

Rapport fra «SVF 8054 Theory of Science End of Term evaluation 2021H»

Innhentede svar pr. 17. november 2021 18:42




- Leverte svar: **13**
- Påbegynte svar: **0**
- Antall invitasjoner sendt: **24**

Med fritekstsvar






Questions concerning background, preparation and contribution

What is your scientific background? *





Please choose only one option.

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Humanities	4	30,8 % 	
Linguistics	3	23,1 % 	
Social sciences	6	46,2 % 	
Else	0	0 %	

How much of the required readings had your read before the course started? *

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
None	2	15,4 % 	
Less than 25%	2	15,4 % 	
25-50%	4	30,8 % 	
More than 50%	2	15,4 % 	
Almost All/All	3	23,1 % 	

How much of the required readings had you read by the time the course ended? *

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
None	0	0 %	
Less than 25%	2	15,4 % 	
25-50%	3	23,1 % 	
More than 50%	4	30,8 % 	
Almost All/All	4	30,8 % 	





In case your answer was not 'Almost all/All', please explain why this was the case: *

- I was on paternity leave until just a few days before part 2 of the course started. I managed to read enough to write a draft paper, but had to leave some of the reading list for later.
- Because I have had other courses to prepare as well.
- I read all of the readings...
- It was too much to read (around 700 or 800 pages) and I did not have the time to read it all.
- N/A
- I did my best to read most of the materials before the seminars
- I am currently in process of completing all the required reading, had not enough time to do it during the course due to work activities (had several conferences and seminars)
- Time constraints
- An amount of literature to read.
- I read almost all the common readings, but for the specialization I did not have time to read more than about half of the course material. I did however watch the lectures over the specialization material before the seminar.
- The reading list is rather long and overwhelming.
- I read the readings that seemed most important generally, and then focused on the readings that was most relevant to my paper.
- The course coincided with other important work, so it was hard to follow up the way I ideally would have. However I made an effort in reading near the end, and found this also useful because of a lot of thoughts from the lectures helped me understand.

How would you evaluate your own contribution (i.e. course attendance; reading literature; preparing for




lectures; active participation) to the course? *

1: very low; 5: very high

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1	0	0 %	
2	1	7,7 % 	
3	4	30,8 % 	
4	7	53,8 % 	
5	1	7,7 % 	

Questions concerning the common lectures**How would you rate the lectures? ***

1: poor; 5: excellent




Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1	0	0 %	
2	0	0 %	
3	1	7,7 % 	
4	8	61,5 % 	
5	4	30,8 % 	

Please explain your rating: *

- Thorough lecturer who elaborated well with examples and with good structure and progression.
- The common lecture was fantastic in terms of delivery. Fredrik is a fantastic tutor and it's very commendable that he could hold an 8 hour lecture on philosophy of science. However, my primary concern is with the **cramming of the course material to fit into a two days seminar**. Judging by the materials that we had to study for the course, two days is not enough. It felt a bit rushed and was very difficult to sit down and contemplate with so much information input in our head. What is philosophy without contemplation? That is why I have rated the course 3.
- Very nice lectures, but it **should have been one day with common and two days with specialization**.
- **They were too intense. Instead of 2 full days**, it would have been **better to have 4 half day**, for example. Otherwise, I would have given a 5, because the lecturer presented the material in a very, very good way.
- Fredrik did really well in his explanations and he kept the energy levels high throughout the lectures. The readings cleared up a lot of things for me.
- The topics were presented in a way that they could be understood by everyone even if when the students' background in philosophy was limited.
- The lectures were informative and well-read
- The lecturer was well-prepared and the lectures were easy to follow. The curriculum matched the topics for each lecture very well.
- The lectures were very interesting, the lecturer is knowledgeable and inspiring. The lecture days could have been shorter, **lectures could have been spread into more days**, as it is difficult to concentrate at the end of the session when the whole day is the same subject.
- Great lectures, very clear.
- They were mostly well-structured and easy to follow.
- I participated a little in the common lectures, but the lectures was perhaps a bit too dense to invite a great deal of participation. I did much of the reading, so I was pretty well prepared.
- Clear topics and connection to course literature. **A bit speedy**, of course due to the extensive content to be covered.

How would you rate the student-lecturer interaction? *

1: poor; 5: excellent

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1	0	0 %	
2	0	0 %	
3	5	38,5 % 	
4	3	23,1 % 	
5	5	38,5 % 	

Please explain your rating: *

- Hard for me to really say as I was following online.
- There was very limited time to interact because of the course material.
- There was not a lot of time for discussion in the common lecture, but Fredrik took time still to answer questions that might come
- It was very interactive in the specialization course.
- When I have talked to Fredrik in person he has been engaged and helpful (I did not talk to Attila in person). Whenever I have interacted with Attila or Fredrik online, the response has been swift and thorough.
- Interactions were not numerous, but they contributed positively to the development of the lecture
- No complaints on the interaction

- There was not very much interaction between the students and the lecturer. This, however, was in my opinion not because of the lecturer, but rather because of the setting. Perhaps if the lectures were organized more like seminars this would be different.
- The lecturer was very willing to answer the students' questions. The lecturer encouraged the students to participate in the discussions all the time.
- The lecturer was easy to approach and very good at answering questions.
- There was active interaction during the lectures.
- Fredrik was very very open to answering questions.
- Could have been more room for questions.

Was the level of the lectures appropriate? *

1: too easy; 5: too difficult

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1	0	0 %	
2	0	0 %	
3	9	69,2 % 	
4	4	30,8 % 	
5	0	0 %	

Please explain your rating: *

- Not too easy, not too difficult. It seemed just about right.
- Being a first year, first semester PhD student with limited background on Philosophy was a disadvantage for sure. I think if the course was provided in the second year of the PhD, I would have been more mature and receptive. Maybe that is something that can be considered for the future courses.
- It was okay, the common lecture was perhaps a bit wide and long
- It was okay.
- Most of the material was known to me from doing ex.phil. back in my BA (in Norway), but I understand that not everyone has had an introductory philosophy course like that. I'm still very happy about the level, as I was better able to reflect on my own experience with my field than I was back when I was a BA student.
- I think that sometimes philosophical topics may be "hard to digest" for those who are not expert in the field, but the lecturer brilliantly managed to give us a complete and accessible introduction to the issues related to philosophy of science
- The lectures' material demanded a solid effort from my side before being understood properly
- Neither too easy nor too difficult.
- The level was appropriate though readings were sometimes a bit difficult. On the other hand, this course can not include literature that is easy to read.
- The level was fine.
- It was appropriate.
- The level seemed just fine.
- It was in the middle, appropriate level.

Questions concerning the specialist seminars

How would you rate the seminars? *

1: poor; 5: excellent

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1	0	0 %	
2	0	0 %	
3	2	15,4 % 	
4	6	46,2 % 	
5	5	38,5 % 	




Please explain your rating: *

- Very experienced and knowledgeable lecturer. He was rather hard to understand for much of the time, delving a bit too much into the abstract. But in the end he corrected these potential shortcomings by being very accessible and helpful with more concrete cases and linking it to many of our research projects.
- Anniken is a fantastic and engaging lecturer. She is knowledgeable, experienced and very inspiring. I wish the specialist course was longer.
- This was very fruitful and I wished there was more time to learn about the different philosophical 'ways' in humanities. Especially because we are 'forced' to take this course in our first year as PhD's.
- All in all, it was quite good, but I did not learn as much on the first day of the humanities specialization, because we only discussed things from videos we had to watch before hand. I had watched all the lecture videos, but since I find the philosophies behind the topics quite difficult, it would have been better to repeat them a little and to talk about them more in detail. The discussion we had that day was to "free" for me.
- Peter was engaged and interactive throughout his seminars. The topics we discussed were really exciting to think about and foundational for the field. I'm very happy with the readings and the discussions we had in the seminars.
- The lectures were dense, but all the topics we covered were presented clearly. It was interesting to reflect on aspects of this field that I don't have to deal with very often.
- The seminars were organised pretty smartly, involving all the participants in active work and discussions
- The seminar where we discussed and gave feedback on each others essays was a good one. The other seminars/lectures were a bit difficult to prepare for. If we had known more about the topics and discussion beforehand, I believe the seminars would have been more useful.
- The seminars were very interesting, broadening students' horizons. On the other hand, articles for reading were sometimes quite complicated and the seminar leader had to explain them.

- Great teacher, amazing group of students and very helpful discussions about method. We had a wonderful time.
- They were useful in clarifying the concepts.
- I like the seminar form, so that was a plus for me. Also, Anniken was very helpful and did a great job.
- The seminar had good interaction and discussions. I think the seminar lacked a clear connection to the common lectures. The teacher had not been to common lectures might be one reason. The teacher did not specify position within the range of philosophy of science positions we had learned about, which maybe would have been helpful.

How would you rate the student-seminar leader interaction? *

1: poor; 5: excellent



Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1	0	0 %	
2	0	0 %	
3	1	7,7 % 	
4	4	30,8 % 	
5	8	61,5 % 	

Please explain your rating: *

- Part 2 of the course was excellent for the social sciences. Lots of good interaction and healthy dialogue on both days.
- This was by far the most interactive seminars I have attended to. I am so happy to be in this specialisation group because the participants were all very interactive and we had an extremely engaging seminar. I am sure we all benefitted by having Anniken as our seminar leader as she led the discussion in the right direction.
- I appreciated Anniken Greves interaction with each of us in Humanities. It was professional and very helpful, and she made it easy to be active.
- The lecturer was very engaged in what we did and we got very constructive feedback.
- Generally good but I would have liked clearer information about the draft and the deadline.
- Interactions were positively contributing to the development of the seminars and brought new issues we could reflect about.
- The seminar leader performed as a perfect dialogist who provided me with a thorough and extremely informative feedback
- See the answer above.
- The seminar leader was always willing to answer the students' questions. He was very patient and gave extensive answers. He always answered emails on time and gave extensive answers as well.
- This seminar was entirely discussion-based, and Anniken made it work very well, giving us feedback and pushing us efficiently in the right direction.
- Seminar leader was active in helping us find our focus and relevance of theory of science in our own research
- Interaction in the group and with the seminar leader was very good.
- he had a very interactive approach and had us present, discuss etc. Still the unclearity mentioned above had some negative effect on this as well.

Was the level of the seminars appropriate? *

1=too easy; 5=too difficult

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1	0	0 %	
2	0	0 %	
3	9	69,2 % 	
4	4	30,8 % 	
5	0	0 %	

Please explain your rating: *

- It was difficult, but I view it as a useful and constructive challenge. Håkon really helped make more sense of it all on the last two days.
- Yes. Anniken did an excellent job in filling the gap between the course material we had to study on our own and the discussion based on our individual projects. The course curriculum was great and the video lectures provided before the class was a good entrypoint for the seminars.
- It was good, not too difficult and not too easy
- It was okay.
- The readings were challenging but not off-puttingly so (and I actually had a good time with the readings). Things cleared up a lot during the seminars.
- The level was quite difficult but I also think it was appropriate for the context.
- For me, it was sometimes difficult to follow some lines of discussion due to their complicatedness; still, the seminars were generally well-organized and easy to follow
- Neither too easy nor too difficult.
- In general yes, but as home readings were quite complicated it was difficult to organise the seminars in the form of discussion all the time.
- The level was just fine.
- The subject in itself is kind of confusing, but the seminar was useful in clarifying the various concepts.
- The level was just fine.
- It is difficult to know if it was too difficult or just inaccessible due to unclear positions and topic. The focus on methodology was interesting, but how it was linked to one or several theory/philosophy positions was left unanswered.

Questions concerning the entire course

How satisfied are you with the course in general? *

1=not satisfied; 5=satisfied




Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1	0	0 %	
2	0	0 %	
3	2	15,4 % 	
4	10	76,9 % 	
5	1	7,7 % 	

Please state the three most important things that you have learned as a result of participating in this course: *

- 1. The relevance of having good theoretical roots in a research project. 2. The importance of theorising, or narrating our way into our research problems. 3. The great help of presenting and critiquing each other's papers.
- 1-That philosophy of science course threw me into this complex discussion on the theoretical, methodological and practical understanding related to truth and reality that will be crucial if I am going to be honest with my own research project and consider making a contribution to the knowledgescape. 2- The course helped me to brainstorm and contemplate about the strengths and pitfalls of my choice of theories and methods for my research project. 3- That I have a lot to study and learn in order to understand.
- To give feedback to others, looking at my project in a different way and that philosophy in humanities are closely connected with the science of humanities.
- I found more clarification on the method for my PhD thesis. I knew how I wanted to do it before, but now I am more secure about it.
- Kuhn's paradigms (they never made sense to me as a BA student but now they're clear to me) - Linguistics: the distinction between physicalism, mentalism and Platonism - Linguistics: the arguments for and against thought being the same as (or structured by) language
- 1. I developed a general knowledge about the main issues and theory of philosophy of science 2. I am more aware about the main debates that are still going on in the field of theoretical linguistics/philosophy of language 3. I had the chance to practice to look at the study of linguistics from a different and more theoretical perspective
- 1. the importance of planning a work and adapting intermediate tasks in accomplishing large written projects, e.g. essays; 2. the tradition of constructivist epistemological thinking, which I would like to try in defining my research object; 3. the basics of general theory of science, were quite useful to refresh and repeat
-
- 1. The literature on philosophy of science doesn't look so scary after one has read several articles on this subject. 2. I was able to comment on some topics and ask questions related to the philosophy of linguistics. 3. I might want to read more articles related to the philosophy of linguistics in the future.
- 1) Better reflection on the concrete method guiding my own research project. 2) Better reflection on how to "practice openness" in the humanities in general. 3) Better reflection on the difference in theory of sciences between natural and human sciences.
- The relevance of philosophy in my research, the importance of looking at the assumptions underlying my theoretical framework and reflection of how I am theoretically situated in my research.
- A better understanding of how to do theoretical groundwork that forms the basis of my project. - Formulating my own research act using new (to me) methods proposed by Anniken Greve. - Interesting theoretical perspectives that was very relevant to my own research project.
- Science, and especially questions about reality and truth, is quite complicated A lot of social science has a close connection to Marx and left-leaning politics I have a better overview of the history, discussions and development of different positions in science. Especially how divisions regarding empiricism (sense based) and idealism/rationalism (thought based) has prevailed through history and can still guide understanding today.

Did the content of the course meet your expectations? *

1= not at all; 5=yes, fully

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1	0	0 %	
2	0	0 %	
3	3	23,1 % 	
4	7	53,8 % 	
5	3	23,1 % 	

Which parts of the course (if any), did you enjoy the most? Please specify: *

- I particularly liked the seminar form of the last two days, as they created a much more interactive forum, which helped us concretize much more of the material. It has also been very useful to have the assignment conducted in stages, with constructive, critical feedback from Håkon along the way.
- Definitely, the **specialization**.
- The **specialization** part
- Writing my essay and getting feedback on it.
- The final day of the linguistics seminars was really interesting to me, and I have been able to directly apply these reflections to my own work and the subfield I'm in.
- I enjoyed learning more about some of the most debated issues in theoretical linguistics
- I really enjoyed the **subject-specific seminars and group work** with discussions
- The common lectures
- I enjoyed writing the essay. The topic of the essay is related to my research. The essay has given me a possibility to consider the methods I am going to use in my dissertation from a more critical point of view.
- The humanities **specialist seminar**. Because it seemed more relevant. The common lectures were good but most of the material was well-known, and it seemed less directly relevant for my own project.
- The **discussion** during the seminar with other students on each other's draft essay.
- I enjoyed both parts. In some sense, the common lectures could perhaps be divided a bit more, since they are very dense with lots of information.
- The common lectures and reading of course literature. I think such a course should focus on the philosophical and theoretical issues and this was best done in

these two.

Which parts of the course (if any), did you enjoy the least? Please specify: *

- Frontal lecturing has a part when trying to cover lots of ground. So it was fair to do. Still, it was hard to make sense of much of what was presented, particularly for someone who has background in neither philosophy nor sociology (as is Håkon's field).
- The common lecture. It was too rushed and too much material to be covered in two days.
- The common lecture, because it would have been enough with one day, or perhaps if insisted on two, then it would be fair to give two days to specialization as well
- The common lectures were too intense. It was too concentrated for this difficult philosophical material. I would have needed some more time between the lectures to process it.
- I can't think of anything.
- I cannot think of anything that I didn't enjoy at all
- I cannot say I am dissatisfied with any of the course's part, perhaps the general theory of science lectures could be less "stuffed" and more focused on explaining the matter which is complicated enough, not thoroughly describing it in detail and from different angles
- -
- It was very difficult to comprehend some articles (not all that I read, however).
- The common lectures. (But the lectures were very good! Just a question of interest.)
- The lectures were a little dry due to less interaction, but I guess that is expected of lectures in general.
- ...
- The specialisation seminar in social science. Firstly it appeared disconnected from the common lectures. Secondly, it was too practical and more like a methodological seminar. The more natural link I would have thought to be a continued discussion of the themes of common lectures, e.g., the critique of social constructivism. When we instead go straight into talk about constructing concepts or research objects without problematising or discussing position in philosophy of science (is this social constructivism, or?), it becomes difficult to grasp.

Do you consider the course relevant for you as a PhD student? *

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Yes	13	100 %	<div><div></div></div>
No	0	0 %	
I don't know	0	0 %	

Do you consider the course relevant for your PhD project? *

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Yes	10	76,9 %	<div><div></div></div>
No	1	7,7 %	<div><div></div></div>
I don't know	2	15,4 %	<div><div></div></div>

Would you recommend the course to other PhD students? *

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Yes	8	61,5 %	<div><div></div></div>
No	0	0 %	
I don't know	5	38,5 %	<div><div></div></div>

Do you have other suggestions for improving the course? *

- Not really. I understand this two-part split is a new development. It is a good change, giving us more time to digest and work with more of the reading list in between. Having the second part of the course in seminar form has been great.
- It could be a great idea to have this course in the second year of the PhD as the students will have a bit more sense of what they are doing, will have read more literature and will be able to make a connection between the course and their own project more efficiently. Also, instead of having two days of crammed up intense common course and only four days of specialization, it could be better to give more **time and focus on specialization part**. This year the seminar time schedule collided with that of GEN- Take control of your PhD course which was a bit stressful to manage for us who had specialization courses and had to miss one sessions each from both the courses. It could be better if the course organizers took consideration on that and coordinate accordingly so that we don't have to miss classes.
- Make more **time for specialization**; either one day common, two day speci, or two + two (the first gathering).
- I would have liked to know before the course that it was more important to read the specialization texts. I started with the texts for the common lectures and then I did not have time to read all the specialization texts, but those would have been more useful and relevant for me.
- My only problem with the course is the gender imbalance in the readings. The common lectures only had two readings by female authors, which I think both sends out a bad signal and could potentially mean that the course misses out on some great readings (with a different perspective than the authors we see in the current reading list).
- I don't have other suggestions
- I thank all of the course organisers and participants for this wonderful course! I would just suggest allocating more time for analysing and discussing some of the required readings in the class, not just leaving it for the essay writing
- -
- My suggestion is to **reduce the length of sessions: to conduct shorter ones** but more often.
- One **days less for common lectures**. One day more for specialist lectures, before (or after) group discussion.
- No suggestions
- **A day or two more, both for the common lectures and for the seminars** would be nice.
- Connect the two parts of the course better. Is it too much to ask that the lecturer of specialisation sits through the common lectures? Make the specialisation

more philosophical and less practical (I guess that this contradicts other phd-students, but this is my opinion..)

[Se nylige endringer i Nettskjema](#)