Making Students Understand Philosophy
Course Design in Higher Education

Niklas Dahl
Department of Philosophy

I. INTRODUCTION

In this report I will describe my attempt to develop a course in Philosophy of Language at the Department of Philosophy. The main difficulty, as I identify it, has to do with it's position as an intermediate course. As such, it's part of the bridge where students are expected to transition from a quantitative to a qualitative understanding of the discipline (Biggs and Tang, 2011, p. 90). That this is the central concern of the course, I will argue, can be seen by analysing the course plan, grading criteria, and reflecting on the departments cultural view of its educational role.

With this in mind, I evaluate how well the current course design is constructively aligned with this goal. Although many aspects are well-motivated, there is still room for several improvements. These are categorised in three sub-challenges to the main pedagogical problem: informing, engaging, and supporting the students in their epistemic transition. I then propose a battery of additions intended to jointly address these challenges, consisting of an introductory workshop on the intended outcomes of the course and how these skills are evaluated, homework sets as opportunities for practising their new skills, and supporting materials to help relieve perceived workload. Finally, I discuss implementation and evaluation of these changes both with an eye to the future and those additions which I managed to implement during the course round which was concurrent with the present project.

II. COURSE DESCRIPTION

The course I'm aiming to develop through this paper is 'Philosophy of Language' (7.5 ECTS) which is a part of the continuation course 'Theoretical Philosophy: Level 2' (30 ECTS). This full-term course consists of five modules of which mine is the third one:

1. Epistemology (7.5 ECTS)

2. Formal Logic (4 ECTS)

3. Philosophy of Language (7.5 ECTS)

4. Philosophical Logic (3.5 ECTS)

5. Metaphysical Issues in Analytic Philosophy (7.5 ECTS)

As of last semester (Fall 2022), I am solely responsible for the course 'Philosophy of Language' and do all of the teaching, planning, and grading.

As the name suggests, it is the first specialised course about philosophical questions about language — such as theories about what meaning is, how words relate to the world, and what social structures underpin communication — and the full-term course it's a part of is the second of three such full-term courses which the department offers as first-cycle studies in Theoretical Philosophy. As such, it is usually taken by students in either their first or second year of university studies in the term immediately following their completion of the basic course and just preceding the term where they write their bachelor's theses. Student groups vary in size from term to term, but are generally made up of around ten students.

Teaching consists of ten sessions each of which occupies a two hour slot in the schedule. These are all split into a 45 minute lecture — where I explain the most important and difficult points of the reading for that session — followed by a 45 minute seminar with a 15 minute break in between. For every session there is assigned reading consisting both of some chapters of the course book and one to two influential research articles on the topic. These research articles are the material for the seminar part, where the students divide themselves into small groups and discuss the text on the basis of some questions provided beforehand. All this takes place over a four week period and is followed by a one week long take-home exam.

Grading is on the scale Fail (U), Pass (G), and Pass With Distinction (VG). Examination is primarily based on the take-home exam which consists of seven questions and the answers are limited to a total of 4 000 words. Each question asks for an explanation of some concept or theory we've discussed and then comparing and contrasting the viewpoints we've seen in the literature. Answers to each question provide up to two points, depending on whether it fulfils all of the criteria for a Pass (1 pt) or, additionally, the majority of the criteria for a Pass With Distinction (2 pts). For a course grade of Pass or Pass With distinction, the student needs to accumulate at least seven or eleven points respectively on the exam.

Finally, the course is evaluated once as a part of the full-term course where the students are given a poll at the end of the entire semester. Most of the questions are about the Intended Learning Objectives (henceforth ILO:s.) from the course plan and whether each has been addressed during the course and if the student has achieved it. Responses are on a five-point Likert scale. Additionally, the students are asked to fill out an evaluation specifically for the Philosophy of Language module at the final session of the course. This evaluation consists of qualitative questions asking for potential improvements in the planning, material, and teaching of the course.

III. ANALYSIS

As it stands, the course is in a both interesting and challenging position within the curriculum. On the one hand, it is the second full term course within the progression, but on the other it comes just before when the students are expected to be able to write a bachelor's thesis in the subject. As such, the course is essentially tasked with, in the vocabulary of the SOLO-taxonomy (Elmgren and Henriksson, 2016, pp. 158–159), bringing the students from the multi-structural to the relational phase of their development in the subject — which also happens to be the shift from the quantitative to the qualitative phase of understanding (Biggs and Tang, 2011, p. 90). That the course inhabits this intermediate position is also evident from the ILO:s presented in the Course Plan (Appendix A). There are, to be sure, several objectives which are on the lower end of the scale, such as accounting for problems and theories within the field. But there are also several more challenging objectives. The students are asked to be able to analyse, compare, critically discuss, evaluate, and even take up their own positions on the philosophical theories and issues they encounter.

One relevant piece of context is how the Department of Philosophy thinks of the courses it offers. While there are many students who take the basic level course out of general interest or as an elective for their main field of study, a large proportion of the few students who do go on to the continuation or bachelor course do so with the aspiration of attaining a graduate degree in philosophy. Additionally, that's how the department tends to view its educational purpose: teaching people to think in a philosophically rigorous way. As such, its educational goals are mainly geared towards teaching students to *do* philosophy, rather than just be knowledgeable about it. It's not clear to what extent the students share this view. While some, undoubtedly, are interested in pursuing a career as academic philosophers, they can have many other motivations.

Here, I would be remiss not to mention one of the most unfortunate facts about the subject, namely its homogeneity. As Ruonakoski (2023, pp. 4–7) notes in her book detailing empirical work on the experience of female philosophy students, the vast majority of both professionals and students in the field are white and male. This, she notes, is the case in Nordic countries as well as internationally, and my own experience gives me little reason to disagree. After laying bare a mountain of evidence about the ways in which the teaching environment disfavours women, she summarises the problem as follows:

> [W]omen's alienation from philosophy appears to include, at least, the following aspects: (1) feeling of distance from the faculty, (2) the occasional gender-based role of underdog in classroom confrontations, (3) difficulties to identify oneself with the traditional masculine role of the philosopher, (4) the dominance of the all-knowing attitude over not-knowing, (5) underestimation of one's abilities by oneself and others, (6) difficulty in acquiring speaking space and (7) frustration with academic philosophy as an institution. (Ruonakoski, 2023, p. 56)

3

As Ruonakoski (2023, pp. 56–61) goes on to argue, these kinds of issues aren't limited to women in the field. Similar feelings of alienation towards the subject are common among those students whose social class, race, or sexual orientation doesn't match the norm. Although no single course can alleviate the situation, at least some of these issues are ones which can be addressed in the classroom.

We can also see the focus on doing philosophy within the grading criteria for the course (Appendix B). Although it's perfectly possible to achieve a passing grade on the course whilst only evincing a multi-structural understanding of the material, the criteria for a pass with distinction require students to be able to independently analyse, compare, and evaluate theories and arguments. All of these are relational — and sometimes even extendedly abstract — objectives (Biggs and Tang, 2011, p. 91). What we can see, then, is that the course is very much intended to push the students along in the structure of their learning outcomes.

When the students begin the course they are very much not there yet. In my, admittedly limited, experience of teaching the course most of them struggle with how to respond to exam questions asking them to reason with and compare theories in an extended answer. Now, this should not be too surprising, given that the majority of students on the course have only completed one or two semesters of university studies (Appendix C).[1] Additionally, 'Philosophy of Language' is the only module of the continuation course which doesn't use invigilated exams. As such, it is the first time the students are asked to fulfil these kind of ILO:s through producing an extended piece of philosophical writing.[2]

This view of the difficulties is, however, not one that's shared by the students. Looking at the course evaluations (Appendix C), we can see that the students give themselves rather high marks about what extent they've achieved the ILO:s. None of the respondents give themselves below a three on a five-point Likert scale, and the median response for all is around four. But this shouldn't be particularly surprising. As Carpenter, Witherby, and Tauber (2020, p. 138) note, there's an abundance of evidence in the literature that students tend to be overestimate their performance when self-evaluating. Indeed, relying on results from Foster et al. (2017, p. 14), they point out that this overconfidence persists even after students have completed several exams in the course. As such, we should expect these numbers to somewhat inflated. Unfortunately, we can't get a much better picture by looking at free text answers since only one of them comments on the module in question. It simply says "The examination in Philosophy of Language was too sprawling with too many different questions which didn't always feel relevant." This does, however, raise the question of how well the examination is *constructively aligned* with the ILO:s.

Constructive alignment, as explained by Biggs and Tang (2011, p. 97), is

---

[1] Although, as we can see from the responses to the course evaluations, a surprisingly large contingent of students have completed four or more terms. This indicates that there's quite a breadth of student abilities to try to take into account when designing the course.

[2] There is one preceding module on the basic level, Philosophy of Mind (4,5 ECTS), where students are examined through a written essay but the ILO:s for this course are firmly in the quantitative phase of the SOLO-taxonomy.

the idea that students reach knowledge about the subject by actively extending their own frameworks with new information in order to achieve the stated goals of the course. That is, the criteria students are told that they will be assessed by will implicitly set the objectives they will pursue (Elmgren and Henriksson, 2016, pp. 247–248), so by selecting criteria which require the students to actively reflect on and structure what they learn we can ensure that they achieve greater understanding of the material. This is an especially important part of the design of a course situated at the transition to a qualitative level of understanding, since that is characterised by the students ability to build a shared structure for disparate ideas. To master the ability to reason independently, the students need to do the work of actively integrating the notions and theories into their own conceptual scheme.

There is at least some constructive alignment already present in the course design. Given that we want our course of studies to train philosophers, it's quite reasonable to ask our students to write extended discussions of philosophical topics.[3] It would be strange to have a curriculum entirely based around in-class-exams, which are known to mainly encourage shallow learning of facts rather than deep understanding of the material (Elmgren and Henriksson, 2016, p. 251), and then expect our students to have acquired the ability to independently write extended discursive texts on philosophy in a clear an coherent manner. Indeed, as Bengtsson (2019, p. 10) finds in his review of the literature, there seems to be a consensus among researchers that take-home exams both promote higher order cognitive skills in students and are better tools for accurately assessing them. This, he points out, makes them especially useful for evaluating performance on skills at higher levels of the taxonomy.[4]

The grading system for the exam have been designed with constructive alignment in mind. As the answers to every question are evaluated on the same scale, namely whether the answer displays the understanding expected for a pass or pass with distinction respectively, there's little risk that some parts of the course are given undue weight in the final assessment. To avoid the situation where students can study only parts of the material, questions are selected to be representative of each part of the course.

The thresholds for the grades have also been selected intentionally. A student can achieve a Passing grade (G) by answering every question of the exam at that level and so show familiarity with all parts of the material. A Pass With Distinction (VG), however, requires the student to display a higher level of understanding of the material through at least four of the seven questions. As the criteria for the higher grade are such that the student displays independent reasoning and comparative thinking, the grading system is meant to reflect

---

[3]This does however raise some issues about fairness for students with writing related disabilities, since the entirety of the examination is done through writing. One might argue that this can be alleviated through writing tools and additional support, given that it is a take-home exam. I will fill out this note later.

[4]Bengtsson discusses the research in relation to Bloom's taxonomy of knowledge (Elmgren and Henriksson, 2016, pp. 153–154) rather than the SOLO taxonomy, but given the large overlap of skills that are considered at the higher levels of the respective structures, I think it is safe to assume that the result transfers.

whether the student has achieved a merely multi-structural (G) or a relational understanding (VG) of the material. And by tying the objectives for a higher level of understanding to a higher grade, the idea is to motivate students to practice those abilities. This has the added benefit, as Elmgren and Henriksson (2016, p. 272) points out, of making it easy to explain what a student who's received a higher grade has shown themselves able to do, which one with a lower grade has not.

Lectures make up half of the classroom activities of the course, although to say so is somewhat misleading. Given that the average cohort consists of ten students, the situation lends itself naturally to a more conversational atmosphere than a traditional lecture. At each session the students are given a handout which summarises the main points of the course book reading for that session. These serve as the basis of the lectures but with tangents on related topics as prompted by student questions and interruptions which are encouraged. As Elmgren and Henriksson (2016, p. 172) notes, lectures also offer the opportunity to tailor the material to the particular students in the classroom in a way that the literature does not, which is especially possible in such a small group environment. This also provides the opportunity to get to know the students and encourage them to participate with questions and comments by giving supportive individual responses (Elmgren and Henriksson, 2016, pp. 186–187).

There's one additional learning activity which isn't visible from the schedule, namely the reading. As the course is supposed to introduce the students to to major theories and problems of contemporary philosophy of language, there is a lot to cover. As I noted in the course description, the students are instructed to read one or two chapters in the course book as well as one or two specified research articles before each classroom session. In part, the high expectations on reading are a result of the small number of hours in the classroom. But the main way that the research articles are supposed to encourage learning is by giving the students a challenging text to engage with in the construction of their knowledge. This is why the every article is paired with chapters in the, significantly more easy to read, course book which introduce the problems that the article is grappling with.

Further, these research articles are the subject of the seminars which make up the other half of the time in the classroom. Apart from hopefully providing an incentive to do the reading, seminars provide an opportunity for the students to formulate what they've read and discuss what they haven't understood (Elmgren and Henriksson, 2016, pp. 172–173). Formulating your thoughts on a text clearly enough to be understood by someone else requires you to analyse and structure that information. As such, seminars provide an invaluable opportunity to practice exactly those skills — analysing, evaluating, identifying assumptions, critically discussing, and formulating criticism — which correspond to the relational level of understanding expressed by the ILO:s.

Although seminars and conversational lectures have significant advantages, they also carry with them some risks. As two of the main aspects of alienation faced by women and minorities in philosophy classrooms are precisely

about speaking space and domination in classroom discussions, these are the kind of learning activities where the problem may come to the forefront. In part this can be alleviated by the attentive care of the teacher, by creating an open and trusting learning environment and distributing their attention equally and intervening to help make space for students who otherwise get dominated (Ruonakoski, 2023, pp. 75–78).

IV. CHALLENGES

As I hope to have made clear in the above analysis, much of the challenge in teaching this course is precisely to help the students make the leap to a qualitative level of understanding of a philosophical subject. To do so, I need to help them develop the skills that level of understanding demands. But while this is the overarching challenge that this course presents, it is also quite multifaceted. For that reason, I would propose the following sub-problems whose solution could go a long way towards meeting the main challenge.

(i) Making the students comprehend what skills they are asked to acquire as part of their transition to a qualitative level of understanding.

(ii) Getting the students to actively practice those skills throughout the course.

(iii) Providing the necessary support to make these demands reasonably attainable.

Since, as mentioned above, many of these students are still at a relatively early stage of their studies, they can't be expected to know what demands come with the expectation of a deeper understanding of the subject matter. And although I noted that there is a sizeable contingent who've completed four or more semesters of university studies, they are still relatively inexperienced within the discipline of philosophy. So while I'd expect their knowledge and skills from other fields to transfer in some ways, and hence make it easier for them to acquire a relational understanding of specifically philosophy, the approach which properly supports their more novice counterparts ought to be helpful for them as well. As such, one important part of paving the way for all of them to achieve understanding will be to make those expectations clear.

But it's not sufficient that the students understand that they need to develop their cognitive and expressive skills as part of the course. They also need the opportunities to practice them. For that reason, it's important to help motivate students to take the time to actually engage seriously with the literature and actively participate in the discussion at seminars. Currently, those are the two learning activities of the course which are most aligned with the qualitative ILO:s. Here, there's also room for additional activities which align with developing the students deeper learning. But that alignment also makes these activities the ones which require the most commitment from the students themselves.

To make that commitment more likely, then, is a matter of ensuring that the students have the motivation to participate. High workload can be an issue, but properly supported students tend to rise to the occasion when faced with a challenging course (Elmgren and Henriksson, 2016, p. 53).

Much of the difficulty then, as I see it, comes from insufficient information about what is asked of them, insufficient constructive alignment in the encouraging them to do it, and insufficient support in facing that rather daunting task.

V. Proposals

With these challenges in mind, it's time to look for solutions. Since the first part of the challenge I've identified is to ensure that the students realize what they're facing, telling them about it might be a good start. But merely reading them the ILO:s is not enough to actually get them to understand the skills they're asked to acquire. For that reason, I intend to include a group discussion on what it is that philosophers do during the introductory meeting. As Rudisill (2011, p. 243) discusses — in preparation for tackling this very problem — there are four core skills which underlie this ability, which also happens to coincide rather nicely with the ILO:s of the course.

(1) Interpretation and analysis.

(2) Critical assessment of arguments, ideas, and presuppositions.

(3) Fluent application of philosophical concepts, distinctions and methods to the project of addressing a philosophical problem.

(4) Creatively developing and pursuing, through the means of effective written and oral communication, a novel approach to any of a certain broad class of puzzling issues.

Asking students to reflect and discuss what each of these skills entail gives them an opportunity to develop meta-cognitive awareness of their own learning process. This method bears some striking similarities to the pedagogy of *uncovering* developed by Calder (2006) for the teaching of history. The idea here is also to focus on developing the skills required by the field through a combination of practice and explicit reflection on that practice.

One additional benefit of explicitly discussing these skills is that it brings into the open the preconceptions of both the students and the teacher about what the practice of philosophy ought to look like. And by doing so, there's room for a critical discussion of those very ideals. As Ruonakoski (2023, pp. 34–37, pp. 52–53) notes, the picture of the ideal philosopher as a solitary genius and proper philosophical practice as confrontational and assertive are very masculinely coded values. Indeed, the tacit understanding of what it means to be a critical thinker is not itself neutral. The priority of individual perspectives over those of collectives and rational introspection over affective perception as a

source of data are both ways that characteristics which are associated with men are routinely viewed as more important (Danvers, 2018, p. 553). By including this perspective in the discussion of the skills expressed by the ILO:s, I want to develop a more inclusive understanding of what's expected that's shared with the students. And by including the students in this discussion I hope foster a classroom environment where they feel safe to voice their views and take an active role in trying to maintain a fair classroom climate.

Although teaching time is unfortunately too limited to include the full sequence of meta-seminars that both Rudisill (2011, pp. 248–249) and Calder (2006, p. 1363) recommend, there is space to include reflection and discussion about developing these skills as part of the introductory meeting. Now, as O'Donovan, Price, and Rust (2004, pp. 327–329) argue, every articulated ILO will come with the tacit knowledge of what it means to meet it. That is, it's impossible to specify what a given teacher will think qualifies as a passable analysis and what constitutes a good one. So, to fully convey what's expected of the students, they recommend (O'Donovan, Price, and Rust, 2004, p. 332) engaging the students in a marking workshop. There, the students discuss how to grade a sample assignment based on the grading criteria and ILO:s of the course before being shown the instructors actual assessment. In doing so, they learn by example how to distinguish good and bad performances of those skills. In turn, this fosters understanding of what it is they themselves are being asked to do. Including a workshop for discussing the skills of doing philosophy together with an exercise of how to evaluate their performance is then, I hope, a large step of the way towards alleviating the challenge of insufficient information.

Assuming, for the moment, that they know what to do, the next step is getting them to do it. That is the second sub-problem, getting them to practice these skills during the course. My first proposal for that is assigning two short homework assignments, each containing two questions of the type that will be on the final exam but limited to the material we've discussed at that point in the course. The students receive feedback on how well their performance lines up with the grading criteria of the course and if they pass, either through two answers at a passing level or at least one at the pass with distinction level, they add an additional point to their total for the final examination. This reward is intended to provide incentive for the students to take the assignment seriously and thus have them work with the material in an engaged way throughout the course instead of simply cramming for the final exam.

The point is to provide opportunities for individual feedback on how the students can develop their philosophical abilities at a time where they still have the opportunity to take advantage of it; that is before the final examination (Elmgren and Henriksson, 2016, p. 278). Thus I can tell them in what ways their work can improve to meet the more demanding of the grading criteria. By including two such opportunities the course will contain a feedback dialogue by design, which is one of the important practices of feedback literate teachers found by Boud and Dawson (2023, p. 165). Now, for feedback to be effective it must be actionable, in the sense that it informs the student of *how* to do things differently and not just that they need to do so. But, as Carless and Boud

(2018, p. 1316), there's more to maximising feedback efficacy than taking the time to write more detailed comments. We need to also develop the students' *feedback literacy.*

The idea is that for feedback to work well, students need (1) to learn the value of the feedback process, (2) perform evaluative judgements of quality, (3) manage affective responses to feedback, and (4) take action as a result (Carless and Boud, 2018, pp. 1316–1318). These can be encouraged by analysing exemplars, for instance during the marking workshop proposed for the beginning of the course, and through the practice of giving peer-feedback (Carless and Boud, 2018, pp. 1320–1321). For that reason I will assign each student to give short feedback to one of their colleagues homework. This will help entrench the skill of evaluating philosophical text, so that they can apply it to their own work.

Finally, we've arrived at providing the support required to enable the students to succeed. It's reasonable to worry about the workload, especially given that I'm adding additional learning activities for the students to participate in. This ties together with motivating the students to do all this work. Two of the important factors for student motivation that Elmgren and Henriksson (2016, p. 70) cite are challenge and control. The students need to be find the material demanding enough to be engaging and they feel that they need to be in control of their studies. But both of these things can also be risk factors which lead to lower engagement. If the coursework is overwhelming, then the students might give up. And if the students are given too much freedom to plan their own studies, they might end up with negative academic emotions.

As such, the students workload is an essential feature to consider. But, as Kyndt et al. (2014, p. 685) point towards, the main effects on students come from their perception of the workload rather than objective measures of it. So, to pre-empt the potential negative results of placing high demands, it's more important to manage student perceptions than to remove material from the course. One of the key ways that Kyndt et al. (2014, p. 692) discuss for lowering the perceived workload is to ensure that the students understand how the course contents are structured. Thus, by taking the time during the introductory lecture to explain the overall contents of the course, how they tie together, and why the course is structured the way it is, I can hopefully provide that basis.

Additionally, I plan to write brief commentaries on the most difficult research articles that make up the literature. While they ought to be challenging, there are some texts which are both central to understanding the field and notoriously difficult. With these short study guides my hope is to ensure that the challenge of the readings lead the students to grow rather than retreat Elmgren and Henriksson (2016, p. 53).

Finally, one of the factors which can contribute to a feeling of a high quantitative workload is the very freedom provided by the expected amount of self-studying. With only six scheduled hours of teaching a week, the students do have the freedom to control their own studies. But without guidance, that also puts the entire responsibility on them to plan accordingly. This brings us to the students having control over their studies. Although there is value in letting

students make their own plans, Kyndt et al. (2014, p. 691) also point to the instructors role to support them in that endeavour. This has lead me to create of a suggested work schedule, which for each workday during the course sets out an even distribution of the reading and writing expected (Appendix E). The idea is that this will provide the students with an outline of how much work they should aim at performing every day if they want to be prepared for the seminars and lectures.

So, to conclude, the changes I want to make are as follows:

(1) Add a workshop discussing philosophical skills and practising assessment to the introductory meeting.

(2) Provide two homework sets as opportunities to practice and receive formative feedback.

(3) Have the students provide peer-feedback on one of their colleagues homework hand-ins.

(4) Create a sample work-schedule for the course.

(5) Provide written commentaries on the most difficult research papers in the course.

VI.   Implementation and Evaluation

As I've been teaching the course during this term-long pedagogical course, I have already started to implement some of the changes. Both the optional homework and the work-schedule were included in this round of the course. In order to evaluate these changes I had the students fill out an evaluation for just this module rather than the full term course, the responses to which can be found in Appendix D. In line with the recommendation from Carpenter, Witherby, and Tauber (2020, p. 144), this evaluation consisted of qualitative questions rather than asking the students to rate aspects of the course on a numerical scale and was performed immediately at the end of the course.

As is evident from the responses, these two additions were a resounding success. The vast majority of students mention the feedback they've received as a result of the homework assignments as one of the best aspects of the course. The work-schedule was even more well-received with several of the students even taking the opportunity to ask that this addition be recommended to all the other teachers at the department ("Ask all teachers to provide a work-schedule!", "The work-schedule was very helpful, I want it for all courses!").

With these measures in place, my intention is to incorporate the skill and assessment workshop and peer-feedback into the next round of the course. This will require me to prepare workshop materials and gather the consent of some previous students to use their exam answers as examples for the discussion as well as preparing instructions for what peer-feedback should look like. I hope to have the time to prepare commentaries on the most difficult papers for the

upcoming round, but otherwise will do that for the following one. Fortunately, a previous teacher has already written aids for some of the texts and has graciously offered to share that material which will make the preparation less onerous.

I will continue to perform the module evaluations at the end of the course to see how these additions are received by the students. Finally, as I continue teaching the course I will have access to more data over time about how well the students perform as measured by the examination. In this way, I will be able to track whether the proposals lead to better learning outcomes as measured by how the average results differ between before and after the changes were made.

VII.   Comments

Before finishing this text I was offered comments from my colleagues in the seminar group as well as my doctoral advisor Martin Jönsson. One of the questions raised by my colleagues was whether the examination is sufficiently aligned with the ILO:s. Perhaps fewer questions with further depth would be a better way to encourage the reflective skills of the students? While I agree in spirit, there are, I think, two reasons to resist this suggestion. The first is the boring answer that the examination also needs to test that the students have taken in the breadth of the course. That is, there needs to be enough questions to cover all the topics we've discussed. The latter is that I don't think the students could be made ready for the leap from in class exams to independent essays in a single module. As Rudisill (2011, p. 248) notes, the students become anxious when the training wheels come off too quickly.

My other colleague pressed on the risk that some voices are more likely than others to get silenced in the more conversational style of the lectures. This is a very important point and one that I've tried to incorporate into the text by adding the discussion on the experience of being a woman or member of a minority in a philosophy classroom.

Finally, Martin Jönsson made several helpful comments on how to improve the text most of which I've simply immediately accepted. He also pushed back on the formulation I gave in a previous version of this text, namely that the department sees it's role as training future philosophers. Rather, a common view is that philosophical training is good because of the rigorous thinking it promotes. I've rewritten the relevant sections to make these more careful claims about the self-image of the subject instead.

He also noted that two very common methods of philosophical work, explication and conceptual analysis, are essentially anti-individualistic when performed well. This ties into the discussion I want to have at the introductory workshop about what it is to do philosophy, since the methods reliance on collaboration and openness to the experiences of others can hopefully alleviate the individualistic practices which Ruonakoski presents as barriers to equal participation. By showing that successful performance and a welcoming attitude go hand in hand, the hope is to provide additional incentive for buy in from the students. This is something I will assuredly incorporate when designing the workshop.

Appendices

A Course Plan

Faculties of Humanities and Theology

FTEA21, Theoretical Philosophy: Level 2, 30 credits
Teoretisk filosofi: Fortsättningskurs, 30 högskolepoäng
First Cycle / Grundnivå

Details of approval

The syllabus was approved by the programmes director by delegation from the pro-dean for first- and second-cycle studies on 2008-03-07 to be valid from 2008-03-07, autumn semester 2008.

General Information

The course is offered as a single course. It can normally be included as part of a general degree at the undergraduate or graduate levels.

Language of instruction: Swedish

Main field of studies	Depth of study relative to the degree requirements
Theoretical Philosophy	G1F, First cycle, has less than 60 credits in first-cycle course/s as entry requirements

Learning outcomes

On completion of the course the student shall

Knowledge and understanding
- be able to give an account of the current theories of Theoretical Philosophy regarding problems concerning the basic constitutions of language, knowledge and reality
- be able to give an account of the basic principles of derivation and translation in propositional calculus and predicate logic

Competence and skills
- be able to analyse individual philosophical arguments and theories and compare and contrast them to each other

This is a translation of the course syllabus approved in Swedish

13

- be able to carry out basic translations and derivations in propositional calculus and predicate logic
- be able to give an account of newly gained knowledge and insights of Theoretical Philosophy in both written and oral form, as part of a group or individually
- be able to account for and critically discuss arguments and theories in Theoretical Philosophy, orally and in writing

Judgement and approach

- be able to evaluate individual philosophical arguments, as well as complete philosophical theories, either individually or in relation to other arguments/theories
- be able to formulate relevant criticism of single arguments or complete theories from the perspective of Theoretical Philosophy
- be able to identify and take a position on the roles of the basic assumptions of ontology, philosophy of language and epistemology regarding methods used in the evaluation of individual theories or arguments.

Course content

The course aims to increase students' knowledge in the key areas of Theoretical Philosophy: epistemology, the philosophy of language, issues concerning metaphysics in analytical philosophy and logic. In addition to in-dept studies in individual subject areas, emphasis is placed on issues concerning how positions taken in one particular subject affect positions taken in another. Emphasis is also placed on proficiency training, in part in order to develop specific skills within formal logic, and in part in order to increase the student's ability to express him/herself in philosophical terms both orally and in writing.

The course consists of the following sub-courses:

1. Epistemology, 7.5 credits,
2. Formal Logic, 4.5 credits,
3. The Philosophy of Language, 7.5 credits,
4. Philosophical Logic, 3 credits,
5. Metaphysical Issues in Analytical Philosophy, 7.5 credits.

Course design

Teaching consists of lectures, text and essay seminars, and practical exercises.

Assessment

Examinations take the form of invigilated examinations and submitted assignments.

Subcourses that are part of this course can be found in an appendix at the end of this document.

Grades

This is a translation of the course syllabus approved in Swedish

14

Marking scale: Fail, Pass, Pass with distinction.
To be awarded a Pass on the whole course the student shall have the grade of Pass on all sub-courses. To be awarded Pass with Distinction on the whole course the student shall have the grade of Pass with Distinction on at least 15 of the 30 credits on the course, and a grade of Pass on all remaining credits.

Entry requirements

To be eligible for the course requires the successful completion of FTEA11, or the equivalent.

Further information

1. The course replaces FTEX72.
2. The credits allocated for course content that in whole or in part is commensurate with another course can only be credited once for a degree. For further details see the current registration information and other relevant documentation.
3. The sub-course names in Swedish:

   1. Kunskapsteori,

   2. Formell logik,

   3. Språkfilosofi,

   4. Filosofisk logik,

   5. Metafysiska frågor i analytisk filosofi.

B GRADING CRITERIA

Below is the table of grading criteria for the module 'Philosophy of Language'. The ILO:s are adapted versions of the ones from the overarching course, specified to the problems about language which are dealt with in this course. Each grading criterion is connected to some number of ILO:s, as illustrated by the separated blocks in the table. All the translations in this section are my own.

ILO	Pass	Pass With Distinction
Be able account for current philosophical theories about problems concerning language.	The student is able to correctly reproduce the main philosophical theories of language in a way which shows that they can their use central concepts and distinctions.	The student is able to identify and reproduce the core of the main philosophical theories of language in an unambiguous and concise way.
	The student is able to correctly apply philosophical theories of language to proposed cases and account for what the theory says about them.	The student is able to concisely define the main concepts of philosophy of language and describe central philosophical distinctions about language.
		The student is able to independently propose examples which illustrate the consequences of philosophical theories of language.
Be able to analyse, contrast and relate specific philosophical arguments and theories within the philosophy of language.	The student can identify and reproduce arguments for and against specific views in a way which shows that they understand core philosophical distinctions about language.	The student can independently compare arguments for or against a view in terms of how strong they are.
	The student can account for how different theories within the philosophy of language relate to one another.	

ILO	Pass	Pass With Distinction
Be able to account for and critically discuss philosophical arguments and theories within the philosophy of language.	The student is able to reason about the plausibility of different theories within the philosophy of language in terms of arguments for the theory or arguments against competing theories.	The student is able to reason independently and vigorously about the plausibility of different theories within the philosophy of language in terms of arguments for the theory or arguments against competing theories.
Be able to evaluate specific philosophical arguments, as well as entire philosophical theories, on their own and in relation to other arguments or theories.		
Be able to formulate relevant criticism against specific arguments or entire theories from a philosophical perspective.		
Be able to recognise as well as adopt a position on the role played by fundamental philosophical assumptions about language for how specific theories or arguments should be evaluated.	The student can passably identify the philosophical assumptions about language which some philosophical positions and arguments rely on.	The student can identify specific philosophical assumptions about language and evaluate theories in terms of which such assumptions they rely on.

C   Course Evaluation

Included here are extracts from the formal course evaluations filled out at the end of the full term for the full 30 ECTS course. As the response rates are rather low, I have collated the responses from the last four terms (both semesters of 2021 and 2022 respectively). The translations are my own. As the evaluations are rather lengthy, I have only included the parts which I've used as a basis for the analysis in the main text.

Question	0	1	2	3	4 or more
How many semesters of university studies have you completed?	0	4	2	0	5

Below are the distribution and mean of students' self-evaluation of how well they have achieved the specified ILO:s.

To what extent have you achieved the ILO?	1	2	3	4	5	μ
Be able to give an account of the current theories of Theoretical Philosophy regarding problems concerning the basic constitutions of language, knowledge, and reality.	0	0	2	8	1	3.9
Be able to analyse individual philosophical arguments and theories and compare and contrast them to each other.	0	0	2	5	3	4.1
Be able to account for and critically discuss arguments and theories in Theoretical Philosophy, orally and in writing.	0	0	4	6	1	3.7
Be able to evaluate individual philosophical arguments, as well as complete philosophical theories, either individually or in relation to other arguments/theories.	0	0	4	6	1	3.7
Be able to formulate relevant criticism of single arguments or complete theories from the perspective of Theoretical Philosophy.	0	0	3	5	3	4
Be able to identify and take a position on the roles of the basic assumptions of ontology, philosophy of language, and epistemology regarding methods used in the evaluation of individual theories or arguments.	0	0	2	6	2	4

D Module Evaluation

LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

Litteratur: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre beträffande kurslitteraturen (avseende exempelvis omfattning och svårighetsgrad)?

Det var ~~trevligt~~ att alla orginaltexter gick att hämta på canvas

Kursmaterial: Har övrigt kursmaterial såsom handouts varit till hjälp? Hur kan detta material förbättras?

Vissa handouts var lite slarvigt häftade och gick i bitar när jag läste dom

Undervisning: Vad har varit bra och vad hade kunnat göras bättre avseende undervisningen? (T.ex. vad anser du om undervisningsformer, svårighetsgrad, antal föreläsningar? Var undervisningen till hjälp för förståelsen av litteraturen? Gav föreläsningarna/diskussionerna något utöver kurslitteraturen? m.m.)

Jag uppskattade att ha en kurs utan salstenta för en gångs skull, regelbundna seminarier var också givande och något jag saknat i andra kurser

19

Feedback: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre med den feedback du har fått under kursen?

Valfria hemuppgifter är ett utmärkt sätt att få feedback från ett elevperspektiv, men jag kan tänka mig är arbetskrävande för föreläsaren

Övrigt: Här finns utrymme för att lämna alla andra kommentarer du skulle kunna vilja skriva om kursen.

2

Litteratur: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre beträffande kurslitteraturen (avseende exempelvis omfattning och svårighetsgrad)?

Det har varit utmanande att hinna med att djupläsa artiklarna inför seminarierna samtidigt som man haft inlämningsuppgifterna. Samtidigt har all litteraturen i inlämningsfrågorna, samt lyckom varit givande och bidragit till kunskapsinhämtning.

Kursmaterial: Har övrigt kursmaterial såsom handouts varit till hjälp? Hur kan detta material förbättras?

Handouts och seminariefrågor har varit fantastiskt bra. Min inlämning hade underlättats om jag kunnat läsa handouten innan föreläsningen.

Undervisning: Vad har varit bra och vad hade kunnat göras bättre avseende undervisningen? (T.ex. vad anser du om undervisningsformer, svårighetsgrad, antal föreläsningar? Var undervisningen till hjälp för förståelsen av litteraturen? Gav föreläsningarna/diskussionerna något utöver kurslitteraturen? m.m.)

Nicholas är fantastiskt bra, extremt bra planerad och genomförd kurs.

Feedback: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre med den feed-
back du har fått under kursen?

Jag är väldigt tacksam över nogrannheten
i feedbacken på inlämningsuppgiften.

Övrigt: Här finns utrymme för att lämna alla andra kommentarer du
skulle kunna vilja skriva om kursen.

Tack för en fantastiskt bra pedagogisk
insats under kursen, Nicklas!

2

LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

Litteratur: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre beträffande kurslitteraturen (avseende exempelvis omfattning och svårighetsgrad)?

Kursen har varit avslappnad och engerande, vi har haft roligt men ändå varit engerande.
Pliss på: hemuppgifterna, handoutsen och hemtentta istället för salstenta

Kursmaterial: Har övrigt kursmaterial såsom handouts varit till hjälp? Hur kan detta material förbättras?

Bra material, gillar att vi fick artiklar länkade

Undervisning: Vad har varit bra och vad hade kunnat göras bättre avseende undervisningen? (T.ex. vad anser du om undervisningsformer, svårighetsgrad, antal föreläsningar? Var undervisningen till hjälp för förståelsen av litteraturen? Gav föreläsningarna/diskussionerna något utöver kurslitteraturen? m.m.)

Det enda som hade kunnat vara bättre hade varit valfritt fördjupningsmaterial eller tips på fördjupning.
En av mina favoritkurser hittills

Feedback: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre med den feedback du har fått under kursen?

Fliss

Övrigt: Här finns utrymme för att lämna alla andra kommentarer du skulle kunna vilja skriva om kursen.

Som intran, en av mine favvickurser

2

Litteratur: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre beträffande
kurslitteraturen (avseende exempelvis omfattning och svårig-
hetsgrad)?

Bra, relevant och i ett ~~Bra~~ tempo.
(väl anpassat)

Kursmaterial: Har övrigt kursmaterial såsom handouts varit till hjälp? Hur
kan detta material förbättras?

Jättebra handouts, och typ nej det har varit bra.
Arbetsschema! Najs!

Undervisning: Vad har varit bra och vad hade kunnat göras bättre avseen-
de undervisningen? (T.ex. vad anser du om undervisningsfor-
mer, svårighetsgrad, antal föreläsningar? Var undervisningen
till hjälp för förståelsen av litteraturen? Gav föreläsningar-
na/diskussionerna något utöver kurslitteraturen? m.m.)

Helt ärligt bästa kursen jag tagit hittills ~~xxx~~ rent pedagogiskt.
~~xxx~~ Kan inte komma på någon förbättring.

Feedback: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre med den feed-back du har fått under kursen?

Över förväntan bra.

Övrigt: Här finns utrymme för att lämna alla andra kommentarer du skulle kunna vilja skriva om kursen.

Niklas är ett bevis på att alla föreläsare bör lära sig pedagogik det hjälper verkligen.

Be alla lärare ge ut ett arbetsschema!

(alla studenter behöver och mår bra av det)

Hemtentor är mer representativt för hur filosofi fungerar, vi borde göra alla examinationer så.

LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

Litteratur: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre beträffande kurslitteraturen (avseende exempelvis omfattning och svårighetsgrad)?

Litteraturen har passat bra till varje föreläsningstillfälle.

Kursmaterial: Har övrigt kursmaterial såsom handouts varit till hjälp? Hur kan detta material förbättras?

Handouts hjälper enormt mycket med att förstå originaltexter. Jag kan inte se hur dessa kan bli bättre.

Undervisning: Vad har varit bra och vad hade kunnat göras bättre avseende undervisningen? (T.ex. vad anser du om undervisningsformer, svårighetsgrad, antal föreläsningar? Var undervisningen till hjälp för förståelsen av litteraturen? Gav föreläsningarna/diskussionerna något utöver kurslitteraturen? m.m.)

Diskussionerna hjälper oss att förstå materialet, upplägget är välgjort.

Feedback: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre med den feedback du har fått under kursen?

Ovanligt välutvecklad feedback, uppskattas mycket!

Övrigt: Här finns utrymme för att lämna alla andra kommentarer du skulle kunna vilja skriva om kursen.

Det var en riktigt rolig kurs, som jag önskade varade längre.
Skitbra med hemtenta!! Det låter oss skriva mer utförligt och själv kommer jag ihåg och förstår mer när jag skriver hemtenta.

2

LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

Litteratur: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre beträffande kurslitteraturen (avseende exempelvis omfattning och svårighetsgrad)?

Den har varit okej! ~~kanske~~
Kul med orginaltexter & en lagom svårighetsgrad.

Kursmaterial: Har övrigt kursmaterial såsom handouts varit till hjälp? Hur kan detta material förbättras?

De har varit till en enorm hjälp & väldigt uppskattat.

Undervisning: Vad har varit bra och vad hade kunnat göras bättre avseende undervisningen? (T.ex. vad anser du om undervisningsformer, svårighetsgrad, antal föreläsningar? Var undervisningen till hjälp för förståelsen av litteraturen? Gav föreläsningarna/diskussionerna något utöver kurslitteraturen? m.m.)

Överlag en jättebra kurs, välstrukturerad & jag har uppskattat att veta exakt vad som förväntas av mig & när.
Hade gärna sett att fler kurser hade samma tydliga upplägg.

Feedback: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre med den feedback du har fått under kursen?

Älskade hur välstrukturerad kursen är!

Övrigt: Här finns utrymme för att lämna alla andra kommentarer du skulle kunna vilja skriva om kursen.

Mycket trevlig kurs & lärare, väldigt bra!
Älskar att det är en hemtenta, det gör
det så mycket enklare att reflektera & man lär sig
mer & på ett djupare plan.

2

30

LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

Litteratur: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre beträffande kurslitteraturen (avseende exempelvis omfattning och svårighetsgrad)?

Bra litteratur, men svårt pga att vissa ord inte har en översättning. Kanske aktuellt m. en lista m. termer och dess översättning och inget annat på denna lista så att det är lättillgängligt att ha till hands när man läser.

Kursmaterial: Har övrigt kursmaterial såsom handouts varit till hjälp? Hur kan detta material förbättras?

Väldigt bra m. handouts, bra m. arbetsschema. Vill alltid ha arbetsschema i alla kurser nånsin, snälla hälsa dina kollegor att eleverna blir glada då. Om eleverna får arbetsschema → eleverna glada.

Undervisning: Vad har varit bra och vad hade kunnat göras bättre avseende undervisningen? (T.ex. vad anser du om undervisningsformer, svårighetsgrad, antal föreläsningar? Var undervisningen till hjälp för förståelsen av litteraturen? Gav föreläsningarna/diskussionerna något utöver kurslitteraturen? m.m.)

Bra m. föreläsning + seminarium. Kul. Lite snabbt ibland. Vi gillar hemtenta. Tack.

PS! säg till de andra att vi vill ha arbetsschema!

Tack på förhand

Feedback: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre med den feed-back du har fått under kursen?

Övrigt: Här finns utrymme för att lämna alla andra kommentarer du skulle kunna vilja skriva om kursen.

2

LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

Litteratur: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre beträffande kurslitteraturen (avseende exempelvis omfattning och svårighetsgrad)?

Texterna än generellt sätt väldigt tydliga, ibland känns det som att det var mycket att läsa till varje lektion.

Kursmaterial: Har övrigt kursmaterial såsom handouts varit till hjälp? Hur kan detta material förbättras?

Handsouten har varit jättebra, en sammanfattning i slutet av varje handout hade varit perfekt.

Undervisning: Vad har varit bra och vad hade kunnat göras bättre avseende undervisningen? (T.ex. vad anser du om undervisningsformer, svårighetsgrad, antal föreläsningar? Var undervisningen till hjälp för förståelsen av litteraturen? Gav föreläsningarna/diskussionerna något utöver kurslitteraturen? m.m.)

Undervisningen har varit väldigt givande. Några av diskussionsfrågorna var lite svåra.

Feedback: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre med den feed-back du har fått under kursen?

Feedbacken har varit specifik vilket är bra.

Övrigt: Här finns utrymme för att lämna alla andra kommentarer du skulle kunna vilja skriva om kursen.

2

34

LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

Litteratur: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre beträffande kurslitteraturen (avseende exempelvis omfattning och svårighetsgrad)?

Jag gillade handoutsen och innehållet i dessa var väldigt bra anpassat till originaltexterna och vår förståelse. Ibland blev det mycket läsning då originaltexternas omfattning är relativt stora.

Kursmaterial: Har övrigt kursmaterial såsom handouts varit till hjälp? Hur kan detta material förbättras?

Arbetsschemat var väldigt hjälpfullt, samt saknas i andra kurser!

Undervisning: Vad har varit bra och vad hade kunnat göras bättre avseende undervisningen? (T.ex. vad anser du om undervisningsformer, svårighetsgrad, antal föreläsningar? Var undervisningen till hjälp för förståelsen av litteraturen? Gav föreläsningarna/diskussionerna något utöver kurslitteraturen? m.m.)

Dubbla föreläsningar tyckte jag var bra och inte för mycket eller för lite

Feedback: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre med den feed-
back du har fått under kursen?

Jag tycker hemuppgifterna ger en bra förscurele
för hemtentan. Hemtentan för övrigt tycker jag hemtentan
är ett bra sätt att tentera denna kurs.

Övrigt: Här finns utrymme för att lämna alla andra kommentarer du
skulle kunna vilja skriva om kursen.

Kul kurs! Berör många tänkvärda saker
inom språket

Litteratur: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre beträffande kurslitteraturen (avseende exempelvis omfattning och svårighetsgrad)?

Mycket bra litteratur. Ibland är originaltexterna svåra men det ska. dom vara.

Kursmaterial: Har övrigt kursmaterial såsom handouts varit till hjälp? Hur kan detta material förbättras?

Varit till mycket hjälp för att snabbt kunna överblicka ett ämne.

Undervisning: Vad har varit bra och vad hade kunnat göras bättre avseende undervisningen? (T.ex. vad anser du om undervisningsformer, svårighetsgrad, antal föreläsningar? Var undervisningen till hjälp för förståelsen av litteraturen? Gav föreläsningarna/diskussionerna något utöver kurslitteraturen? m.m.)

Överlag har jag gillat hela upplägget. framför allt hemuppgifterna.

Feedback: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre med den feedback du har fått under kursen?

Fått bra feedback på hur jag
skulle skriva för att få VG.

Övrigt: Här finns utrymme för att lämna alla andra kommentarer du skulle kunna vilja skriva om kursen.

Gillar att vi har hemtenta.

2

LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

Litteratur: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre beträffande kurslitteraturen (avseende exempelvis omfattning och svårighetsgrad)?

Vet inte delt var helt ok

Kursmaterial: Har övrigt kursmaterial såsom handouts varit till hjälp? Hur kan detta material förbättras?

handoutsen var bra, bättre än vissa tidigare kurser

Undervisning: Vad har varit bra och vad hade kunnat göras bättre avseende undervisningen? (T.ex. vad anser du om undervisningsformer, svårighetsgrad, antal föreläsningar? Var undervisningen till hjälp för förståelsen av litteraturen? Gav föreläsningarna/diskussionerna något utöver kurslitteraturen? m.m.)

formatet var bra vet inte om jag hade ändrat något

Feedback: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre med den feed-
back du har fått under kursen?

inte mycket att säga

Övrigt: Här finns utrymme för att lämna alla andra kommentarer du
skulle kunna vilja skriva om kursen.

inte mycket att säga

2

LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

Litteratur: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre beträffande
kurslitteraturen (avseende exempelvis omfattning och svårig-
hetsgrad)?

Bra val av kursbok och tydligt förklarat
här denna inte stämmer. Orginaltexter
varierar i svårighet, kanske skulle behövas någon
info om vilka texter som är eller inte är
mer komplicerade.

Kursmaterial: Har övrigt kursmaterial såsom handouts varit till hjälp? Hur
kan detta material förbättras?

Bra handouts, möjligtvis rubriker för
struktur men annars inga klagomål.
Väldigt bra med arbetsplanering och struken
på canvas andra lärare borde följa detta
exemplet.

Undervisning: Vad har varit bra och vad hade kunnat göras bättre avseen-
de undervisningen? (T.ex. vad anser du om undervisningsfor-
mer, svårighetsgrad, antal föreläsningar? Var undervisningen
till hjälp för förståelsen av litteraturen? Gav föreläsningar-
na/diskussionerna något utöver kurslitteraturen? m.m.)

Inga problem
Bra föreläsningar och seminarinen,
ev. gå igenom Seminarifrågor tillsmmng
efter föreläsning

Feedback: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre med den feedback du har fått under kursen?

Bra feedback

Övrigt: Här finns utrymme för att lämna alla andra kommentarer du skulle kunna vilja skriva om kursen.

+ + Väldigt bra med hemtentamen,
· ger en bättre förståelse och användning
av kurslitteratur
+ Bra med valfria hemuppgifter, bättre förståelse
Bäst strukturerad kurs hittills (mindre stress

2

42

LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

Litteratur: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre beträffande kurslitteraturen (avseende exempelvis omfattning och svårighetsgrad)?

Jag tyckte både texter och kursbok var bra i omfattning och svårighetsgrad.

Kursmaterial: Har övrigt kursmaterial såsom handouts varit till hjälp? Hur kan detta material förbättras?

Handouts har varit väldigt hjälpsamma, men layouten (listonmates) av dem tycker jag mest var förvirrande.

Undervisning: Vad har varit bra och vad hade kunnat göras bättre avseende undervisningen? (T.ex. vad anser du om undervisningsformer, svårighetsgrad, antal föreläsningar? Var undervisningen till hjälp för förståelsen av litteraturen? Gav föreläsningarna/diskussionerna något utöver kurslitteraturen? m.m.)

Det ende jag önskar är att det på seminarierna hade varit någon slags uppsamling i hellclass då det annars är svårt att veta om det som diskuterats i gruppen är relevant.

Feedback: Vad har varit bra och vad kunde ha varit bättre med den feedback du har fått under kursen?

Är mycket nöjd med feedback som getts.

Övrigt: Här finns utrymme för att lämna alla andra kommentarer du skulle kunna vilja skriva om kursen.

Gillar att det var hemtents istället för salstenta. Känns som att det testar kunskapena bättre.

2

E EXAMPLE WORK SCHEDULE

LUNDS UNIVERSITET

Måndag 13/3:

Läs kapitel 1 i Philosophy of Language.

Föreläsning 13:15 - 15:00.

Läs kapitel 2 i Philosophy of Language.

Tisdag 14/3:

Läs Russell, B. (1905) On Denoting.

Strawson, P.F. (1950) On Referring.

Onsdag 15/3:

Föreläsning 13:15-15:00

Läs kapitel 3 i Philosophy of Language.

Torsdag 16/3:

Läs Frege, G. (1892) On Sense and Reference.

Läs Searle, J. (1958) Proper Names.

Läs kapitel 4 i Philosophy of Language

Fredag 17/3:

Läs Kripke, S. (1972) Utdrag ur Naming and Necessity.

Föreläsning 13:15-15:00.

Läs Putnam, H. (1973) Meaning and Reference.

Måndag 20/3:

Föreläsning 10:15-12:00.

Läs kapitel 5 i Philosophy of Language.

Läs kapitel 8 i Philosophy of Language.

Tisdag 21/3:

Läs Quine, W.V.O. (1951) Two Dogmas of Empiricism.

Skriv svar på första frågan på Hemuppgift 1.

Onsdag 22/3:

Föreläsning 10:15-12:00.

Läs kapitel 6 i Philosophy of Language.

Läs Wittgenstein, L. (1953) Utdrag ur Philosophical Investigations.

Torsdag 23/3:

Läs Brandom, R. (2007) Inferentialism and Some of Its Challenges.

Läs kapitel 9 i Philosophy of Language.

Skriv svar på andra frågan på Hemuppgift 1.

Fredag 24/3:

Föreläsning 10:15-12:00.

Deadline 12:00 för Hemuppgift 1!

Läs kapitel 10 i Philosophy of Language.

Läs Davidson, D. (1967) Truth and Meaning.

Måndag 27/3:

Läs Szabo, Z. (2012) The Case for Compositionality.

Föreläsning 13:15-15:00.

Läs kapitel 7 i Philosophy of Language.

Tisdag 28/3:

Läs Grice, H.P. (1957) Meaning,

Läs kapitel 11 i Philosophy of Language.

Läs Borg, E. (2012) Semantics without Pragmatics.

Onsdag 29/3:

Föreläsning 10:15-12:00.

Skriv svar på första frågan på Hemuppgift 2.

Läs kapitel 12 i Philosophy of Language.

Torsdag 30/3:

Läs Grice, H.P. (1975) Logic and Conversation.

Läs kapitel 13 i Philosophy of Language.

Skriv svar på andra frågan på Hemuppgift 2.

Fredag 31/3:

Läs kapitel 14 i Philosophy of Language.

Deadline 12:00 för Hemuppgift 2!

Föreläsning 13:15-15:00.

Läs kapitel 15 i Philosophy of Language.

Hemtentan publiceras efter föreläsningen.

2

Måndag 3/4:

Läs Saul, J. (2012) Politically Significant Terms and Philosophy of Language.

Läs Camp, E. (2013) Slurring Perspectives

Tisdag 4/4:

Föreläsning 10:15-12:00.

Tisdag 11/4:

Deadline för inlämning av hemtenta 23:59.

3

References

Bengtsson, L. (2019), "Take-Home Exams in Higher Education: A Systematic Review", in *Education Sciences* 9 (267), pp. 1–16.

Biggs, J. and C. Tang (2011), *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*, 4th, Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Boud, D. and P. Dawson (2023), "What Feedback Literate Teachers Do: An Empirically-derived Competency Framework", in *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 48 (2), pp. 158–171.

Calder, L. (2006), "Uncoverage: Toward a Signature Pedagogy for the History Survey", in *The Journal of American History* 92 (4), pp. 1358–1370.

Carless, D. and D. Boud (2018), "The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of feedback", in *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 43 (8), pp. 1315–1325.

Carpenter, S. K., A. E. Witherby, and S. K. Tauber (2020), "On Students' (Mis)judgments of Learning and Teaching Effectiveness", in *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition* 9, pp. 137–151.

Danvers, E. (2018), "Who is the critical thinker in higher education? A feminist re-thinking", in *Higher Education Research and Development* 23 (5), pp. 548–562.

Elmgren, M. and A.-S. Henriksson (2016), *Universitetspedagogik*, Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Foster, N. L. et al. (2017), "Even after thirteen class exams, students are still overconfident: the role of memory for past exam performance in student predictions", in *Metacognition Learning* 12, pp. 1–19.

Kyndt, E. et al. (2014), "'Time is not enough.' Workload in higher education: a student perspective", in *Higher Education Research and Development* 33 (4), pp. 684–698.

O'Donovan, B., M. Price, and C. Rust (2004), "Know what I mean? Enhancing student understanding of assessment standards and criteria", in *Teaching in Higher Education* 9 (3), pp. 325–335.

Rudisill, J. (2011), "The Transition from Studying Philosophy to Doing Philosophy", in *Teaching Philosophy* 34 (3), pp. 241–271.

Ruonakoski, E. (2023), *Sisters of the Brotherhood: Alienation and Inclusion in Learning Philosophy*, Cham: Springer Nature.