

SPA4117 VÅR-2011
PERIODISK EMNERAPPORT

Emneansvarlig: Jeroen Vandaele
Andre lærer: /

1. Beskrivelse av og kommentarer til eventuelle avvik fra og endringer i emnebeskrivelsen

The course contents are described here:

<http://www.uio.no/studier/emner/hf/ilos/SPA4117/index.xml>

All points were treated except “narrativ sammenheng” – for lack of time.

2. Kommentarer til kvantitative gjennomføringsdata på emnet (karakterer, stryk, frafall)

For SPA4116, of 11 students (=of 11 “und. meldt”) 8 took the exam (=“Eks. Meldt”), and all passed (“Best.”). The average mark was C, the marks were generally spread (1A, 2 B’s, 3 C’s, 2 D’s). No complaint was lodged.

Most students were very motivated: they worked hard during the semester (in class and in tutorials) to improve their marks. Some students delivered excellent non-obligatory works.

3. Er det indikasjoner/eksempler på særlig god kvalitet? Hvordan er de fulgt opp?

I was particularly happy with the following student remark in the evaluation: “Det kan være vanskelig å vite hva man kan faktisk forske på innenfor språkvitenskapene. Når jeg treffer folk fra nordisk eller andre språkprogrammer føler jeg meg sjelden som en språkviter, men dette emnet har gitt meg bedre forståelse av ting jeg har lest og lært tidligere, i forbindelse med emner og arbeidet med masteroppgaven.”

All students agreed with the examination form: on “7.3 Jeg ville ønsket en annen vurderingsform på emnet”, all 5 answer “enig”.

As with my 4116 course, most students seem to have liked the linguistically and rhetorically oriented feedback on their two mid-term papers. This is reflected in “6.6. Jeg har fått nyttig tilbakemelding”: 4 students respond “enig” and 1 “litt enig” (of 5).

All 5 students state that they have attended between 70% and 100% of the classes, which is also my impression: most of those who took the exam came to class. See also point 5.4: “følge seminar- eller gruppe” receives 2 times “god”, 2 times “svært god” and 1 “ikke relevant”. Also, nobody states that my teaching was not “engasjerende” or not “strukturert”.

As an extra to my courses, I invited an ex master student to come and present her course-related MA thesis.

4. Er det indikasjoner på sviktende kvalitet? Hvordan er de fulgt opp?

I think I use the best text book on the Hispanic market, published by an established Spanish academic publisher of linguistic text books and recommended by Teun Van Dijk, an authority figure in the field. It is true, however, that some English-written handbooks may be still a bit better. Nonetheless, 4 students write for the “pensum”: “god”, 1 “svært god” (5.1). I recommend the students secondary, non-obligatory reading in English.

One criticism of 2 students concerns “semestersidene for emnet har til enhver tid vært oppdaterte og gitt god informasjon”: They er “unenige”.

Another criticism is formulated in words by a student: “Den første oppgaven kommer veldig tidlig in kursrekken og det gjorde det vanskelig å vite hva man kunne skrive om.” That task comes after the fifth course week. I will try to give more specific examples of possible topics. This may diminish anxiety. (On the other hand, this may also diminish creativity.)

5. Hva er det fokusert på i denne perioden mht utvikling av studiekvalitet?

It was the first time I taught this course, which is always labor-intensive, although a decent Spanish text book fortunately exists and helped me. It was my work to find and develop case studies, to develop powerpoints, to re-explain the ideas expressed in the text book, and to offer complementary viewpoints.

6. Forslag til tiltak for å forbedre emnet

I will try to keep inviting ex master students to present the discourse analytic MA theses.