Periodical report for SPR4104, autumn 2014
Diana Santos

1. How did the teaching work?

I think it worked better than in 2013 because it was the second time I gave this course, and also because I did it in English (most of it).

Still, I think there are many things that should be improved (next time), and again as I said last time, since the course is complicated and the students have also to gain proficiency in R one more hour per week would be an absolute improvement.

I invited a British scholar to give two classes, but although he was very good I don't think that this worked very well, because he had a totally different style and because they did not get actual exercises to work with. It was one more source of complexity and difference in an already wide-ranging course.

2. **Gir læringsutbytteformuleringene i emnebeskrivelsen en god beskrivelse...?**

As said in the previous report, being an introduction gives a lot of possibilities. The teacher can always select what she thinks are more important or relevant bits, but of course nobody manages to become a statistical expert after one semester. So, all the examples given are "in some cases", not all!

3. Fungerer emnebeskrivelsen tilfredsstillende?

I hope so. But again, not ALL methods used in the humanities can be taught in one semester.

4. Have you done changes?

Well, in addition to have rewritten all the materials in English, I also changed some of the material that I taught and the list of the articles the students should read.

I also made the qualification works more complex and more encompassing and gave more (optional) exercises every week. This because I had some very good students in the course.

This year I did not rely on USIT to provide an introductory course on R, I did it myself and believe it went well.

5. Suggestions for improvement

The tandem between the pensum books and my own classes is still not working well enough, although I created a document to try to make the bridge between lectures and parts of the books. I must think better on how to use the books in the course or at least mention what are the differences between the three approaches. (The books are wonderful, just each of them follows a totally different teaching strategy and I have a third way...)

To require that the students study together in order to improve their R abilities is a good idea, by then it would be nice thta they had a "kollokviegruppe" with a former student. Could that be arranged?

Finally, although the course does not require any previous course at ILOS/HF, because it deals with a lot of mathematics students should be warned that, the more maths they know, the better. Currently all students at Vgs, irrespective of direction, must have some form of maths, but this was not the case for previous generations. So the "no previous requirements" information on the webpage may seem misleading, if one does not know how to compute an average or draw a straight line in a coordinate system, and has no interest whatsoever to learn it.