. Prospective research students also receive a letter that describes their skills as I have ascertained them, indicates that I value these skill sets, and invites them to collaborate on a potential research project with me in the future. When students express interest, we set up a meeting to discuss the opportunities. Through the conversations, I learn more about their scholarly interests, their French skills, and why they decided to discuss the opportunity further. I encourage students with elementary French skills to investigate coursework that would further their language competency.

The students who end up working with me almost always share certain characteristics. Most students express interest because they have had some French and are interested in France's history. Some have visited France during a high school trip or on a vacation with their families. Others enjoyed learning about social history in their history courses and wanted to get more of a hands-on experience with it. All of the six students who collaborated in my past "faculty-driven" projects were minoring or majoring in history, and several had at least considered graduate school as an option after they completed their undergraduate experiences. Historians who would like to make undergraduate research a component of their professional lives can select and motivate the students most likely to collaborate on research projects from the pool of students who sit before them every day.

My third lesson is that historians should step back from their projects and consider how they might be segmented and parsed into manageable yet complementary pieces. Faculty who conceive of their own research in multiple, related projects that can be accomplished by a novice in ten

weeks will find it much easier to develop collaborative enterprises with undergraduate students. My projects are designed to be complementary to my main path of research, and I arrange them according to ability level. So, for example, students with one or two semesters of French would be invited to work with tax or census records—the sources most amenable to introductory work. Students with more than two semesters of French might have the opportunity to work with the orphanage records, and students who are working on a minor or major in French might be introduced to the court cases. I also have projects that are based on printed and translated works readily available in our library, but so far, no students have taken me up on these. All of them want to work with what they call the "real" archival documents. Students are excited about working with manuscripts, and historians should do everything in our power to help the students work with them. But the important point is that faculty need to design projects that won't overwhelm the students.

Lesson four is that faculty should organize and design a collaborative research project over several semesters, including a summer if possible. My first few collaborative attempts were designed to be done in one semester, and they did not work out as well. Only the most concise projects could be carried out in one semester. It takes the students some time to develop the skills to use the documents effectively and to build knowledge of the secondary literature. My most successful collaborations have occurred over the academic year, and students frequently take two credits of advanced independent study in history each semester. Faculty should pre-design the project to be broken up into multiple stages with mutually understood timelines and project deadlines. These can be outlined in a syllabus that includes weekly or biweekly meetings, clear project deadlines, and if the collaboration is credit-based, some mutually agreeable grading method.

Successful collaborative projects will share a certain rhythm and almost always work through an academic year and even a summer. In September, the students and I first review the research and dissemination process as a whole and discuss what the research arc might look like.[35] Then, I slowly introduce the documents and paleography to the students while they begin their background secondary reading. I provide some of the basic bibliography, but expect the students to build upon it with further research of their own. By the end of October, each student should have developed a question or problem to be solved, at least in part through the use of the primary sources. The question emerges after reviewing a certain number of documents and secondary sources and working through the issues with me in meetings.

I coordinate the projects with the university's cycle for undergraduate research grants, conference proposals, and conference presentations. Once

the student has ascertained the research problem, he or she can then develop a grant proposal for their project. In the fall, Minnesota State, Mankato sponsors an undergraduate research competition in which students can apply for funding for their projects. Awards of various sizes are provided for supplies, student stipends, or both. I use the university deadline to help the students develop a grant proposal for their project. Since, other than travel, historians' research expenses can be insignificant compared to the lab sciences, my students request supply funds to purchase expensive monographs that the library does not own, primarily because our own departmental purchasing funds are so paltry. When the research project is complete, the students and I agree to donate the books to the library's collection so that future generations of students might use them.

From October through early March, we further develop the research for the project, meeting weekly or biweekly, depending on the needs of the student. The deadline for campus research symposium abstracts is usually in late February or early March, so we target that date for completing the research and developing an outline. In March, the students develop the outline and translate the project into a PowerPoint presentation for the university's undergraduate research symposium. In April, they move from outline and presentation to a conference-length paper (ten to twelve pages), some of which are then published in the university's online journal of undergraduate research during the summer. Organizing a reasonable and attainable timeframe that aligns with the institutional framework is crucial for the success of the projects. Students become frustrated if their work extends into a summer session without any advance notice or planning, so it is important to break projects down into achievable components.

Benefits to Faculty

While at first glance this may seem like extra, unnecessary, uncompensated work to many faculty, I see it as a practical and effective way to continue thinking about my research amid the myriad of other faculty obligations within a teaching- and service-intensive university setting. My colleague, Kim Contag, has written:

> Mentoring an undergraduate student [can] parallel the intellectual collaboration between professor and graduate student and might serve to strengthen the professor's research agenda....Many professors find it difficult to conduct major research projects during the academic year and reserve the bulk of their research for the summer months when they are not teaching. By mentoring students during the academic year, a professor can continue to both facilitate an ongoing research project in which they are interested and prepare an exceptional student to participate in the community of scholars.[36]

At Minnesota State, Mankato, faculty have a twenty-four credit annual teaching load, and any chance faculty have to interweave discussions of their research interests within the working day seems time well spent. Collaborating on research projects with undergraduates allows faculty with heavy teaching loads to further develop and think about their research.

Scheduling an hour or so per week for meetings with students to discuss collaborative research encourages faculty to continue thinking about research projects while entertaining the constantly expanding list of faculty obligations. To this effect, some faculty who also supervise graduate students develop "vertical research teams" in which faculty and graduate students work with undergraduates on a project. This approach has gained popularity in psychology graduate programs, for example. Team meetings, led by the faculty mentor, occur once per week.[37] The complexity of individual projects is related to the students' expertise, but everyone can make a contribution in their own way.

Collaborating with students on research projects can be an efficient and effective use of faculty time in several ways. First, student collaborators can help one begin early investigations into the potential usefulness of the documents that faculty have not yet explored well. For example, with my own larger project on adolescence and family life in early modern France, I knew that there were several types of source materials that I had not taken full advantage of. When I came across tax records or a census in the archives, I photographed them so students and I can consider how the experiences of single women might be illuminated in the documents, something I've been mulling over as a subsequent area of research.[38] Students can help develop research questions with the sources, pursue related secondary material, and posit hypotheses about the significance of the sources. For example, Jessica Nelson and Chad Axvig, both undergraduate students, first investigated the possibility of using Dijon's hospital registers to learn more about youth in eighteenth-century France.[39] Their research culminated that year in a paper provided at a regional history conference. Nelson has gone on to pursue a similar topic for her master's and doctoral studies, and recently published her first piece related to this research.[40] Conducting collaborative research in this manner allows the faculty member to push their research agenda into complementary directions and it allows investigations that one might not be able to pursue on one's own. This is an invaluable use of time for the faculty.

Second, scholars can gain new understanding of their materials because of their discussions and analyses of the documents in collaboration with undergraduate students. If historical insights are framed by new questions, and our questions are framed by our current contexts, who

better to ask insightful questions about the past than our undergraduate students? They come to university with far different personal, social, even political and economic experiences than their forbearers.   Their minds haven't been weighed down by decades of historiographic study, and so they come to their projects with few preconceived notions of, and little respect for, authoritative scholarship. James Gillham, another of my student collaborators, conducted a fairly routine analysis of five years of entrance registers for Dijon's abandoned children. In the process of better understanding the context of child abandonment, Gillham noted that some of the girls were disabled, a fact that, until then, few historians had noted as a significant cause of early modern child abandonment.[41] Disability had been a topic of increasing interest among historians, but I hadn't read much related scholarship at that point in my career. As a result of his questions and analysis, Gillham and I were able to connect his insights with a larger professional discussion on the topic.[42] Did our research definitively prove Gillham's observation about eighteenth-century abandonment? Of course not—but his insight does allow other students to take hypotheses provided by previous projects and test them repeatedly through their own data sets and secondary research.[43]

Third, historians may end up co-authoring pieces as a result of their work with their undergraduates. Inviting students to collaborate with you takes on a whole new level of significance for them when you invite them to co-author a project. At the same time that Gillham and I developed his project, I was invited to provide a teaching case study for a National Endowment for the Humanities project on the global history of childhood.[44] I wasn't sure of the exact course my contribution would make, but working with Gillham at the same time that we were developing insights about disability and child abandonment helped me refine my perspective and develop clear goals. At the same time, I pushed him to consider how faculty at all educational levels might benefit from the insights of our project, and how we could relay that effectively. We drew up outlines for the project, wrote paragraphs and sections together, translated documents, suggested complementary sources, and offered perspectives on subsequent revisions.

Fourth, collaborating on research projects with undergraduates provides useful opportunities to integrate research into courses, thus influencing the education of countless other undergraduate students. Besides the obvious advantages of keeping courses fresh, interesting, and relevant by moving into new areas of investigation, faculty have the unique opportunity to view their sources and research through an undergraduate's eyes prior to incorporating the material more formally into a course. One can sense at which points the students are most excited, and which documents most

interest them. My students' examinations of tax registers, for example, helped influence me to use the lens of marital status and single women as an organizing analytical theme throughout my advanced undergraduate "Women in European History" course. Undergraduate research projects can be used as foundations for various classroom exercises. Lectures can integrate examples of the students' work. I've worked with undergraduates to translate sections of primary documents for use in future classes. Moreover, simply asking one's undergraduate research collaborators how they would transfer the insights gained from their research into a classroom sparks interesting ideas that a professor might not come to on his or her own. Gillham suggested using institutional registers of abandoned children to inspire students to conduct further research and create short-story historical fiction as a semester assignment. This class activity emerged entirely from our undergraduate research collaboration.[45] I never would have integrated this into my "Social History of Preindustrial Europe" course without his assistance.

Conclusion

Historians and other humanists or social scientists might respond that their capstone seminars or even individual honors thesis options provide obvious and more time-efficient solutions to the problems and opportunities outlined in this essay. To them, undergraduate research occurs in a formal class or seminar paper, perhaps with further mentorship after the course has ended; it is not something practiced regularly with students outside of class. Moreover, individual attention to students is more usefully provided to graduate students (although faculty time with such students is also uncompensated and occurs above and beyond the graduate seminar). In other words, historians might believe we "do" undergraduate research all the time—through term papers and class projects. Are these students not undergraduate researchers, too?

This counterargument has some merit. Capstone seminars generally enroll fewer students, are taught in-load, and allow the faculty more choice in their topic and scope than do other advanced courses. Professors can thus align their own research interests within the seminar model while incorporating undergraduate research pedagogies and methods for all students nearing graduation. The seminar also provides an ideal setting through which to assess student learning and conduct analyses for program evaluation. There are many benefits to the capstone course, which is why so many history departments have moved to it over the past three decades.

However, one of the most important virtues of the undergraduate research movement as witnessed in some other disciplines throughout the university

community is true *collaboration* between professor and students on a research topic of significance. Is a capstone seminar on the Renaissance, Absolutism, or the Enlightenment fulfilling significant collaborative and engagement characteristics of undergraduate research when the class reads a few common books, the students choose their individual research projects, and they develop their research in relative isolation from one another while the professor serves as a consultant? It is not unknown for a professor leading a capstone seminar to meet with the students once or twice over a two-month period, mid-semester, when the students are "working on their own research." While such a course might have virtues in its own right, the important element of student-faculty collaboration is missing. As Stephens and Thumma wrote, "the key for us was to shift the object and relationship from mentoring to collaboration....we followed a model that promoted working together."[46] In order for a capstone course to align with undergraduate research characteristics and to have the same learning and engagement outcomes, it must be designed very carefully by the historian who conceives of the class as an opportunity to collaborate with the students. As Wertheimer has explained, the scholar should "be as committed to the group project as you expect your students to be. They will make the course a top priority only if they see you doing so."[47] In the model advanced by Wertheimer, Stephens, and Thumma, and here in this essay, the professor is both research team leader *and* collaborator.

Notes

1.   Shouping Hu, Kathyrine Scheuch, Robert A. Schwartz, and Joy Gaston Gayles, *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: Engaging Students in Research and Creative Activities* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2008), 16.

2.   T. J. Wenzel, "What is Undergraduate Research?" *Council on Undergraduate Research Quarterly* 17, no. 4 (June 1997): 163.

3.   Jeffrey M. Osborn and Kerry K. Karukstis, "The Benefits of Undergraduate Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity," in *Broadening Participation in Undergraduate Research: Fostering Excellence and Enhancing the Impact*, ed. Mary K.

Boyd and Jodi Wesemann (Washington, D.C.: Council on Undergraduate Research, 2009), 41-42.

4.   The American Historical Association awards the Raymond J. Cunningham Prize for Best Article by an Undergraduate. The award requires that the article has been published in a history department journal. See <http://www.historians.org/prizes/cunningham.cfm>, for example. Phi Alpha Theta, the American national history honor society, offers regional and national conferences for undergraduates, but does not advocate explicitly for faculty-undergraduate research collaboration.

5.   John Wertheimer, "The Collaborative Research Seminar," *Journal of American History* 88, no. 4 (March 2002): 1476-1481; Robert Stephens and Josh Thumma, "Faculty-Undergraduate Collaboration in Digital History at a Public Research University," *The History Teacher* 38, no. 4 (August 2005): 525-542; Robert P. Stephens, Kathleen W. Jones, and Mark V. Barrow, "The Book Project: Engaging History Majors in Undergraduate Research," *The History Teacher* 45, no. 1 (November 2011): 65-80.

6.   Hu, Scheuch, Schwartz, and Gayles, 9-11, 46-47.

7.   Shouping Hu, George Kuh, and Joy Gaston Gayles, "Engaging Undergraduate Students in Research Activities: Are Research Universities Doing a Better Job?" *Innovative Higher Education* 32, no. 3 (October 2007): 171, 174.

8.   William G. Bowen, Matthew M. Chingos, and Michael S. McPherson, *Crossing the Finish Line: Completing College at America's Public Universities* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009).

9.   Derek Bok, *Our Underachieving Colleges: A Candid Look at How Much Students Learn and Why They Should Be Learning More* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006).

10.   Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University, *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities* (Stony Brook, NY: State University of New York-Stony Brook, 1998).

11.   Association of American Colleges and Universities, *College Learning for the New Global Century* (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2007), 61-62.

12.   Hu, Kuh, and Gayles, 175.

13.   Wendy Katkin, "The Boyer Commission Report and Its Impact on Undergraduate Research," in *Valuing and Supporting Undergraduate Research*, ed. Joyce Kinkead (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2003), 19-38.

14.   Hu, Scheuch, Schwartz, and Gayles, viii.

15.   George Kuh, Jillian Kinze, John H. Schuh, and Elizabeth J. Whitt, *Student Success in College: Creating Conditions That Matter* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2005), 214-215.

16.   Richard J. Light, *Making the Most of College: Students Speak Their Minds* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 108.

17.   Ibid.

18.   Osborn and Karukstis, 41-53.

19.   John Ishiyama, "Does Participation in Undergraduate Research Benefit Social Science and Humanities Students?" *College Student Journal* 36, no. 3 (Spring 2002): 380, 385.

20.   Mitchell R. Malachowski, "A Research-Across-the-Curriculum Movement," *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, no. 93, (Spring 2003): 59-60.

21.   Stephens and Thumma, 527.

22.   Hu, Scheuch, Schwartz, and Gayles, 10-11.

23.   Mark S. Schantz, "Undergraduate Research in the Humanities: Challenges and Prospects," *Council on Undergraduate Research Quarterly* 29, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 26.

24.   Hu, Scheuch, Schwartz, and Gayles, 10-11, 41, 71; Ishiyama, 380; Todd McDorman, "Promoting Undergraduate Research in the Humanities: Three Collaborative Approaches," *Council on Undergraduate Research Quarterly* 25, no. 1 (September 2004): 39; V. Daniel Rogers, "Surviving the Culture Shock of Undergraduate Research in the Humanities," *Council on Undergraduate Research Quarterly* 23, no. 3 (March 2003): 133; Schantz, 26; Stephens and Thumma, 527-528.

25.   Stephens and Thumma, 528.

26.   Kimberly Contag, "Mentoring the Undergraduate Scholar/Motivating the Faculty Mentor," in *Reading, Writing, Research: Undergraduate Students as Scholars in Literary Studies*, ed. Laura L. Behling (Washington, D.C.: Council on Undergraduate Research, 2009), 123.

27.   Hu, Scheuch, Schwartz, and Gayles, 41-42, 71.

28.   Rogers, 135.

29.   McDorman, 39.

30.   Steven Hoffbeck, a professor at Minnesota State University, Moorhead, utilized this approach while working on *Swinging for the Fences: Black Baseball in Minnesota* (Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 2005).

31.   Archives départementales de la Côte d'Or (Dijon, France, hereafter ADCO), 118H 1250/7, Registre des enfants de St. Esprit and Bonnets Rouges; and Archives de l'Hôpital de Dijon (Dijon, France, hereafter AHD), F2/1, Registre des admissions à Ste. Anne, 1713-1820.

32.   For example, Archives municipales de Dijon (Dijon, France), L 279, Rôles des tailles de la paroisse Saint Philibert.

33.   For example, ADCO, L 514.

34.   For example, ADCO, B2/360/223.

35.   A good introduction for students can be found in Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*, seventh ed. (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 3-130.

36.   Contag, 118, 123-124.

37.   See, for example, Stephen M. Ritchie and Donna L. Rigano, "Solidarity through Collaborative Research," *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 20, no. 2 (March 2007): 129-150.

38.   Bridgette Heussler, "Single Women and the Early Modern Economy: The Example of Dijon, France," Undergraduate Research Conference (Mankato, Minnesota), April 2006; Megan Turok, "Breaking Social Confinement: An Analysis of Eighteenth-Century Women in the French Economy," Undergraduate Research Conference (Mankato, Minnesota), April 2008.

39.   Jessica Nelson and Chad Axvig, "Adolescent Orphans in Eighteenth-Century France: The Hospital of Dijon," 38th Annual Northern Great Plains History Conference (Fargo, North Dakota), October 2003.

40.   Jessica Nelson, "Gender, Age, and the Abandonment of Children in Eighteenth-Century France," *Journal of the History of Childhood and Youth* 4, no. 1 (Winter 2011): 116-135.

41.   James Gillham, "À cause de son infirmité: Disability at a Girl's Orphanage in Early Modern Dijon, France," Undergraduate Research Conference (Mankato, Minnesota), April 2007.

42.   Catherine Kudlick, "Disability History: Why We Need Another 'Other'," *American Historical Review* 108, no. 3 (June 2003): 763-793; Paul K. Longmore and Lauri Umanksy, eds., *The New Disability History: American Perspectives* (New York: New York University Press, 2001).

43.   In 2010-2011, for example, Emily Timm tested Gillham's hypothesis with another sample from the documents, coming to similar conclusions. Emily Timm, "Causes for Child Abandonment in Eighteenth-Century France," Undergraduate Research Conference (Mankato, Minnesota), April 2011.

44.   Christopher Corley and James Gillham, "Orphanage Records, Early Modern France," in *Children and Youth in History*, Item #121, <http://chnm.gmu.edu/cyh/case-studies/121>.

45.   Ibid.

46.   Stephens and Thumma, 529.

47.   Wertheimer, 1477.