

**SPA2116/4116 VÅR-09**  
**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/SPA2116/>

All points (1.-10) were treated except points 2 (“Hvordan kan vi beskrive språklig skapte "mentale bilder" (i kognitiv lingvistikk og narratologi?)”) and 8 (“Hvilken rolle spiller lingvistisk "ikonisitet" i litteratur?”) – for lack of time. It is possible that points 2 and 8 are taken up again when the course is taught in the future. The course is planned again for next fall.

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

For SPA4116, all 4 students (of 4 undervisningsmeldt) took the exam. The marks were 1 A, 1 B, 1 C and 1 F. Given the good marks of three students, the one F caused some concern. However, the “oppmann” confirmed the “F”. No formal complaint was lodged.

For SPA2116, 5 students (of 6 “und. meldt”) took the exam. The marks were 1 A, 2 B’s, 1 C and 1 D.

Most students were very motivated: they worked hard during the semester (in class and in tutorials) to improve their marks.

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

Most students seem to have liked the linguistically and rhetorically oriented feedback on their two mid-term papers. Several students mentioned (and most agreed) that it was the first time they got this kind of feedback. This is reflected in “6.6. Jeg har fått nyttig tilbakemelding”: for SPA4116, 3 students respond “enig” and 1 “litt enig” (of 4); for SPA2116 all 2 respond “enig”. They asked me, moreover, if in future times I could dedicate one week to composition exercises. I will of course continue to give detailed feedback but I cannot dedicate much more time to writing exercises. I need my time for the proper content of the course. However, there is obviously a general need for such kind of feedback.

I also held an unofficial mid-term evaluation. Most students were positive, although they added it was a difficult course. A 4000-student reflects this difficult-but-rewarding argument in the official evaluation: “Emnet stilte høye krav og læreren ga veldig mye av seg selv. Ekstremt spennende og engasjerende”.

Most students also agreed with the examination form: on “7.3 Jeg ville ønsket en annen vurderingsform på emnet”, only 1 answers “enig” and 5 answer “uenig”. A level-2000 student

explains this in words: “Hvordan mappeeksamen er lagt opp er kjempebra, for det er garantert den best måten å lære på”.

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

I see two problems.

Firstly, there is the fact that level-2000 and level-4000 take this course together. There will always be level-4000 students who feel “slowed down” and level-2000 students who feel “overpowered”, especially in the seminar discussions. One 4000-student indeed comments: “Jeg føler at dette emnet ikke burde være både på 2000 og 4000-nivå”. However, I believe this problem was not insurmountable because the group dynamics was good. This seems reflected in class attendance: there was a constant presence of 8 or 9 students. In an unofficial mid-term evaluation, one student suggested to work more in pairs or groups of 3, to reduce the anxiety of level-2000 students. I followed that suggestion but I am not sure that it worked better than the group discussions in which I co-determine who has to answer. Nonetheless, I am grateful for the suggestion and will try to think of new activities suitable for work in small groups.

Secondly, one student complained that she had to read English theoretical texts (see also section 5, below). I told her that learning to read academic English is part of being an academic person in the 21st century, whichever the field of specialization.

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

It was the first time I taught this course. It was labor-intensive: only *English* handbooks exist of cognitive poetics, and the existing scholarly literature applies its concepts to English texts only. Therefore, I have had to develop the topics, translate the concepts into Spanish, find and analyze appropriate Spanish texts, make detailed powerpoint presentations, and write an exemplary student research paper. Next time, I will focus on *writing out* several powerpoint presentations in handbook-format chapters.

#### **6. Forslag til tiltak for å forbedre emnet**

This is an interdisciplinary course – crossing linguistics and poetics. Therefore, and in order to increase the number of students, it would be good if the course were also open to master students of “Spanskspråklig litteratur”. More students would allow me, perhaps, to split up the course in a 2000-level version and a 4000-level version. This would solve problem 1 mentioned under section 4. However, the academic teachers responsible for that master are reluctant to include it in their course package.