

*Sample Undergraduate Core Course Syllabus*

# POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS WESTERN COUNTRIES, THE EUROPEAN UNION AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

## COMPENDIUM

Helene Helboe Pedersen (Coordinator)

Rasmus Brun Pedersen (Coordinator)

Daniel Finke

Anthony Kevins

---

---

## 1. Introduction – the goals and aims of the course

This compendium is developed for the BA-course *Political Institutions: Western countries, The European Union and International Institutions* (PI). The course deals with political systems and their interactions. Its focus is on providing students with an understanding of how political systems work, as well as the causes and consequences of institutional differences for the representativeness and efficiency of political decision-making processes.

The course contains three core elements: 1) national political systems and institutional differences between these systems; 2) international cooperation and the interaction between political systems; and 3) the political system of the EU.

The first bloc of the course provides insights into the political systems of selected countries and the significance of key institutional differences across political systems. This includes differences between presidential and parliamentary systems, federal states and unitary states, and the modes of operation in parliaments and governments.

The second bloc of the course concentrates on the interaction between political systems, transnational politics and related theories. In particular, we focus on theories aimed at explaining the formation and operation of international organisations, as well as different types of transnational governance.

The third bloc of the course focuses on the EU's political system and the various theories that have been developed in relation to it. This includes theories about European integration, representation and elections in the EU, and the EU's institutional structure, mode of operation and foreign policy.

The goal of the course is to give students a general knowledge of how political institutions at various levels of governance function, develop, and impact democratic representation and decision-making. Specifically, the course aims to give students the following competences:

- The student must be able to describe the political system of selected western countries, the EU, and international organizations.
- The student must be able to describe selected theories of how political actors interact in and through political institutions.
- The student must be able to compare key empirical differences between political systems and identify the differences and similarities.
- The student must be able to compare selected theories about the relationship between political actors and institutions and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of these theories
- The student must be able to apply the general methods of political science to independently and systematically analyze issues regarding institutions, political systems and their interaction.
- The student must be able to apply the theories of the course to analyse empirical material and issues regarding institutions and their interaction to independently and systematically discuss and assess the relevance and scope of application of these theories.

These overall learning objectives can be divided into three major headings (as illustrated in Table 1): theoretical knowledge, empirical knowledge, and an ability to apply theories to empirical material.

**Table 1. Overall learning objectives for the course**


Theory	Empirical knowledge	Application
<p>The student must be able to describe selected theories of how political actors interact in and through political institutions.</p> <p>They must be able to compare selected theories about the relationship between political actors and institutions and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of these theories</p>	<p>The student must be able to describe the political system of selected western countries, the EU, and selected international organizations.</p>	<p>The student must be able to apply the general methods of political science to independently and systematically analyze issues regarding institutions, political systems and their interaction.</p> <p>The student must be able to apply the theories of the course to analyze empirical material and issues regarding institutions and their interaction. The goal here is to independently and systematically discuss and assess the relevance and scope of application of these theories.</p>

In order to achieve these goals, the course has been organized as described in Sections 3 and 4.

## 2. The course's relation to other courses on the BA in Political Science

The course is closely connected to other BA-courses in political science at Aarhus University. Figure 1 places PI in relation to other courses taught in the BA-education through a simplified version of an input-output-model. It should be noted that the model is a simplified presentation and certain overlaps will occur between the different courses. On overall level General Political Science (Almen Statskundskab) deals with the input side of the political system. It presents knowledge of and theories about social cleavages, opinion formation, the role of public opinion and on political participation. The course on Public Policy (Offentlig Politik) overall focuses on the outcome side – political decisions, policies, regimes and reforms that are treated as the dependent variable. International Relations (International Politik) deals in a broad sense with the international systems, and how states interact and conduct their foreign policies where the focus is on the structure of the international system and the role of conflicts and cooperation between states.

**Figure 1: The PI course role in the BA-program**




## 3. The organization of the course

PI focuses on what happens in the so-called “black box” between demands expressed in civil society to policies influencing the living conditions in a society. It is per definition difficult to study what happens in a black box. In PI we open the black box by studying the way power is organized in central political institutions and how they operate in order to reach political decisions. We thus study the role of the structures as well as the modus operandi of selected political institutions. The classic input-output-models were traditional primary limited to and aimed at understanding domestic politics and distributive processes on this level.

However, to give a comprehensive understanding of how the most important political institutions are structured and function we need to acknowledge that modern governance is multilayered. There are multiple layers of authority from municipalities over nation states to supranational organizations. Therefore, in order to grasp these different layers of authority, PI needs to draw on insight from Comparative Politics as well as International Relations to understand the way power is structured within as well as between states. The overall theoretical framework used to bridge Comparative Politics and IR is theories of institutionalism. Institutionalism has been a central theoretical tendency that have drawn focus on how institutions are created and their effects on behavior and policies, which has been themes in studies of international relations and in comparative politics

The course PI is organized according to the different layers of governance in modern developed democracies and makes a distinction between 2 layers: the national level and the regional level (EU) and focus on how and why states creates international institutions and how they impact upon states behavior by giving examples from NATO and UN. Figure 2 illustrates the organization of the course.

**Figure 2: Illustration of the structure of PI**



This means that the overall organization of the course will consist off tree overall blocks:

We start the course with a general introduction to the concept of institutions and theories about the relationship between actors and institutions (L1). This general framework is relevant for all aspects of the course even though a somewhat different terminology is used in the different research traditions.

- In the first bloc (weeks 2-5), we focus on the national level of governance (we do not move below the national level so we will not discuss municipalities or states in much detail). Empirically we focus on Western democracies when applying typologies to describe national political institutions such as electoral systems, legislatures and executives.
- The second bloc (weeks 6-8) takes one further step towards studying political institutions beyond the nation state. Based on theories from Institutional theories we discuss why states choose to create international organizations and whether and how states can control international organizations when they are first are created. Empirical we will draw on examples from the UN, NATO and the EU.

- The third bloc (weeks 9-14) deals with the European Union as an example of regional level governance. The political system of EU will be explained in detail but EU will also be analysed from an IR-perspective as an example of cooperation between sovereign nation states and as an actor in international politics. This EU-bloc is the largest bloc in the course since it is a goal of PI in itself that students are familiar with the EU political system and because EU as an empirical case bridges the research traditions of comparative politics and international relations.

Finally, in the last week of teaching we discuss how the study of institutions draw on different traditions in comparative politics and international relations and make a critical reflection on the contribution of institutional theories. The course can be described on more details in table 2.

**Table 2. Organization of the course: Lectures and classes**

Week	Lecturer	Theme
L1 Jan. 31	HHP	Introduction: Institutionalism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hall &amp; Taylor (1996) New institutionalism</li> <li>• Compendium comments (supplementary reading)</li> </ul>
C1		Institutionalism beyond Comparative Politics and International Relations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jupille &amp; Caporaso (1999) Institutionalism and the European Union</li> </ul>
<b>Block 1: Political institutions in Western countries</b>		
L2: Feb. 7	AK	Electoral systems and party systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repetition: Gallager (2013) Electoral systems</li> <li>• Caramani (2013) Party systems</li> <li>• Benoit (2007) Electoral laws as political consequences</li> </ul>
C2		Electoral systems and womens representation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• McAlister &amp; Studlar (2002) Electoral systems and women's representation: a long-term perspective</li> </ul>
L3: Feb. 14	HHP	Legislatures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kreppel (2014) Typologies and Classifications</li> <li>• Sieberer (2011) The Institutional Power of Western European Parliaments</li> </ul>
C3		Classifying legislatures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dalton (2012) Politics in Germany</li> <li>• Schain (2012) Politics in France</li> </ul>
L4: Feb. 21	HHP	Governments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cheibub et al. (2004) Government Coalition and Legislative Success Under Presidentialism and Parliamentarism</li> </ul>
C4		Government efficiency and responsiveness

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coleman (1999) Unified Government, Divided Government, and Party Responsiveness</li> </ul>
L5: Feb. 28	AK	<p>Federalism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loughlin (2011) Federal and local government institutions</li> <li>• Beramendi (2007) Federalism</li> </ul>
C5		<p>Representation in federal systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wlezien &amp; Soroka (2011) Federalism and Public Responsiveness to Policy</li> </ul>
<b>Block 2: International cooperation</b>		
L6: March 7	RBP	<p>Why states create international organisations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keohane (1984) After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Economy</li> <li>• Stein (1982) Coordination and Collaboration: Regimes in an Anarchic World</li> </ul> <p><i>Supplementary readings: Jackson &amp; Sørensen pp. 107-110</i></p>
C6		<p>Establishing international security cooperation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schimmelfennig (2016) NATO and institutional theories of international relations</li> </ul>
L7: March 14	RBP	<p>What do international institutions do?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buzan (2004) From International to World Society?</li> <li>• Barnett &amp; Finnemore (2007) Practical approach</li> <li>• Knudsen (2015) Primary institutions and international organizations: Theorizing continuity and change</li> </ul>
C7		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as lecture</li> </ul>
L8: March 21	RBP	<p>Economic and political cooperation: EU integration process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moravcsik &amp; Schimmelfennig (2009). Liberal Intergovernmentalism</li> <li>• Niemann &amp; Schmitter (2009). Neo-functionalism</li> </ul>
C8	RBP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schimmelfennig (2015) Liberal intergovernmentalism and the euro area crisis</li> <li>• Niemann &amp; Ioannou (2015) European economic integration in times of crisis: a case of neofunctionalism?</li> </ul>
<b>Block 3: The EU</b>		
L9: March 28	AK	<p>The political system of the EU</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hix &amp; Høyland (2011) pp. 1-18</li> <li>• Hargreaves &amp; Homewood (2013) EU Law Concentrate: Law Revision and Study Guide</li> </ul>
C9		<p>No readings – trial exam</p>
L10: April 4	AK	<p>Executive politics in the EU</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hix &amp; Høyland (2011) pp. 23-48</li> </ul>
C10		<p>A new type of Commission?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peterson (2016) Juncker's Political European Commission and an</li> </ul>

		EU in Crisis.
L11: April 18	DF	Legislative politics in the EU <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hix &amp; Høyland (2011) pp. 49-75</li> </ul>
C11		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rasmussen &amp; Reh (2013) The consequences of concluding codecision early</li> <li>Häge &amp; Kaeding (2007) Reconsidering the European Parliament's legislative influence</li> </ul>
L12: April 25	DF	Elections and democracy in the EU <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hix &amp; Høyland (2011) pp. 105-157</li> </ul>
C12		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Follesdal &amp; Hix (2006) Why there is a democratic deficit in the EU</li> </ul>
L13: May 2	DF	Judicial politics in the EU <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hix &amp; Høyland (2011) pp. 75-105</li> </ul>
C13		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Carrubba, Gabel &amp; Hankla (2008) Judicial behavior under political constraints</li> <li>Dyevre (2010). Unifying the field of comparative judicial politics</li> </ul>
L14: May 9	DF	The EU as a global actor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hix &amp; Høyland (2011) pp. 302-331</li> </ul>
C14		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dür &amp; Zimmermann (2007) Introduction: The EU in international trade negotiations</li> <li>Da Conceicao (2010) Who controls whom? Dynamics of power delegation and agency losses in EU trade politics</li> </ul>
<b>Outro</b>		
L15: May 16	RBP, DF, HHP, AK	Wrap up and critical reflections and exam
		Exam preparations

PI is organized as most other BA-courses with four hours teaching per week. Two hours of lectures and two hours of class discussions. The exam is a six hour written exam and after the course students are expected to be able to describe political institutions and theories about them and to be able to compare these institutions and theories in a theoretically informed empirical analysis. The descriptive element of the course is thus strong giving students an opportunity to gather knowledge of various political institutions on the national as well as international level of governance.

To make the teaching activities support the achievement of the learning objectives lectures will focus on providing knowledge of concepts, typologies and theories for defining, classifying and understanding the function and structure of political institutions, while classes will focus on applying these concepts, typologies and theories on empirical material. Exercises for the classes will focus on 1) supporting the gathering of empirical knowledge of selected political institutions for instance through class presentations and 2) training writing skills through smaller weekly written assignments.

Lectures as well as classes will be taught in English just as all written assignments must be in English.

The final exam can be written in Danish or English.



Lectures

Helene Helboe Pedersen (HHP) ([helene@ps.au.dk](mailto:helene@ps.au.dk)) (coordinator), Lecturer

Rasmus Brun Pedersen (RBP) ([brun@ps.au.dk](mailto:brun@ps.au.dk)) (coordinator), Lecturer

Anthony Kevins (AK) ([akevins@ps.au.dk](mailto:akevins@ps.au.dk)) Lecturer and course instructor

Daniel Finke (DF) ([finke@ps.au.dk](mailto:finke@ps.au.dk)) Lecturer

If you have any practical questions you are welcome to contact one or both of the coordinators.

---

---

## 4. Comments for the reading material

### Week 1: Introduction to Institutionalism

#### Lecture

PI starts out with an introduction to the role of institutionalism in political science and how it has developed. Here the definition of institutions as well as the different positions on how institutions and actors stand in relation to each other is discussed. We also use this first week to discuss why studies of political institutions in systems of multilevel governance need to draw on ideas from comparative politics as well as international relations.

Political institutions have always played a prominent role in political science. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century scholars were concerned with describing formal political institutions such as constitutions, legislatures and administrative apparatuses. This tradition has been labelled 'old institutionalism' and was critiqued of being too descriptive not leading to cumulative knowledge and theory development. Political scientists, especially in US, reacted by initiating the behavioral approach (behaviouralism) in the years after World War II. Here the importance of political institutions was either rejected or reduced and it was argued that political behavior could not be explained or studied by reading formal rules but only by observing actual behavior. Political phenomena were explained by the aggregate behavior of individual (rational and strategic) actors. However, 'new institutionalism' evolved as a reaction to behaviouralism around the 1980s. One of the reasons was that scholars found themselves unable to explain important political outcomes by only taking the individual interests of the actors into account. For instance, rational choice scholars of the US Congress found it difficult to explain coordination and cooperation among Members of Congress. 'New institutionalism' in general has a broader understanding of institutions including informal institutions such as procedures and norm and they also theorize more explicitly about the relationship between actors and institutions.

In the text for the lecture Hall & Taylor (1996) argues that the approach of 'new institutionalism' can be divided into three schools of institutionalism: historical institutionalism, rational choice institutionalism and sociological institutionalism. They describe and compare the different schools highlighting the most important differences and similarities. They also discuss the potential these schools hold for explaining the creation and change of political institutions.

The new institutionalism has had a tremendous impact on political science. So much, that Pierson and Skocpol claim that "*we are all institutionalists now*"<sup>1</sup>. The relevance and use of institutional approaches have perhaps been nowhere more profound than in the study of the European Union.

#### Classes

In the text for the first class Jupille and Caporaso build on the new institutionalist approach and argue that the institutional approach has made it possible to formulate a more coherent study of the European Union which as a political phenomenon stands ambiguously between the fields of international relations and comparative politics. By reviewing studies of EU they classify the

---

<sup>1</sup> Pierson, P. and T. Skocpol (2002) 'Historical institutionalism in contemporary political science' in I. Katznelson and H. V. Miller (eds.) *Political Science: State of the Discipline*, New York: Norton, pp. 693-721

institutionalist approaches according to their assumptions regarding institutions and preferences and discuss how an institutional approach offers analytical tools for analyzing the most recent questions in the study of EU. Their main argument is that a generic form of institutionalism is more promising for the study of EU than sticking in the camps of comparative politics or international relations.

*Learning objectives for week 1*

Theory	Empirical knowledge	Application
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe the three new institutional approaches</li> <li>Discuss their differences and similarities</li> <li>Discuss their strengths and weaknesses</li> </ul>	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use institutionalisms to discuss how EU as a political phenomenon can be understood in different ways</li> </ul>

**Bloc 1: Political institutions in Western countries**

In the first bloc we introduce essential political institutions in Western countries. Specifically we discuss four political institutions, which are central for the way power is distributed and operates in political systems. These institutions are the electoral system, legislatures, executives and federalism. For each of these institutions we discuss 1) how to classify them, 2) potential causes of variations and 3) potential consequences for representation and efficiency.

Week 2: Electoral systems

While parliaments and governments are in many ways the core institutions that make democracies function on an everyday basis, which parties enter parliament and, subsequently, form the government is not a given. This is not least because the electoral rules governing how people vote and how these votes are translated into parliamentary seats vary greatly between countries. We will study what consequences the organization of electoral systems have on social outcomes like turnout and the representation of minority interests. In reality, the electoral system of a country is never neutral: it always benefits some groups in society over others. Given this inherent issue, it is vital to understand why some countries adopt one electoral system over another.

*Lecture*

This lecture addresses three primary questions: what is an electoral system?; how do electoral systems matter?; and why do electoral systems differ across countries? It begins with a brief overview of the key distinctions among electoral systems. Although you were already introduced to the topic in Pol.Intro, we start with a refresher given the wide variety of electoral systems out there (hence the repetition from Caramani). Crucially, this overview will also allow us to home in on some the electoral system characteristics that are especially important to outcomes we may care about (such as inequality and minority representation). We then turn to a discussion of why different countries have ended up with different electoral systems, using the Benoit article as our starting point. This view of electoral laws as political consequences will then be illustrated using a recent example from the UK.

---

---

### *Classes*

In lecture we discussed some of the consequences of electoral systems, and we use the tutorial this week to focus in on one of these effects: how does a country's electoral system affect women's representation in parliament? We will use the article by McAlister and Studlar (2002) to kick off a discussion about what factors seem to matter for the number of women elected to parliament. Yet your own research will be essential to this discussion, as the exercise this week will have you updating the data in the article and conducting research on a country of your choice.

### *Learning objectives of week 2*

Theory	Empirical knowledge	Application
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Describe different types of electoral systems</li><li>• Describe causes of variation in electoral system types</li><li>• Describe some of the consequences of different electoral system types</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Describe factors that might shape women's legislative representation in developed countries</li><li>• Be familiar with general patterns in women's legislative representation as they relate to electoral systems</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Discuss in what ways electoral systems might increase or decrease women's legislative representation</li></ul>

### Week 3: Legislatures

Almost all countries have some kind of legislature. Legislatures in Western countries are comparative old and have served as inspiration for many younger legislatures around the world. Legislatures have been research objects in political science for centuries as scholars have asked how legislatures are organized, what they do, and not least how powerful they are. During the era of old institutionalism especially descriptive typologies and detailed single case descriptions of the formal organization and procedures of legislatures were prominent. We now build on this research as studies of legislature moves towards a more new institutionalist approach where informal as well as formal characteristics are taken into account and the search for explanations to the variation across legislatures has set in.

### *Lecture*

In the lecture, you are provided with an overview of the relevant dimensions for describing legislatures such as the relationship between the legislature and the executive, the tasks of a legislature and the organizational differences in terms of chambers and committees. Furthermore, more recent attempts of classifying legislatures proposed by Kreppel and Sieberer are presented showing how legislatures may not only be classified into boxes of weak and strong legislatures but can be measured on more dimensions regarding their institutional independence and power resources to give a more accurate and dynamic description of modern legislatures. Hereby, it also becomes evident how legislatures not only circumscribe the behavior of legislative actors but also are products of powerful actors' interaction.

### *Classes*

In the class for this week, you will read about the French and German legislatures to get a detailed knowledge of these systems. In the exercise, you are asked to apply the theoretical knowledge from the lecture to describe and compare the French and German legislatures according to the dimensions presented in the lecture.

*Learning objectives for week 3*

Theory	Empirical knowledge	Application
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Identify dimensions for classifying legislatures</li><li>• Discuss strengths and weaknesses of different typologies</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Detailed knowledge of the French and German legislatures</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Use typologies to describe and classify legislatures</li><li>• Discuss potential cause and consequences of the institutional design of legislatures.</li></ul>

Week 4: Executives

A major theme for old institutionalist studies is the constitutional division of power between the executive and legislative powers. The most prominent dichotomy for describing these relations are presidential versus parliamentary regimes. Whereas many institutionalist studies have been occupied with how to classify regimes within these two broad categories and their subcategories, new institutionalism has drawn increased attention toward the consequences of different regime types for representation and efficiency. In this week, we build a causal chain where we first ask how parliamentary/presidential regimes influence government formation and second how different types of governments within these two regime types influence legislative efficiency (lecture) and responsiveness (class).

*Lecture*

In the lecture, you are introduced to the major differences between presidential and parliamentary regimes and the traditional critique of the representativeness and efficiency of these systems. The lecture presents a definition of a government and different types of governments such as majority and minority, coalition and single-party governments. Based on this common framework the lecture use the article by Cheibub et al. (2004) to discuss first if coalition governments are more likely in parliamentary regimes and second if minority governments are less legislative efficient in presidential regimes. The main theoretical argument is that government formation and legislative efficiency is a product of the interaction between incentives regulated by political institutions and the preferences of political actors – in this case political parties.

*Classes*

In the classes for this week, we continue the discussion on the potential consequences of different types of government. Specifically we consider the case of divided government in US. Coleman (1999) revisits the claim that divided governments are just as efficient as unified governments and argues that scholars have 1) neglected important moderating institutional factor and 2) misinterpreted the party government model and thus neglected the importance of responsiveness rather than efficiency in the production of bills. In the exercise, you are asked to apply your theoretical knowledge from the lecture to define and explain divided government and to discuss the consequences of different forms of government in the case of US.

*Learning objectives of week 4*

Theory	Empirical knowledge	Application
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Define different types of government and executive-legislative relations</li> <li>Discuss potential strength and weaknesses of parliamentary and presidential systems</li> <li>Explain the potential impact of regime types on coalition formation</li> <li>Explain the potential impact of government type on legislative efficiency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explain the decision-making procedure in US</li> <li>Explain what is meant by divided government in US</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use definitions of different governments to describe and classify governments in Western countries</li> <li>Make theoretically informed analyses of possible consequences of different types of government</li> </ul>

Week 5: Federalism

So far the course has concentrated on national level political institutions like legislatures and executives. These are clearly very important, yet in many countries power is not concentrated at the national level, but is rather spread out across federal sub-units (e.g. states, provinces, cantons). This week's focus on federalism will serve as an essential part of the national bloc – allowing us to grasp just how much of an impact federal structures have on the way other political institutions function in a country. What is more, it will also provide a helpful bridge to the EU bloc, since it serves as an introduction to multi-level governance.

*Lecture*

The lecture explores the role of federalism in modern-day democracies, using the texts by Loughlin and Beramendi as an introduction to federalism and the major debates surrounding it in the literature. We start by providing an overview of the main characteristics of federal as opposed to unitary states, while at the same time distinguishing federalism from decentralisation. We will then turn to outline the historical origins of federalist institutions: why have some countries chosen this particular mode of government, while others haven't? Next, we will proceed to examine how federalist institutions affect the operation of democracy, in the process touching on some of the other discussions we have engaged in during the national bloc. Given the nature of federalism, we will also discuss how it has a profound effect on the distribution of resources across a federation. Finally, we end the lecture by briefly discussing how traditional federalism (the topic of this lecture) might relate to the European Union (as the subject of the next lecture bloc).

*Classes*

As we discussed in lecture, federalism has important implications for the way democracies work. One crucial implication relates to the extent of democratic accountability, since it can be difficult in a federation to disentangle the issues that matter for elections at the federal versus subnational levels. The tutorial this week therefore focuses on the extent to which voters are able to sort out which policy actions and responsibilities belong to which levels of government. The discussion will start from Wlezien and Soroka's investigation of public responsiveness in Canada. In your groups,

you will then conduct your own research on the Canadian federation to better understand not only how federalism works in practice, but also the difficulties in assigning responsibility for policy outcomes.

*Learning objectives of week 5*

Theory	Empirical knowledge	Application
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Describe federalism and distinguish it from alternative forms of governance</li><li>• Discuss the relationship between federalism and decentralisation</li><li>• Describe some potential causes and consequences of federalism</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Describe the concept of accountability and its relationship to federalism</li><li>• Describe some of the complexities inherent in federalism using the Canadian example</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Discuss the connection between public opinion and government responsibilities in a federation</li></ul>

**Bloc 2: International institutions**

In the second bloc we move beyond the nation state and introduce various approaches to study the question of why states choose to cooperate internationally, why they choose to institutionalize their cooperation by creating international institutions. We further investigate the question of what these types of institutions can do, and once created whether they can develop a life of their own, independent from the states that created them in the first place. The bloc introduces you to International Relations theories treatment of institutionalism and tries to bridge comparative politics and IR with the common institutionalist focus.

Week6: RC and Security cooperation

The first week in this block addresses some of the fundamental questions of the creation and maintenance of international cooperation. The main focus is to give a deeper understanding of the Rational choice institutionalism and how insights have been utilized and translated in the IR literature to explain why states choose to cooperate. The particular focus is on Liberal Institutionalism and how and why states create international organizations and regimes. It is important to have an understanding of the role of preferences, level of information, trust in order to understand the strength and durability of the international organizations that states create in order to regulate their interactions.

*Lecture*

This lecture addresses three primary questions: Why do states choose to cooperate; what can explain the decisions to create international institutions; and what design do they choose for the organization. The theoretical backbone in this lecture is Rational Choice institutionalism. Based on rational choice and game theoretical insights the lecture presents a framework that can be utilized

to answer the three above mentioned questions. We focus in particular on the relevance of preferences, information and expected utility. In addition we draw on the insights from SI and HI.

### *Classes*

In the lecture we introduced a theoretical rational choice framework to explain why states cooperate and why they form institutions. In the classes we want you to utilize this framework to analyze the cooperation in the NATO alliance and discuss how this organization works and how it can be changed in the future

### *Learning objectives of week 6*

Theory	Empirical knowledge	Application
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Describe RC intuitionism</li><li>• Understand the logics in the theory and its approach to the formation and the design of international organizations</li><li>• Describe some of the consequences institutional designs have on states behavior</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Knowledge of the organization of NATO as an example of an international organization</li><li>• Describe factors that might shape international organizations</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Apply institutionalist explanations to explain why NATO was created and how it can be changed in the future to meet new security threats.</li></ul>

### Week 7: What do institutions do?

The second week of this block deals with the question of what happens when international institutions are created and ask whether the states that have created the institutions can control them and whether there are unintended consequences of the establishment of international institutions.

### *Lecture*

The lecture takes its point of departure in sociological institutionalism and insights from the IR literature the lecture asks the question about what happens when states have established international institutions. Can states control the institutions and what impact do these institutions have on the behavior of the founding states? The lecture treats institutions based on the insights from the English school, and its focus on primary and secondary institutions and how they develop and evolve.

Taken its empirical point of departure in examples from the UN cooperation it focuses on the impact of the creation of international norms and procedures for conflict resolutions and whether the evolution of international norms can be said to be in the control of the member states or whether institutions tend to live a life on their own. The lecture also introduces historical institutionalism to



answer these questions, especially the role of path dependency, and whether these institutional paths can be said to follow the initial ideas behind the creation of the international institutions.

### *Classes*

The classes will draw on the literature from the lecture and focus on whether institutions are in the control of member states or whether institutions can have a life of their own. The aim is to utilize the theoretical approaches on a concrete case about the UN's Right to protect framework that have evolved over the last decades.

### *Learning objectives of week 7*

Theory	Empirical knowledge	Application
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Describe Sociological and Historical institutionalism</li><li>• Understand the logics in the theory and its approach to the formation and the design of international organizations and whether states can continue to control institutions</li><li>• Describe some of the consequences institutional designs have on states behavior</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Knowledge of the organization of UN as an example of an international organization where states have difficulties in controlling</li><li>• Describe factors that might shape international organizations impact upon states behavior</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Apply institutionalism to explain why UN system can evolve beyond the control of the member states preferences</li></ul>

### Week 8: Political and economic cooperation: EU integration process

The final week in this block synthesizes elements in the three institutionalisms in the study of the European integration process. The goal is to illustrate how the institutional logics have been in cooperated in theories like Neo-functionalism and Liberal Intergovernmentalism and their explanation of the European integration process. Another goal is to prepare the students for the following block on EUs institutions. Here a solid knowledge of the process that shaped these institutions is a precondition for the understanding of the debates and conflicts lines within and across the EU institutions.

### *Lecture*

This lecture addresses three questions: What is the European Integration process? How can it be studied? And how can we understand the institutional design of the cooperation? The lecture presents the students with an oversight of the integration process and its dynamics. Two central integration theories, Neofunctionalism and Liberal Intergovernmentalism is then introduces and used to explain the main developments in the cooperation. Since both theories draws on

institutional theories they will be used to give us an understanding of the overall institutional and balance between the institutions and its member states.

### *Classes*

In the class the students will be trained to apply the NF and the LI theories to explain the politics of the “euro crisis”. The students will be asked to compare the two perspectives and reflect on the usefulness of the theories and reflect on whether we should expect “institutional change” in response to the “euro crisis”?

### *Learning objectives of week 8*

Theory	Empirical knowledge	Application
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Understand neofunctionalism, especially the role of spill over logics</li><li>• Understand Liberal Intergovernmentalism</li><li>• Understand the logics in the two theories, their relation to institutional theory</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Knowledge of the European integration process</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Apply NF and LI theories to explain the integration processes and its dynamics with a focus on the Euro crisis</li></ul>

## **Bloc 3: The European Union**

Our third and final bloc turns to introduce and examine the European Union, which serves as an example of regional level governance. There are two major objectives in this section. First, we set out to provide a detailed introduction to the EU and its institutional and policy architecture. Second, we analyze the EU from an IR-perspective, treating it both as an example of cooperation among sovereign nation states and as an actor in international politics. The bloc will ensure that students are familiar with the EU as a political system (a major goal of the course in its own right) while at the same time bridging the research traditions of Comparative Politics and International Relations.

### Week 9: The Political System of the EU

In this week we introduce the EU as a political system. This involves both a brief overview of its historical development and an introduction to its institutional and policy architecture. It will therefore set the stage for the rest of the bloc, over the course of which we will go into detail on the various topics introduced this week.

### *Lecture*

We begin by building from last week's discussion of the EU integration process, briefly recapping a few key moments and treaties in the development of the EU. In doing so, we aim to broadly sketch out how the EU came about and how it has changed over time. Next, we proceed to discuss the EU's policy architecture: what policy areas are under the control of the EU? Which are shared by the EU and member states, or coordinated between them? And which policy areas are outside of EU competencies? We then introduce the institutional architecture of the EU, providing an overview of the EU's key institutions (which will be fleshed out in the coming weeks). Finally, we end with the question: how can we best understand the European Union? Is it similar to an international organization (like the UN) or a federal state (like the US)? This lecture thus sets the stage for the rest of the bloc.

*No Classes – Trial Exam*

*Learning objectives of week 19*

Theory	Empirical knowledge	Application
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Understand theories on how the EU came about</li><li>• Describe the broad theoretical frameworks on how politics in the EU works</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Key moments in the development of the EU</li><li>• The broad division of control over policy between the EU and member states</li><li>• The EU's institutional architecture</li></ul>	-

Week 10: Executive politics in the EU

After last week's introduction to the EU's general structure, we now zoom in on executive politics in the European Union. We therefore pick back up some of the themes from week 4, when we focused on national-level executives. But as we will see, although we can come up with some important parallels to these discussions from the national bloc, executive politics in the EU has some peculiar characteristics. In particular, understanding executive politics in the EU requires us to carefully unpack the relationship between national and supranational executive power in the context of the EU's dual executive structure. As a result, we will also highlight numerous connections to discussions from the past two weeks about the process of European integration.

*Lecture*

In this lecture, we will concentrate on answering two major questions: What does executive politics look like in the EU? And why does the form of executive politics in the EU matter? We begin by briefly recapping the classical differences in executive power at the national level – i.e. the distinction between presidential and parliamentary systems. We then discuss the limitations of that framework in trying to understand executive politics in the EU. That leads us to describe the nature

of the Council and the Commission as institutions, and to consider their respective relationships to the EU's member states. In the process, we discuss different theories of executive politics, as well as concepts like administrative and political accountability. We will also draw out relevant connections to the two major integration theories, Neofunctionalism and Liberal Intergovernmentalism.

### *Classes*

In class this week we turn to examine recent trends in the nature of executive politics in the EU. In particular, we focus on the possibility that the current Juncker Commission is more "politicized" than its predecessors and discuss why that might matter for our understanding of executive power in the EU. For your exercise, you will be asked to discuss these developments with relation to Brexit.

### *Learning objectives of week 10*

Theory	Empirical knowledge	Application
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Understand theories of executive politics.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Describe the nature of the Council and the Commission, as well as their respective relationships to the EU's member states.</li><li>Describe the framework of political and administrative accountability in the EU.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Discuss how the nature of the executive politics may have changed over the recent crises, with a special focus on Brexit.</li></ul>

### Week 11: Legislative Politics in the EU

In this week we conceive the EU as a bicameral political system, where the European Parliament is directly elected by the voters (lower house) and the Council represents the interests of national governments (upper house). We will get to know the rules that govern coalition building and decision making in each of these two "chambers". Subsequently, we study the interactions between European Parliament and the Council in the Ordinary Legislative Procedure.

### *Lecture*

The lecture starts with a review of week 3 (Legislatures). We discuss the role of the European Parliament and the Council vis-à-vis the European Commission. Can we classify the EU's legislature as either strong or weak? Next we are looking into each of the two legislative bodies separately: What is the relation between the plenary and committees or work groups? How are information, amendment and voting rights allocated? What interests are represented in each of the two bodies? Is there a role for party politics? How are coalitions formed and how does that affect policy making? Finally, we take on a truly bicameral perspective by asking how Council and European Parliament interact when making EU law. Is the inter-institutional relation characterized by conflict or cooperation?

### *Classes*

In classes we study the relevance of the so-called trilogues. For long it has been an informal yet institutionalized practice that delegates from the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission meet early on in the legislative process to agree on a compromise. In the treaty of Lisbon this procedure has been formalized. What are advantages of this fast-track-procedure? How does it affect the relation between European Parliament and Council? Does it affect the internal dynamics in each of the two legislative bodies?

### *Learning objectives of week 11*

Theory	Empirical knowledge	Application
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Theories that explain the formation of legislative coalitions.</li><li>Theories of bicameralism.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Composition of European Parliament and Council.</li><li>Rules of Procedure and internal organization of European Parliament and Council.</li><li>Ordinary Legislative Procedure</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Discuss how informal bicameral negotiations (such as the “trilogue”) affect patterns of conflict and coalition within parliament.</li></ul>

### Week 12: Elections and Democracy in the EU

The EU has been accused of having a democratic deficit. This week’s lecture deals with the institutional foundations of this accusation. The electoral connection between voters and the decision makers in Brussels will be in the center of this bloc. We are going to discuss the extent of the democratic deficit and whether it has its roots in a lack of a European public sphere or in particular features of the EU’s institutional design.

### *Lecture*

This lecture addresses the following questions: What do Europeans think about the current state of integration? How are Members of the European Parliament elected? Do they represent the interests of their voters? Are governments, when acting in the Council, accountable to their national parliaments? In answering these questions, we are going to start with a review of week 2 (electoral systems) and 3 (legislatures) which allows us to classify the EU’s institutions from a comparative perspective. Next, we are going to see that the additional level of government creates additional challenges for democratic representation. The daily work in the EP is organized around European Political Groups, yet national parties set up the lists for European elections. Voters are often more concerned with punishing their national governments when casting their vote at European elections. Ministers enjoy a significant level of discretion when negotiating in the Council. And the media’s attention is frequently lower for EU politics as compared to national politics. The lecture will present each of these challenges and point towards its institutional foundations.

---

---

### *Classes*

In the class the students will be trained to evaluate the democratic quality of the EU's political system. On the one hand, this includes an evaluation of the state of the union against normative democratic theory. On the other hand, this includes a discussion of whether or not institutional reforms might be able to improve the democratic quality of EU politics.

### *Learning objectives of week 12*

Theory	Empirical knowledge	Application
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evaluate the democratic quality of a multilevel political system</li><li>• Understand the basic concepts of principal agent theory (agency drift, oversight mechanisms)</li><li>• Know the theory of second order elections</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Relevance of Parties and Political Groups in the European Parliament</li><li>• Public Opinion on the state of integration</li><li>• Rules for and voting patterns in European Parliament elections</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Discuss the democratic quality of the European Union</li><li>• Discuss how electoral rules affect voter representation in the European Parliament</li></ul>

### Week 13: Judicial Politics in the EU

In western nation states we take the powers of the judiciary for granted. In most cases, we observe an independent, hierarchical and differentiated courts system as well as a constitutional court that constraints legislative and executive power. So far, we have learned that member states delegated significant legislative competences to the EU, but only limited competences to execute and implement law. But to what extent has judicial oversight over legislation and implementation been integrated? In this lecture, we will describe the powers of the European Court of Justice and see how it obtained increasing independence over the course of European integration.

### *Lecture*

In the lecture we will start by describing the EU's court system, specifically the European Court of Justice, with regard to its composition and its most important procedures. We will place special emphasis on the institutionalized relation between the European Court of Justice and the member states, the so-called "institutionalist model" of judicial politics (Dyevre 2010). Once we have delineated the court's role in the EU's present political system, we will apply the integration theories (see Week 8) to explain how the court step by step established its powers vis-à-vis the member states. Specifically, we will see how norms such as the direct effect and the supremacy of EU law have been established and institutionalized. Guided by integration theories we will also study the relation of the European Court of Justice to national judicial systems.

---

---

### *Classes*

In the class the students will be trained to analyze the European Court of Justice discretion vis-à-vis the member states from a strategic perspective. Specifically, we will discuss how the court has been able to extend its powers by exploiting disunity amongst member states.

### *Learning objectives of week 13*

Theory	Empirical knowledge	Application
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Understand the “institutionalist model” of judicial politics.</li><li>• Understand the basics of legal integration theory and its nexus to integration theories (week 8)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Powers, composition and procedures of the European Court of Justice.</li><li>• History of Legal Integration (key decision by the ECJ).</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Apply integration theories to legal integration.</li><li>• Apply institutionalist model of judicial politics to the ECJ.</li></ul>

### Week 14: The EU as a Global Actor

The history of European Integration has seen a number of halfhearted attempts of installing a common EU foreign policy. In fact, until today there is only one policy area where the EU acts as an unrivaled and powerful actor at the global stage: international trade. In common defense and security policy NATO is still at the wheel and the common neighborhood policy is frequently hampered by divergent regional interests of member states.

### *Lecture*

In this last lecture on the EU, we are going to add yet another analytical level by studying the EU's role in global politics. In how far can 28 member states with partly very different regional interests and resources agree on a common foreign policy? How do national parliaments, courts and referenda constrain the common foreign policy? Why is the EU an extremely powerful actor in international trade, but not in security, defense or development policies? Who do you call to speak to Europe? The lecture starts by describing the EU's competences and decision bodies in different fields of foreign policy. Specifically, we will focus on the common trade policy and the set-up of the External Action Service. In the second part of the lecture, we will explain the current state of the EU's common foreign policy from a rational and a sociological institutionalist perspective.

### *Classes*

In class students will analyze EU trade negotiations along one of the recent examples such as CETA, TTIP or (maybe) the upcoming Brexit negotiations. Specifically, they will study the relationship between national parliaments, governments, the Commission and the international partner (USA, Canada, or Britain) from multiple principal agent perspective. In doing so, they will learn the limits of and conditions for a successful EU foreign policy.

*Learning objectives of week 14*

Theory	Empirical knowledge	Application
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Understand the implications of institutional constraints on foreign policy making.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Actors in EU foreign policy making.</li><li>Legal framework of Common trade policy.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Apply rational choice theory to current trade negotiations.</li></ul>

## 5. Readings for Political Institutions

Students are expected to acquire on book:

Hix, S. & Høyland, B. (2011) *The political system of the European Union*. Palgrave Macmillan (3<sup>rd</sup> edition), pp. 1-20, 23-48, 49-74, 75-104, 105-157.

Additional readings in compendium and on-line:

Beramendi, P. (2007) 'Federalism', in Carles Boix & Susan Stokes (eds.), *Oxford Handbook on Comparative Politics*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 752-781 (30 pages) (copy in compendium).

Benoit, K (2007) 'Electoral laws as political consequences', *Annual Review of Political Science* 10: 363-388 (36 pages) (online article).

Barnett, Michael & Martha Finnemore (2007) 'Political approach chapter 2' in Thomas G Weiss & Sam Daws (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of the United Nations*, Oxford University Press, pp. 41-57 (17 pages) (copy in compendium).

Buzan, Berry (2004) *From International to World Society? English School Theory and the Social Structure of Globalisation*, Cambridge, chapter 6, pp. 161-204 (44 pages) (copy in compendium).

Cheibub, A., Przeworski, A. & Saigh, S. M. (2004) Government Coalitions and Legislative Success Under Presidentialism and Parliamentarism, *British Journal of Political Science*, 34(4): 565-587 (23 pages) (online article).

Caramani, D. (2013) 'Party systems', chapter 13 in Caramani (ed.), *Comparative Politics*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 327-345 (19 pages) (copy in compendium).

Carrubba, C.J., Gabel, M. & Hankla, C. (2008) Judicial behavior under political constraints: Evidence from the European Court of Justice. *American Political Science Review*, 102(04): 435-452 (18 pages) (online article).

Coleman, J.J. (1999) Unified Government, Divided Government, and Party Responsiveness, *American Political Science Review*, 93(4): 821-835 (25 pages) (online article).

Da Conceicao, E. (2010) Who controls whom? Dynamics of power delegation and agency losses in EU trade politics. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 48(4): 1107-1126 (20 pages) (online article).



- 
- Dalton, R.J. (2012) Politics in Germany in Powell in G.B., Dalton, R.J. & Strøm, K. *Comparative Politics Today. A World View*, 10<sup>th</sup> ed. Pierman, pp. 255-259+271-272+280-283 (10 pages) (copy in compendium).
- Dür, A. & Zimmermann, H. (2007) Introduction: The EU in international trade negotiations. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 45(4): 771-787 (17 pages) (online article).
- Dyevre, A. (2010) Unifying the field of comparative judicial politics: towards a general theory of judicial behaviour. *European Political Science Review*, 2(2): 297-327 (31 pages) (online article).
- Follesdal, A. & Hix, S. (2006) Why there is a democratic deficit in the EU: A response to Majone and Moravcsik. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44(3): 533-562 (30 pages) (online article).
- Gallager, M. (2013) 'Electoral systems', chapter 10 in Caramani (ed.), *Comparative Politics*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 184-188 (5 pages) (copy in compendium).
- Hall, Peter A. & Rosemary C.R. Taylor (1996) Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms, *Political Studies* 44(5): 936-955 (20 pages) (online article).
- Hargreaves, S. & Homewood, M.J. (2013) *EU Law Concentrate: Law Revision and Study Guide*. Oxford University Press, pp. 1-20 (20 pages) (copy in compendium).
- Häge, F. M. & Kaeding, M. (2007) Reconsidering the European Parliament's legislative influence: Formal vs. informal procedures. *European Integration*, 29(3): 341-361 (21 pages) (online article).
- Jupille, J. & J. A. Caporaso (1999) Institutionalism and the European Union: beyond International Relations and Comparative Politics, *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2: 429-444 (16 pages) (online article)
- Keohane, Robert O. (1984), "After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Economy," genoptrykt i Mingst, Karen A. & Jack L. Snyder (eds.) *Essential Readings in World Politics* (New York: W.W. Norton), pp. 338-354 (17 pages) (copy in compendium).
- Knudsen, Tonny Brems (2015) Primary institutions and international organizations: Theorizing continuity and change. Paper for the 9<sup>th</sup> Pan-European Conference on International Relations, Sicily, 23-26 September 2015 (27 pages) (copy in compendium).
- Kreppel, A. (2014) 'Typologies and Classifications' in S. Martin, T. Saalfeld & K.W. Strøm (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Legislative Studies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 82-100 (19 pages) (copy in compendium).
- Loughlin, J. (2011) 'Federal and local government institutions', in Caramani (ed.) *Comparative Politics*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 199-211 (13 pages) (copy in compendium).
- McAlister, I. & Studlar, D. (2002) 'Electoral systems and women's representation: a long-term perspective', *Representation* 39(1): 3-14 (12 pages) (online article).
- Moravcsik, Andrew & Frank Schimmelfennig (2009) 'Liberal Intergovernmentalism', in Antje Wiener & Thomas Diez (eds) *European Integration Theory*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 67-87 (21 pages) (copy in compendium).

- 
- Niemann, A. & Ioannou, D. (2015) 'European economic integration in times of crisis: a case of neofunctionalism?' *Journal of European Public Policy*, 22(2): 196-215 (20 pages) (online article).
- Niemann, Arne & Philippe C. Schmitter (2009) 'Neo-functionalism', in Antje Wiener & Thomas Diez (eds) *European Integration Theory*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 45-65 (21 pages) (copy in compendium).
- Peterson, J. (2016) 'Juncker's Political European Commission and an EU in Crisis', *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*. Early View. (20 pages) (online article).
- Rasmussen, A. & Reh, C. (2013) The consequences of concluding codecision early: trilogues and intra-institutional bargaining success. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 20(7): 1006-1024 (19 pages) (online article).
- Schain, M.A. (2012) Politics in France in Powell, G.B., Dalton, R.J. & Strøm, K. *Comparative Politics Today. A World View*, 10<sup>th</sup> ed. Pierman, pp. 200-202+227-233 (10 pages) (copy in compendium)
- Schimmelfennig, Frank (2016) "NATO and institutional theories of international relations", in Mark Webber & Adrian Hyde-Price (eds.) *Theorising NATO New perspectives on the Atlantic alliance*. London: Routledge, pp. 93-115 (13 pages) (copy in compendium).
- Schimmelfennig, F. (2015) 'Liberal intergovernmentalism and the euro area crisis', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 22(2): 177-192 (16 pages) (online article).
- Sieberer, U. (2011) The Institutional Power of Western European Parliaments: A Multidimensional Analysis, *West European Politics*, 34(4): 731-754 (24 pages) (online article).
- Stein, Arthur A. (1982) Coordination and Collaboration: Regimes in an Anarchic World. *International organization*, 36(2): 299-324 (26 pages) (online article).
- Wlezien, C. & Soroka, S.N. (2011) 'Federalism and Public Responsiveness to Policy', *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 41(1): 31-52 (22 pages) (online article).

## *Sample Advanced Course Syllabus*

### **Pragmatism and Politics**

Department of Political Science, Aarhus University

**Time:** Thursdays 11.00-14.00

**Location:** Building 1330, Rm. 018

**Lecturer:** Anthony Kevins  
Office: Building 1331, Rm. 111  
Email: [akevins@ps.au.dk](mailto:akevins@ps.au.dk)  
Telephone: 87165649

### **Course Objectives**

The course module offers a more extensive and more thorough analysis of a topic from within political science. To this end, the course module provides an overview and a critical discussion of the literature and the issues relevant for the topic of the seminar.

This seminar trains students to:

- trace the shifting content of the “pragmatic consensus” in a variety of policy areas over time, and evaluate the reasons for those shifts.
- determine whether a given policy change reflects an underlying pragmatic or political position.
- understand and critically assess the distinction between pragmatism and politics, as well as the tensions between technocracy and democracy.
- assess the potential role and contributions of political science in a democratic society.

### **Course Content**

What role has pragmatism played in western democracies? How and why has the content of “the pragmatic consensus” differed across countries and over time? Is pragmatism apolitical, and if so, is it preferable to politics? In this course, we will explore these questions through reference to various Western European policy trajectories, from the era of the post-war consensus through to today. In particular, we will focus on changes to the welfare state, economic policy, and approaches to immigration – as well as the relationship of the EU (and the Eurozone crisis) to member-state politics. In examining these developments, special attention will be paid to the use of pragmatism as a concept in politics and the tensions between technocracy and democracy. We will look at discourse and reform across different institutional settings, often with reference to literature on comparative political economy. This course is designed not only to help students better understand the relationship between pragmatism and politics in western democracies, but also to provide an exploration of the potential role of political scientists and their research in these societies.

### **Comments on form of instruction**

The seminar module requires active participation of students. At the beginning of the seminar module the lecturer and the students agree on specific "activity requirements" that the students have to fulfil.

The module consists of 15 tutorials of three hours over a period of 15 weeks

### **Exam details**

Topic of student's choice, oral exam

*Grading:* External co-examination

*Assessment:* 7-point grading scale

*Notes:* The examination lasts approx. 30 minutes divided equally between examination in synopsis (800-1200 words, corresponding to approx. 2-3 pages) and in the general curriculum. There is no preparation.

Re-examination takes place in February and August. The assessment method is home assignment

*Exam time:* 30 minutes

*Literature:* A collection of scanned book sections and electronic articles

*Reading Load:* The readings total just under 1200 pages.

## **COURSE OUTLINE AND READINGS**

---

*Week 1: February 5*

### **The End of Ideology**

Lipset, S. M. (1964). "The Changing Class Structure and Contemporary European Politics." Daedalus **93**(1): 271-303.

MacIntyre, A. (1971). "The End of Ideology and the End of the End of Ideology," in Against the Self-Images of the Age: Essays on Ideology and Philosophy, pp. 3-11.

Lipset, S. M. (2001). "The Americanization of the European Left." Journal of Democracy **12**(2): 74-87.

Evans, G. and Tilley, J. (2012). "The Depoliticization of Inequality and Redistribution: Explaining the Decline of Class Voting." The Journal of Politics 74(4): 963-976.

*Week 2: February 12*

**State 2.0**

O'Reilly, T. (2013) "Open Data and Algorithmic Regulation." in Beyond Transparency: Open Data and the Future of Civic Innovation, pp. 289-300. [Available online from the book's website: <http://beyondtransparency.org/chapters/part-5/open-data-and-algorithmic-regulation/>]

Sunstein, C. (2014) Why Nudge?: The Politics of Libertarian Paternalism (Introduction, "Behaviorally Informed Paternalism", pp. 3-22).

Hansen, P.G. and Jespersen, A.M. (2013) "Nudge and the Manipulation of Choice: A Framework for the Responsible Use of the Nudge Approach to Behaviour Change in Public Policy". European Journal of Risk Regulation 3: 3-28.

Legget, W. (2014). "The Politics of Behaviour Change: Nudge, Neoliberalism and the State." Policy & Politics 42(1): 3-19.

*Week 3: February 19*

**Democracy 1.0**

Walker, J.L. (1966). "A Critique of the Elitist Theory of Democracy" The American Political Science Review 60(2): 285-295.

Shapiro, I. (2002). "Optimal Deliberation?" The Journal of Political Philosophy 10(2): 196-211.

Ryfe, D.M. (2005). "Does Deliberative Democracy Work?" Annual Review of Political Science 8: 49-71.

Dryzek, J.S. (2002). Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. (Chapter 1, "Liberal Democracy and the Critical Alternative", pp. 8-30.) [Available as an e-resource from the library.]

*Week 4: February 26*

**Philosophical versus Everyday Pragmatism**

Bohman, J. (1999). "Democracy as Inquiry, Inquiry as Democratic: Pragmatism, Social Science, and the Cognitive Division of Labor." American Journal of Political Science 43(2): 590-607.

Shields, P. M. (2008). "Rediscovering the Taproot: Is Classical Pragmatism the Route to Renew Public Administration?" Public Administration Review, 68: 205-221.

Hildebrand, D. L. (2008). "Public Administration as Pragmatic, Democratic, and Objective." Public Administration Review, **68**: 222–229.

Somin, I. (2004) "Richard Posner's Democratic Pragmatism and the Problem of Ignorance." Critical Review: A Journal of Politics and Society **16**(1):1-22.

## ***Unit 2: Pareto-Optimal Obviousness – Three Examples***

*Week 5: March 5*

### **Making Welfare Work**

Jenson, J. and Saint-Martin, D. (2003). "New Routes to Social Cohesion? Citizenship and the Social Investment State." The Canadian Journal of Sociology / Cahiers canadiens de sociologie **28**(1): 77-99.

Taylor-Gooby, P. (2008). "The New Welfare State Settlement in Europe." European Societies **10**(1): 3-24.

Van Kersbergen, K. and Hemerijck, A. (2012). "Two Decades of Change in Europe: The Emergence of the Social Investment State." Journal of Social Policy **41**(3): 475-492.

Nolan, B. (2013). "What Use is 'Social Investment'?" Journal of European Social Policy **23**(5): 459–468.

*Week 6: March 12*

### **Dismantling the Welfare State**

Robert E. Goodin (1982). "Freedom and the Welfare State: Theoretical Foundations." Journal of Social Policy **11**(2): 149-176.

Offe, C. (1987). "Democracy against the Welfare State?: Structural Foundations of Neoconservative Political Opportunities." Political Theory **15**(4): 501-537.

Larsen, C. A. (2008). "The Institutional Logic of Welfare Attitudes: How Welfare Regimes Influence Public Support." Comparative Political Studies **41**(2): 145-168.

*Week 7: March 19*

### **Managing Growth**

Mulas-Granados, C. (2006). Economics, Politics and Budgets: The Political Economy of Fiscal Consolidations in Europe. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. Pp. 17-24, 30-41.

Hopkin, J. & Blyth, M. (2012). "What can Okun teach Polanyi? Efficiency, regulation and equality in the OECD." Review of International Political Economy, **19**(1): 1-33.

Blyth, M. (1997). "Moving the Political Middle: Redefining the Boundaries of State Action." The Political Quarterly **68**: 231–240.

Schmidt V.A. and Thatcher, M. (2014). "Why are Neoliberal Ideas so Resilient in Europe's Political Economy?" Critical Policy Studies **8**(3): 340-347.

*Week 8: March 26*

### **Abandoning Growth**

Saad Filho, A. (2007). "Monetary Policy in the Neo-Liberal Transition: A Political Economy Critique of Keynesianism, Monetarism and Inflation Targeting." In Albritton, R., Jessop, B., and Westra, R. (eds.) Political Economy and Global Capitalism: The 21<sup>st</sup> Century, Present and Future. London, UK: Anthem Press, pp. 89-119. [Available as an e-resource from the library.]

Van der Bergh, J.C.J.M. (2009). "The GDP Paradox." Journal of Economic Psychology **30**(2): 117-135.

Alexander, S. (2012). "Planned Economic Contraction: The Emerging Case for Degrowth." Environmental Politics **21**(3): 349-368.

Piketty, T. (2014). Capital in the Twenty-First Century. (Read pages 86-96). [Available as an e-resource from the library.]

*(No class on April 2)*

*Week 9: April 9*

### **Immigration as a Solution**

Ruhs, M. and Anderson, B. (2013) "Responding to Employers: Skills, Shortages and Sensible Immigration Policy." In Jurado, E. and Brochmann, G. (eds.) Europe's Immigration Challenge: Reconciling Work, Welfare and Mobility, pp. 95-104. [Available online through the library.]

Borjas, G.J. (2001) Heaven's Door: Immigration Policy and the American Economy. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Chapter 1, "Reframing the Immigration Debate", pp. 3-19.)

Seglow, J. (2005). "The Ethics of Immigration." Political Studies Review, **3**(3): 317–334.

Foster, J. (2012). "Making temporary permanent: The silent transformation of the temporary foreign Worker Program," Just Labour: A Canadian Journal of Work and Society **19**: 22-46.

*Week 10: April 16*

### **Immigration as a Problem**

Hopkins, D.J. (2010) "Politicized Places: Explaining Where and When Immigrants Provoke Local Opposition." The American Political Science Review **104**(1): 40-60.

Hainmueller, J. and Hiscox, M.J. (2010). "Attitudes toward Highly Skilled and Low-skilled Immigration: Evidence from a Survey Experiment." American Political Science Review **104**(1): 61-84.

Portes, A. and Rumbaut, R.G. (2014). Immigrant America: A Portrait. Pp. 371-390.

Winter, E. (2015). "Rethinking Multiculturalism after its 'Retreat': Lessons from Canada." American Behavioral Scientist: 1-21. Published online before print January 12, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0002764214566495.

### ***Unit 5: Consequences***

*Week 11: April 23*

#### **A Democratic Deficit?**

Follesdal, A. and S. Hix (2006). "Why There is a Democratic Deficit in the EU: A Response to Majone and Moravcsik." Journal of Common Market Studies **44**(3): 533-562.

Macartney, H. (2014). "The Paradox of Integration? European Democracy and the Debt Crisis." Cambridge Review of International Affairs **27**(3): 401-423.

Norris, P. (2011). Democratic Deficit: Critical Citizens Revisited. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. (Chapter 12, "Conclusions and Implications", pp. 236-246.)

Przeworski, A. (2010). Democracy and the Limits of Self-Government. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 99-117.

*Week 12: April 30*

#### **Populism?**

Dechezelles, S. and Neumayer, L. (2010). "Introduction: Is Populism a Side-Effect of European Integration? Radical Parties and the Europeanization of Political Competition." Perspectives on European Politics and Society **11**(3): 229-236.

Mouffe, C. (2005). "The 'End of Politics' and the Challenge of Right-wing Populism." In Panizza, F. (ed.) Populism and the Mirror of Democracy. London, UK: Verso, pp. 50-59, 65-71.

Rydgren, J. (2007). "The Sociology of the Radical Right." Annual Review of Sociology **33**: 241-262.

Kaltwasser, C.R. (2012). "The Ambivalence of Populism: Threat and Corrective for Democracy." Democratization **19**(2): 184-208.



*Week 13: May 7*

**Protest?**

Offe, C. (1985). "New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics." Social Research **52**(4): 817-868.

FitzGibbon, J. (2013). "Citizens against Europe? Civil Society and Eurosceptic Protest in Ireland, the United Kingdom and Denmark." Journal of Common Market Studies **51**(1): 105–121.

della Porta, D. and Andretta, M. (2013). "Protesting for Justice and Democracy: Italian Indignados?" Contemporary Italian Politics **5**(1): 23–37.

***Unit 4: Solutions***

*Week 14: May 14*

**Political Science?**

MacIntyre, A. (1981). After Virtue. (Chapter 8, "The Character of Generalizations in Social Science and their Lack of Predictive Power", pp. 84-102).

Shapiro, I. (2002). "Problems, Methods, and Theories in the Study of Politics, or What's Wrong with Political Science and What to Do about It." Political Theory **30**(4): 596-619.

Shapiro, I. and Wendt, A. (2007). "The Difference that Realism Makes: Social Science and the Politics of Consent" in Shapiro, I. (ed.) Flight from Reality in the Human Sciences, pp. 19-50.  
[Available as an e-resource from the library]

*Week 15: May 21*

**Politics?**

Crick, B. R. (1972). In Defence of Politics. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. (Chapter 5, "A Defence of Politics against Technology", pp. 92-110.)

Dahl, R.A. (1994). "A Democratic Dilemma: System Effectiveness versus Citizen Participation." Political Science Quarterly **109**(1): 23-34.

Knight, J. and Johnson, J. (2007). "The Priority of Democracy: A Pragmatist Approach to Political-Economic Institutions and the Burden of Justification." American Political Science Review **61**(1): 47-61.

Hay, C. (2007). Why We Hate Politics. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press. (Chapter 5, "Why Do We Hate Politics?", pp. 153-162.)

**Class 5: Election outcomes and party system polarization**

This week's class is about one of the causes of polarization in party systems. The article that you will read develops an argument about how parties that lose elections will behave. In your study groups, you will assess the article's argument and empirics – most importantly by conducting your own research into the 2015 selection of Jeremy Corbyn as leader of the British Labour Party.

Questions:

1. Why will parties tend to become more extreme after an electoral defeat?
2. What causes losing parties to eventually converge on the position of the winner?
3. Summarize the main results from the case studies and quantitative analysis, respectively. Which do you find more convincing? What are the main strengths and weaknesses of both? *(Study groups should answer question 3 in writing, uploading your one page response on the class blackboard site by Wednesday 23:59.)*
4. In the 2015 UK election, the Labour Party lost a second consecutive election. Following the loss, Jeremy Corbyn was elected new leader of the Party. Based on your own research\*, discuss to what extent the case fits with the theory and conclusions from Bækgaard and Jensen (2012). Think about the following questions in doing so:
  - a. How is the Labour Party leader elected? What was Corbyn's support like from the party membership versus his support from the "Parliamentary Labour Party"?
  - b. How does the distinction between the party membership and the "Parliamentary Labour Party" fit with the article's theory about the mechanism leading parties to become more extreme? According to Bækgaard and Jensen (2012), who are the actors driving the effect?*(Study groups provide the answer for question 4 on 2-3 slides and upload them on blackboard by Wednesday 23:59.)*

\* Some potential sources include:

- [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Labour\\_Party\\_\(UK\)\\_leadership\\_election,\\_2015](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Labour_Party_(UK)_leadership_election,_2015)  
("Procedure", "Candidates", and "Result" sections)
- [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jeremy\\_Corbyn\\_Labour\\_Party\\_leadership\\_campaign,\\_2015](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jeremy_Corbyn_Labour_Party_leadership_campaign,_2015)  
(Introduction section)
- <http://www.economist.com/news/britain/21661653-jeremy-corbyn-will-probably-win-but-then-run-into-trouble-seeing-red>
- <http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2015/sep/12/jeremy-corbyn-wins-labour-party-leadership-election>
- <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/politicsandpolicy/2015-the-year-british-politics-lost-its-opposition/>

*Readings:*

Martin Bækgaard and Carsten Jensen (2012), "The dynamics of competitor party behavior", *Political Studies* 60 (1), pages 131-146 (16 pages).

## **Sample Writing Workshop Activity**

### Instructions:

- 1) Read through the examples on your own and mark down a grade for each
  - Three excerpts from a hypothetical introductory paragraph:
    - Topic introduction; thesis; essay structure overview
  - Potential grades: A, B, C, and D
- 2) Turn to your partner and discuss why you assigned that grade
  - Update the grade if you think you made a mistake
- 3) Then we'll discuss your answers as a class

**The Question:** Will globalisation ultimately result in the convergence of Esping-Andersen's "worlds of welfare" and thereby erase institutional differences across welfare states?

### Excerpts:

#### **Topic Introduction (i.e. first part of intro, before the thesis)**

- a) Webster's dictionary defines globalisation as "the act or process of globalizing: the state of being globalized; especially: the development of an increasingly integrated global economy marked especially by free trade, free flow of capital, and the tapping of cheaper foreign labor markets".
- b) Globalisation will ultimately result in the convergence of Esping-Andersen's "worlds of welfare".
- c) Neo-liberalism and the fiscal austerity that goes with it have led to the substantial restructuring of welfare states across the globe. There remains much debate, however, as to what these changes mean to the future of welfare state institutions.

#### **The Thesis (i.e. your main argument; your answer to the question)**

- a) Globalisation is a big issue that affects welfare state, capitalist, and citizenship regime institutions.
- b) While some people argue that globalisation will result in convergence, others deny this.
- c) I argue that globalisation will ultimately result in the convergence of Esping-Andersen's "worlds of welfare".
- d) This essay will analyse and compare the validity of globalisationist and institutionalist theories through an examination of welfare state retrenchment as it has occurred in the United Kingdom and Sweden. While both states have indeed seen retrenchment, it has taken different forms under different institutional arrangements.

#### **Essay Structure Overview (i.e. your plan for the rest of the answer)**

- a) I will make my argument by pointing to the impact of EU integration on everything from social policy to citizenship policies.
- b) I will prove this point by referencing the research of Palier and Martin, Ferrera, and Taylor-Gooby.
- c) In making this argument, the paper begins by tracing welfare state development within each case, and then examines the neoliberal restructuring which has occurred in social security and healthcare in recent decades. We then conclude with a brief analysis of the future prospects of welfare states.

# PS-Project – Supervision Anthony Kevins

Below I write as things happen – ‘stream of consciousness’ – but I will highlight the important things.

17.03.2016

Wow, Anthony, you took the plunge! **Peer feedback** with a **very good introduction** not only as to the elements of the feedback but also of **the rules of the game and why they are important**. You were just GOOD, and not surprisingly, I enjoyed every minute and **I’m full of praise**.

In all respects, **your matrix was very, very good** – you pinpointed the elements that are crucial not only to understanding but also to developing the academic presentation, an important skill. And: **everybody had to listen carefully to the presentation** in order for them to evaluate the presentation. In other words, the learnt in several loops.

Of course, I am no mind reader, but my impression was that **the students liked the challenge**. There were no sounds of disapproval after you having started the lesson, on the contrary. The first group was relaxed (after a bit of nervous giggling) and took the presentation seriously.


Good that you thanked the group for being Guinea pigs – and being Guinea pigs they did a good job.

Your **wrapping up** – well, it couldn’t be done better. Starting by stating some positive elements and then moving to the problems is *the* way of giving feedback. And writing the remarks on the chalk board meant that this was not only a ritual, but something that was of importance. Also your wrapping up the feedback and stating the importance of and the reason for it was perfect.

The feedback of the students was good. Also they took the task seriously, and their points were good. To my mind, they learnt very much and very well through your technique.

A last thing: I am happy to realize that you know the students by name. This contributed to the very positive atmosphere that characterized the lesson.

So much for today. Have a nice weekend.



1  
August 29, 2013

MCGILL UNIVERSITY COURSE EVALUATION



End-of-term course evaluations results are used:

- to help instructors improve future offerings of courses;
- to inform students about courses and instructors; and
- as one indicator of teaching effectiveness for promotion and tenure purposes.

Written comments, solicited or unsolicited, are treated as confidential, and are not made available to the McGill Community.

THE COURSE RATINGS REPORTED HERE ARE ONLY ONE INDICATOR OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS AND THESE RESULTS SHOULD BE TREATED WITH CAUTION SINCE THEY REPRESENT REPORTS ON ONLY THIS PARTICULAR COURSE

COURSE: POLI357 001 : Politics: Contemporary Europe

TERM CODE: 201305 MERCURY

INSTRUCTOR: Anthony Kevin

COMPLETED EVALUATIONS / TOTAL REGISTERED : 10 / 34 = 29.4%

The departmental means are calculated from the Faculty of Arts - Undergraduate courses questionnaire.

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION RESULTS

QUEST- NO.	VALID REPLIES	RESPONSE BREAKDOWN					PERCENT BREAKDOWN					STD MEAN DEV		DEPT COURSE MEAN MEAN		FIRST LINE OF QUESTION TEXT
		1	2	3	4	5	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	N/A			

Q001	10		2	6	2			20	60	20		4.0	0.7	4.2	4.1	OVERALL, THIS IS AN EXCELLENT COURSE.
Q002	10		1	5	4			10	50	40		4.3	0.7	4.3	4.3	OVERALL, I LEARNED A GREAT DEAL FROM THIS COURSE.
Q003	10	1					10	60	30			4.0	1.2	4.4	4.1	A.K. : OVERALL, THIS INSTRUCTOR IS AN EXCELLENT TEACHER.
Q004	10			6	4			60	40			4.4	0.5	4.3	4.1	A.K. : OVERALL, I LEARNED A GREAT DEAL FROM THIS INSTRUCTOR.
Q005	10		1	2	3	4		10	20	30	40	4.0	1.1	4.1	4.0	A.K. : LECTURE(S) GIVEN BY THIS INSTRUCTOR WERE EFFECTIVE.
Q006	10		1		3	5	1	30	50	10		4.3	1.0	4.5	4.2	A.K. : CONSIDERING CLASS SIZE, THE INSTRUCTOR WAS AVAILABLE FOR INDIVIDUAL CONSULTATION.
Q007	10			5	5			50	50			4.5	0.5	4.1	4.0	OVERALL, THIS COURSE WAS INTELLECTUALLY CHALLENGING.
Q008	10		1	1	1	7		10	10	70		4.4	1.1	4.1	4.1	THE COURSE OBJECTIVES WERE CLEARLY EXPLAINED.
Q009	10		1			9		10		90		4.7	0.9	4.6	4.6	STUDENTS WERE INVITED TO SHARE THEIR IDEAS AND KNOWLEDGE.
Q010	10			1	3	5		10	30	50		4.2	1.0	3.9	4.0	TESTS, ASSIGNMENTS AND OTHER REQUIRED WORK FOR THE COURSE WERE APPROPRIATE.
Q011	10			1	4	5		10	40	50		4.4	0.7	4.1	4.2	THE EVALUATION METHODS USED IN THIS COURSE WERE APPROPRIATE.
Q012	10				1	5	4	10	50	40		4.3	0.7	4.1	4.1	COURSE MATERIALS (E.G., READINGS, LECTURE NOTES, EXERCISES, AUDIO-VISUAL PRESENTATIONS E
Q014	10						10			100		0.0		5.0	5.0	THE TA WAS EFFECTIVE IN FULFILLING HIS/HER ROLE.
Q015	8						8			100		0.0				FOR SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS ONLY: PLEASE SPECIFY IF YOU ARE BSW 90 CREDITS OR BSW 60 CRE

\*\*\* DEPT MEAN = Sum of all valid responses for this question in all courses in the department/number of such responses

\*\*\* DEPT COURSE MEAN = Sum of the means for this question for all courses in the department/number of courses in the department

1  
January 7, 2014

M C G I L L   U N I V E R S I T Y   C O U R S E   E V A L U A T I O N  
- - - - -



End-of-term course evaluations results are used:

- to help instructors improve future offerings of courses;
- to inform students about courses and instructors; and
- as one indicator of teaching effectiveness for promotion and tenure purposes.

Written comments, solicited or unsolicited, are treated as confidential, and are not made available to the McGill Community.

THE COURSE RATINGS REPORTED HERE ARE ONLY ONE INDICATOR OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS AND THESE RESULTS SHOULD BE TREATED WITH CAUTION SINCE THEY REPRESENT REPORTS ON ONLY THIS PARTICULAR COURSE

COURSE: POLI357 001 : Politics: Contemporary Europe  
TERM CODE: 201309    MERCURY  
INSTRUCTOR: Anthony Kevin  
COMPLETED EVALUATIONS / TOTAL REGISTERED : 30 / 75 = 40.0%

The departmental means are calculated from the Faculty of Arts questionnaire.

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION RESULTS																		
QUEST- NO.	VALID REPLIES	RESPONSE BREAKDOWN					PERCENT BREAKDOWN					STD MEAN DEV			DEPT COURSE MEAN MEAN			
		1	2	3	4	5	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	N/A					
FIRST LINE OF QUESTION TEXT																		
Q001	30	1	6	6	13	4		3	20	20	43	13		3.4	1.1	4.0	4.1	OVERALL, THIS IS AN EXCELLENT COURSE.
Q002	30	2	1	4	10	13		7	3	13	33	43		4.0	1.2	4.3	4.4	OVERALL, I LEARNED A GREAT DEAL FROM THIS COURSE.
Q003	29	1	1	5	11	11		3	3	17	38		4.0	1.0	4.1	4.3	A.K. : OVERALL, THIS INSTRUCTOR IS AN EXCELLENT TEACHER.	
Q004	30	2	2	3	13	10		7	7	10	43	33		3.9	1.2	4.1	4.3	A.K. : OVERALL, I LEARNED A GREAT DEAL FROM THIS INSTRUCTOR.
Q005	30	2	1	4	13	10		7	3	13	43	33		3.9	1.1	3.9	4.0	A.K. : LECTURE(S) GIVEN BY THIS INSTRUCTOR WERE EFFECTIVE.
Q006	30	2	2	7	17	2		7	23	57	7		4.3	1.1	4.0	4.3	A.K. : CONSIDERING CLASS SIZE, THE INSTRUCTOR WAS AVAILABLE FOR INDIVIDUAL CONSULTATION.	
Q007	30			4	14	12			13	47	40		4.3	0.7	4.2	4.3	OVERALL, THIS COURSE WAS INTELLECTUALLY CHALLENGING.	
Q008	30	1	2	4	9	14		3	7	13	30	47		4.1	1.1	4.1	4.2	THE COURSE OBJECTIVES WERE CLEARLY EXPLAINED.
Q009	30			1	4	25				3	13	83		4.8	0.5	4.1	4.3	STUDENTS WERE INVITED TO SHARE THEIR IDEAS AND KNOWLEDGE.
Q010	30	2	3	6	12	7		7	10	20	40	23		3.6	1.2	4.0	4.2	TESTS, ASSIGNMENTS AND OTHER REQUIRED WORK FOR THE COURSE WERE APPROPRIATE.
Q011	30			2	8	16			7	27	53	13		3.7	0.8	3.9	4.1	THE EVALUATION METHODS USED IN THIS COURSE WERE APPROPRIATE.
Q012	30			2	16	12			7	53	40		4.3	0.6	4.0	4.2	COURSE MATERIALS (E.G., READINGS, LECTURE NOTES, EXERCISES, AUDIO-VISUAL PRESENTATIONS E	
Q014	30			4	9	6			13	30	20	23		3.6	1.1	4.1	3.9	THE TA WAS EFFECTIVE IN FULFILLING HIS/HER ROLE.
Q015	14					7			13	30	23	100		0.0	1.3	1.3	1.3	FOR SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS ONLY: PLEASE SPECIFY IF YOU ARE BSW 90 CREDITS OR BSW 60 CREDITS

\*\*\* DEPT MEAN = Sum of all valid responses for this question in all courses in the department/number of such responses  
\*\*\* DEPT COURSE MEAN = Sum of the means for this question for all courses in the department/number of courses in the department

## Overall status

	Respondents	Percent
No answers	3	50,0 %
Partially completed	0	0,0 %
Completed	3	50,0 %
Rejected	0	0,0 %
In total	6	100,0 %

## For how many semesters have you been enrolled in your Study Programme?

	Respondents	Percent
1 - 2 semesters	1	33.3%
3 - 4 semesters	0	0.0%
5 - 6 semesters	1	33.3%
7 - 8 semesters	0	0.0%
9 - 10 semesters	1	33.3%
More than 10 semesters	0	0.0%
Total	3	100.0%

## 1. What do you think was good about how the seminar was organised? What could be improved?

- There was a clear structure of how it was organized, and progression during the weeks was really good.
- The structure of the seminar was clear from the start and did not change during the seminar. The discussions were productive and fuelled by numerous and diverse group exercises. The timing of the class could be improved (slow pace first then fast pace in the end)
- All in all, everything was good.

Good mix/balance between discussion/exercises/lecture...

The only thing that could be a bit improved is time gestion, because there were a few times where we ran out of time and could manage the whole foreseen program.

## 2. Seminar organisation was good

	Respondents	Percent
Absolutely agree	3	100.0%
Agree	0	0.0%
Neutral	0	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Absolutely disagree	0	0.0%
Do not know / Do not wish to answer	0	0.0%
Total	3	100.0%

## 3. The curriculum was appropriate in terms of level and scope

	Respondents	Percent
Absolutely agree	3	100.0%
Agree	0	0.0%

Neutral	0	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Absolutely disagree	0	0.0%
Do not know / Do not wish to answer	0	0.0%
Total	3	100.0%

#### 4. The course was conducted well

	Respondents	Percent
Absolutely agree	3	100.0%
Agree	0	0.0%
Neutral	0	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Absolutely disagree	0	0.0%
Do not know / Do not wish to answer	0	0.0%
Total	3	100.0%

#### 7. Which parts of the seminar did you find particularly interesting?

- All of it.
- The articulation between the different theories we've studied with some more concrete topics was particularly interesting. The global reflexivity of the course is appreciated
- Exercices and debates because it was very interactive and also helpful to really understand the concepts and memorize them.

#### 8. My attendance has been good

	Respondents	Percent
Absolutely agree	2	66.7%
Agree	1	33.3%
Neutral	0	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Absolutely disagree	0	0.0%
Do not know / Do not wish to answer	0	0.0%
Total	3	100.0%

#### 9. In general, I have been well prepared for classes

	Respondents	Percent
Absolutely agree	2	66.7%
Agree	1	33.3%
Neutral	0	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Absolutely disagree	0	0.0%
Do not know / Do not wish to answer	0	0.0%
Total	3	100.0%



## 10. The seminar has increased my interest in the subject

	Respondents	Percent
Absolutely agree	1	33.3%
Agree	2	66.7%
Neutral	0	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Absolutely disagree	0	0.0%
Do not know / Do not wish to answer	0	0.0%
Total	3	100.0%

## 11. How do you assess the workload involved in following the seminar?

- I was able to structure it so that it was fine.
- The workload involved in the seminar was correct and the preparation work well integrated into the class
- Fair and evenly balanced.

## 12. The workload of the seminar was evenly distributed over the semester

	Respondents	Percent
Absolutely agree	1	33.3%
Agree	2	66.7%
Neutral	0	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Absolutely disagree	0	0.0%
Do not know / Do not wish to answer	0	0.0%
Total	3	100.0%

## 13. Overall, which aspects of the seminar do you feel were succesful (less succesful)?

- it was a problem that we were so few people, which made class discussion less fruitful
- The structure of the class was clear and well articulated. The discussions and group works worked neatly. The timing of some classes could be improved (the first half was always slower than the second half)
- Everything was great, it was the best course I had as an exchange student at AU, and more generally one the bests of my whole Bachelor degree.

## 14. All in all the seminar was succesful

	Respondents	Percent
Absolutely agree	2	66.7%
Agree	1	33.3%
Neutral	0	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Absolutely disagree	0	0.0%
Do not know / Do not wish to answer	0	0.0%
Total	3	100.0%

	Responses				Response	
	(A)Enig	(A)Overvejende enig	(H)Hverken- eller	(U)Overvejende uenig	Antal	Gns. score
Holdunderviseren/Instruktoren var god til at forklare stoffet	71.4 %	23.8 %	.	4.7 %	21	4.6
Holdunderviseren/Instruktoren gjorde sig umage for at forstå, hvor vi kunne have vanskeligheder med	71.4 %	23.8 %	.	4.7 %	21	4.6
Holdunderviseren/Instruktoren var god til at give os råd om, hvordan man bedst muligt arbejder med stoffet og løser opgaver	47.6 %	4.7 %	38.0 %	9.5 %	21	3.9

### Translation

- 1) The instructor was good at explaining the course content.
- 2) The instructor made an effort to understand where we were having difficulties
- 3)The instructor was good at giving advice on how best to apply the course content and solve problems

Response Range: Agree / Predominantly agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Predominantly disagree

NB: Antal = number of students, and Gns. score = average response. Student comments follow on the next page.

<b>Q12_Uddyb evt. dine svar vedrørende instruktør/holdundervisningen her</b>
For me, the biggest problem with this course has been the very difficult curriculum, and the fact, that because I did not understand the curriculum very well after having read it, I really needed to come to the lectures and have it further explained - instead I came to lectures, where I became more confused than before, and where the lectures' english was far from understandable throughout. ..I would like to applause especially Anthony - but also Daniel - for making such a big effort trying to improve their teaching. I think this course has tremendous potential, but it just didn't work this first time.
There is substantial difference between the different lecturers, så the question on their communication skills, is my estimated average.
Anthony did a great job! On every student class he helped os back on track after the less good lectures (forelæsninger). ..Summarized important points from lectures, pointed out what was important from the current week, and took time for questions. ..Feel very lucky that we had Anthony as our student teacher, and I'm impressed that he could help us so much and even take in extra students on the lectures.
Anthony was great, and has been the main reason i understood the lectures.
Anthony var en rigtig god holdunderviser, på trods af at han ikke sad med til forelæsninger havde han en mavefornemmelse for at nogle af Finkes forelæsninger ikke var gået så godt, hvorfor han gennemgik det mest væsentlige på holdtime. ....Dog synes jeg at der i høj grad manglede mere subjektiv feedback på vores skrivelser. Det kom meget til at handle om struktur struktur struktur, hvilket også er vigtigt, men det har vi hørt meget om før (metode, PT, Sociologi, Kom. pol osv) + struktur er noget nemmere når man skriver en opgave alene og ikke i en læsegruppe. ....Vi afholdte også nogle skrive-workshops hvor vi brugte lang tid på at lære at skrive en indledning, hvor jeg nok i højere grad ville have prioriteret mere substantielt arbejde med skrivelserne frem for strukturen. ....MEN udover de to øverste pointer, så var anthony på trods af det nye fag en rigtig god holdunderviser. ....forslag til næste år: lad holdunderviserne sidde med til forelæsningerne + instruer udenlandske holdundervisere i hvad en "holdtime" i Danmark er (de kunne fx sidde med til en dansk holdtime for at fornemme instruktorens rolle)
Anthony Kevins did really well in trying to explain the material, and going over the central points of any lecture where there might be confusion. He gave examples of structure to the written assignments, helped us get an understanding of the more complex parts of the course material. He was extremely helpful and did a great job.
Anthony was very good at the class teaching!..Mostly because there was a lot of misunderstanding form lectors. A lot was unclear, and gone through to quickly in lectors, but he took time too explain it for us in class.
We had Anthony Kevins as our student teacher. In the beginning there was some clear misunderstandings regarding how the classes should be run, and concerning feedback on written assignments. However, he took the feedback we gave him seriously, and improved himself a lot.
I have found the lectures quality to be very much uneven. I have no doubt that everybody has done their best. But i think that it is clear, that there has no been put enough time in regards of preperations for the course. As an example Finke was not briefed in ragards of what to expect of out knowledge of the institutions. That is not good enough an unfair to us aswell as him.
I just want ot start of by saying that I really like Anthony and his teaching and he shouldn't take the generel critism to much to heart. ..Anthony has been really good at explaining the cource material to us. A few times he has also spent a great deal of time explaining what went on a the leccature, in out classes, because no one understood much of what Daniel was saying. ..Ahtony has only gotten better throughout the semester - adding a struture of the class and becoming more and more aware of his pronunciation. ..I would have liked to have more individuel direct feedback on all the written assignments. Often the focus as more on structure than substance which is quite frustrating when you spent a lot of time trying to understand something substantiel but then don't really get much feedback on whether is was right or not. So maybe try to incorporate a more substantiel feedback. ..Furthermore in the beginning we just went through the written assignment questions as normal questions but when we wanted feedback in turned into feedback primarily about struture. Not actually what has needed.
I didn't find it very beneficial
Anthony Kevins really saved the day during the whole course. Concerning the weekly assignments he was very good at structuring and guiding us through the questions to be answered, while at the same time including us as students and listen carefully to our questions. ....More than that the extra lecturing that he did when the primary lectures lacked quality, was very welcomed.
We usually had a fine sumup of the lectures main points and a go through of the various institutions which helped solving the assignments - The knowledge of the actual institutions was sometimes limited which made a sumup of the institutional design very productive.
I have been very satisfied with the student teacher - He did a great job explaining the material and lectures, if we have had any misunderstandings or questions in general. He has also been very clear about what he expected of us in this course, and how we should take on the exam etc. Over all, he did an amazing job.
Nothing really to note. This was were all my misunderstandings from lectures was solved.
My class had Anthony as a teacher, and he really supported our learning. Often a lot of things were very unclear from the lectures, but Anthony took his time to answer our questions from the lecture. This was really helpfull. Generally the class and the relationship with the student teacher was very good, and we had a lot of interesting discussions. Often we didn't have time to answer all the questions in debt, and this was unfortunately, but often this was due to the confusion in regard to the lectures. Had the lectures been better, the classes could also have been more en debt.
Very good! Could not be better!

	Responses				Response	
	(A)Enig	(A)Overvejende enig	(H)Hverken- eller	(U)Overvejende uenig	Antal	Gns. score
Holdunderviseren/Instruktoren var god til at forklare stoffet	60.0 %	35.0 %	5.0 %	.	20	4.6
Holdunderviseren/Instruktoren gjorde sig umage for at forstå, hvor vi kunne have vanskeligheder med	65.0 %	30.0 %	5.0 %	.	20	4.6
Holdunderviseren/Instruktoren var god til at give os råd om, hvordan man bedst muligt arbejder med stoffet og løser opgaver	30.0 %	15.0 %	35.0 %	20.0 %	20	3.6

### Translation

- 1) The instructor was good at explaining the course content.
- 2) The instructor made an effort to understand where we were having difficulties
- 3)The instructor was good at giving advice on how best to apply the course content and solve problems

Response Range: Agree / Predominantly agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Predominantly disagree

NB: Antal = number of students, and Gns. score = average response. Student comments follow on the next page.

**Q12\_Uddyb evt. dine svar vedrørende instruktør/holdundervisningen her**

Our student teacher has been really good at understanding the difficulties we have had. Specially the EU-bloc lectures have been horrible - the lecturer wasn't understandable and the material for the lectures started at a level where we couldn't follow - we needed to get the baseline of EU before moving on to the materiale which we have been taught in. In this situation our Anthony did a great job

Anthony continuously saved this course in his lessons. Every lesson he would start by recapping the lecture in a clear and precise manner - for most of us this was only at this point the goal with the lecture were apparent

Anthony var virkelig god til at imødekomme vores frustrationer. Det blev antaget at vi vidste meget mere om EU's opbygning og organisering, hvilket vi ikke gjorde, Anthony valgte at prioritere at vi fik en god forståelse af dette. Han har været meget forstående overfor, at det også kan være vanskeligt at svare fyldestgørende på engelsk.

Anthony forsøgte ihærdigt at følge op på det vi ikke havde fået med fra forelæsningserne. På den måde fik vi mere med fra forelæsningserne, men det betød også af holdtime spørgsmål blev gennemgået hurtigere. Derudover lagde han i sin feedback af oplæg og skriveøvelser mere vægt på den sproglige udførelse mm., hvilket ikke rigtig giver mening, da vi hverken skal til mundtlig eksamen eller aflevere på engelsk. Det kunne være fedt, hvis han havde lagt mere vægt på det substantielle i sin feedback. MEN overordnet har han virkelig forsøgt at få det bedste ud af holdtimerne.

Anthony frequently cleared out some misconceptions and misunderstandings from the lectures that were unclear to us. This was helpful, but due to the fact that there often seemed to be misunderstandings between the lecturers/teachers about what exactly we were supposed to learn and what they took for granted we already knew it sometimes got confusing.

The instructor was not used to teaching, so at first it was difficult for him to see what kind of help we needed, and as students we were used to someone who has been a part of the same learning system and thus is more knowledgeable about it, so it was difficult for us to articulate the problems we had in a way that was easy to understand for the instructor. However, we all worked at it and it has gotten much better.

We had Anthony in our class, and I think he did a really great job. ..When we had several lectures in a row, where people did not understand what was going on, he started the class by asking which questions we had, and then he incorporated them into his schedule for the class. It worked extremely well. He really made a great effort. ..I think we were lucky to have him, because I have heard about other classes who has other teachers, and they did not feel they gained anything from there, which is a shame, because it has been some very interesting topics.

Regarding the teacher classroom: If you have to make written assignments then feedback is necessary either thorough peer-review or from the class-room teacher.

Sometimes the focus of the classes and lectures were very different and these differences could have been better explained...Overall, Anthony was a great instructor.

Anthony did a great job with elaborating central points from the lectures, that we didn't understand.

Vi var heldige, vi havde Anthony som instruktør, da han trods alt havde mere styr på stoffet og hvad der var vigtigt, hvorfor han efter alle Daniel Finkes forelæsninger kunne svare på uddybende spørgsmål. Jeg synes han har været god som instruktør, og holdtimerne er det eneste tidspunkt i dette forløb, hvor jeg rent faktisk har fået noget ud af undervisningen. ..Hvad der overordnet ved holdtimerne bør forbedres er dog feedback ift skriveøvelser. Det har været under alt kritik, at vi - trods høj efterspørgsel efter det - OVERHOVEDET ikke har fået noget at vide omkring skriveøvelserne. Ikke engang kollektivt. Tit er et spørgsmål også blevet gennemgået ift overordnede ting istedet for at komme ind på, hvad der substantielt skulle have stået...Et andet aspekt er de mange mundtlige powerpoint presentations. Det er som sådan fint nok nogle gange, men når eksamen er skriftlig virker det trivielt uge efter uge at skulle evaluere på sine medstuderendes gestikuleren og artikuleren frem for indholdet.

Hold 4 har været heldige med at have Anthony som instruktør, det tror jeg har hjulpet vores hold. ..Det ville være rart, hvis der til hver forelæsning var en undervisningsbeskrivelse, så i vidste, hvad vi skulle have haft ud af hver forelæsning og holdtime. ..Det kunne måske have hjulpet hvis instruktorene, selvom de er phd'er var til forelæsning - ligesom i alle andre fag, på den måde har de også selv en ide om hvad der er foregået på forelæsningen, de virker ofte helt tabt og uden anelse om hvad der er forelæst i. ..Andre ugesedler med mere fokus på de ting der er gennemgået på forelæsning. Det virker meget irrelevant at have så specifikke ugesedler med fokus på et lille lands parlament. De evindeligt mange oplæg der har været har fuldstændigt mistet deres betydning. Igen synes de at mangle relevans og relation til forelæsning/holdtimetekster. ..Der har manglet feedback på de igen, evindeligt mange skriveøvelser der har været. Problemet er ikke antallet af skriveøvelser, men når der ikke kommer et eneste ord tilbage på det vi har lavet, så virker det meningsløst at lave dem. ....Det har virkelig været et træls og irriterende fag at have. Det har skabt meget virvar, som kun har givet frustrationer og super meget stress i forhold til forventninger til eksamen!

Our student teacher made an effort to understand our difficulties and was willing to explain things from the lecture that we didn't understand (a lot) ..On the other hand the feedback was lacking e.g. the written assignments..Also I think that he should have gotten more guidance/introduction to the IFSK kind of teaching

The idea w the written assignments and hand-ins seemed like a misunderstanding; we didn't get any feedback and thereby simply had no idea what to expect. So make sure to give feedback when the students are handing something in, otherwise it seems like a waste of time when one have absolutely no idea of the level.

Anthony definitely helped us a lot. The lectures were often very confusing, so after about 5 or 6 lectures we started each class by walking through the basics (which we completely jumped in the lecture). That was the best thing about this course.

Anthony has been most help and truly concerned about all of our frustrations. He has tried to explain the things, that did not make sense in the lectures and is willing to answer all of our questions.

	Responses					Response	
	(A)Enig	(A)Overvejende enig	(H)Hverken- eller	(U)Overvejende uenig	(U)Uenig	Antal	Gns. score
Holdunderviseren/Instruktoren var god til at forklare stoffet	45.4 %	40.9 %	4.5 %	.	9.0 %	22	4.1
Holdunderviseren/Instruktoren gjorde sig umage for at forstå, hvor vi kunne have vanskeligheder med	36.3 %	50.0 %	4.5 %	.	9.0 %	22	4.0
Holdunderviseren/Instruktoren var god til at give os råd om, hvordan man bedst muligt arbejder med stoffet og løser opgaver	27.2 %	31.8 %	22.7 %	4.5 %	13.6 %	22	3.5

### Translation

- 1) The instructor was good at explaining the course content.
- 2) The instructor made an effort to understand where we were having difficulties
- 3) The instructor was good at giving advice on how best to apply the course content and solve problems

Response Range: Agree / Predominantly agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Predominantly disagree / Disagree

NB: Antal = number of students, and Gns. score = average response. Student comments follow on the next page.

**Q12\_Uddyb evt. dine svar vedrørende instruktør/holdundervisningen her**

Anthony er god, men fokusere alt for meget på mundtlig præsentation. Vi har dog absolut ingen metodisk analyse lavet, sammenlignet med fx. almen, hvorfor man kan være lidt bekymret for en diskrepans mellem, hvad der faktisk forventes til eksamen og hvad vi har trænet i. Kan godt bidrage til den generelle paniske tilstand flere er i omkring eksamen

Anthony var fremragende, han var det eneste der fungerede i faget

Det har været svært at se en rød tråd mellem undervisningen på forelæsningen og undervisningen på holdtiden. Dernæst har det været svært at finde ud af, hvad der reelt set har været teorier, som vi kan bruge til eksamen og så hvad der kun har været empiri. Det gør at det har været svært at arbejde med holdtime sedlerne, fordi vi ikke har kunne bruge nogen teorier. Dernæst har det været svært og se den kobling, som i mener der har været til Almen Statskundskab og dette fags opbygning af faget.

Han var god til at give os en kort opsummering af de forelæsninger hvor vi virkelig ikke følte at vi fik noget ud af emnerne. Men der har dog været lidt problemer ift. at der ikke har været meget deltagelse på holdet, hvor instruktøren så bare har kigget på os i stedet for selv at besvare spørgsmålet. det har været problematisks synes jeg. Ydermere mangler jeg til tider lidt dybdegående gennemgang af holdtimeteksterne og måske en mere generel forståelse af hvad et skal bruges til og hvad det egentlig handler om

Vi havde en god instruktør, der var god til at tage tid til at gennemgå spørgsmål vi ikke forstod. Hvilket var dejligt. ...Dog blev der brugt meget til på at fremlægge og "lær at lave en god fremlæggelse" hvilken der oftest føles som spild af tid, da eksamen er mundtlig og folk helst bare ønskede at forstå faget.

Anthony har været rigtig god til at samle op på evt. spørgsmål fra forelæsningerne - han har gjort et rigtig godt stykke arbejde. ...Det er fint at vi holder oplæg og der kommer lidt feedback, men når der er så meget fokus på feedback af præsentations teknik og vi ikke gennemgår spørgsmålet bagefter - forstå jeg ikke pointen i dette. Jeg kan hellere ikke se meningen med øvelsen når vi har en eksamensform der er skriftlig og ikke mundtlig. ...Hvis/ når studerende fra andre hold følger andre holdtimer, bør de også deltage i undervisningen/oplæg på lige fod med det oprindelig hold deltager. ....Desværre fik man ikke særlig meget ud af Daniel Finks forelæsninger, både teksterne og forelæsningerne var svære at forstå - det var svært at se hvor det førte hen ad.

He did fine, but the problem was that the lectures an the course in general has not had a clear frame, which has made it very difficult to get anything out of the classroom lectures. It has been starting from the bottom and try to understand what we were meant to take away from the lectures in the first place.

It was very frustrating that we had to use a lot of time in the tutorial, just to make clear what we were supposed to have learned in the lecture. This was especially the case during Daniel Finkes weeks of lectures. It could have been prevented with better lectures by him

Vi kom til at bruge alt for lang tid på at forstå stoffet fra forelæsningen på holdtiden, hvorved vi ikke fik arbejdet særligt meget med ugesedlen. Om end det var rart at få afklaring ift. pensum, så var det ikke optimalt, at holdtiden blev brugt på denne måde.

Anthony gjorde sit bedste.

Jeg vælger at kommentere på dansk, da jeg således bedst kan udtrykke mig selv...Jeg gik på hold 8 og havde Anthony som holdinstruktør, og da han hurtigt opfangede, at vi ofte havde svært ved det tekniske stof fra forelæsningerne eks. arbejdsdeling, partisystemer, elektorale systemer osv. valgte han hver gang at indlede holdtiden med at spørge ind til forståelsesproblemer, som han så forsøgte at udrede...Derudover har han i flere omgange brugt forskellige undervisningsmetoder eks. 'diskuter med sidemanden', 'fremlæggelse med feedback fra holdet' og 'kort skriveøvelse af vores noter, som vores sidemand så skulle læse'. ...Han har også givet os eksempler på gode og dårlige indledninger, strukturafrnit og konklusioner så vi fik en forståelse for en akademisk opgave...Han har også snakket meget struktur i en opgave med os, hvordan vi skal bygge en opgave op osv.

We were lucky to have Anthony as a class instructor, because he elaborated the main lectures and elaborated the difficulties we had. However, the time he spend on elaborating the material took a lot of the time from the actual student class which is problematic since we couldn't get "deep" into that material.

Det er meget svært at komme i dybden med stoffet og forstå det ordentligt, når det hele foregår på engelsk...Vores instruktør var dog meget forstående og prøvede at hjælpe os så godt som muligt.

Daniel Finke is completely useless.

Vi var rigtig heldige at få Anthony Kevins som holdunderviser, som virkelig har gjort en indsats for at hjælpe med at få holdet til at forstå både forelæsningspensum og holdtime pensum. ...Han har været rigtig dygtig, men at faget ikke er tilrettelagt særlig godt, især med det store fokus på mundtlige præsentationer og manglende feedback har han adresseret ok.



## Evaluation report: F17 - Politiske institutioner: Vestlige lande, EU og udenrigspolitik - ClassF01 [431151U046] to Anthony Kevins

### (S17)BSS\_Course\_Evaluations

Project Audience 320

Responses Received 224

Response Ratio 70.0%

#### Subject Details

**ECTS** 10

**Niveau** Bachelor

#### Report Comments

##### Scale

Agree=5

Mostly agree=4

Neutral=3

Mostly disagree=2

Disagree=1

**Creation Date** Sun, May 14, 2017




## Overall outcome



## Overall outcome

	Response count	Mean	Very significant outcome	Significant outcome	Some outcome	Limited outcome	No outcome
I rate the overall outcome of the course as:	224	2.8	4.5 %	16.1 %	42.9 %	32.6 %	4.0 %

On average, I have spent this many hours per week on this course (participation in teaching, activities and preparation)




On average, I have spent this many hours per week on this course (participation in teaching, activities and preparation)

	Responses	Mean	1-5	6-8	9-11	12-14	15-17	18-20	21-23	24-26	27-29	>=30
Responses, mean and percentages	224	9.8	3.6 %	25.9 %	46.9 %	21.4 %	2.2 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %

## Standard questions

Agree
  Mostly agree
  Neutral
  Mostly disagree
  Disagree
  Not relevant




## Standard questions

	Response count	Mean	Agree	Mostly agree	Neutral	Mostly disagree	Disagree
The lecturer clearly communicated what he or she expected of us on this course	223	2.5	2.2 %	22.9 %	23.8 %	24.7 %	26.5 %
During the course I had continuous opportunity to apply what I had learned and to have errors and misunderstandings explained.	224	2.9	4.9 %	32.6 %	25.9 %	23.7 %	12.9 %
During this course, there have been good opportunities to receive feedback/guidance regarding my academic performance	224	3.0	4.0 %	38.4 %	27.2 %	19.2 %	11.2 %
The course was well-structured; e.g. the purpose of the individual course material and activities was clear to me.	223	2.8	3.6 %	32.3 %	26.9 %	16.6 %	20.6 %
The course website on Blackboard supported the teaching and learning activities.	211	3.7	19.0 %	43.6 %	26.1 %	6.6 %	4.7 %
On this course, it has been possible for me to get help and support from my fellow students when I encountered academic problems.	224	3.4	12.5 %	43.8 %	24.6 %	10.7 %	8.5 %
I have actively participated in the course's teaching and learning activities, both during and between classes.	223	3.7	13.5 %	52.9 %	22.0 %	9.4 %	2.2 %
Through the teaching activities I have been inspired to engage in the subject	224	2.5	4.9 %	17.9 %	25.9 %	23.7 %	27.7 %
The lecturer(s) was/were good at communicating the course material	224	2.6	1.3 %	22.8 %	27.2 %	29.0 %	19.6 %
The lecturer(s) was/were good at understanding where we might have difficulties with the course material	222	2.5	2.7 %	16.2 %	32.4 %	29.3 %	19.4 %

## The student teacher's communication skills

The student teacher's communication skills



## The small group teacher's communications skills

	Response count	Mean	Agree	Mostly agree	Neutral	%(Mostly disagree)	Disagree
The small group teacher was good at communicating the material	223	3.6	31.8 %	29.6 %	13.5 %	17.5 %	7.6 %
The small group teacher was good at structuring relevant learning activities	223	3.3	27.4 %	21.5 %	21.5 %	15.7 %	13.9 %
The small group teacher was good at understanding where I, and my fellow students, might have difficulties understanding the course material	223	3.7	29.1 %	33.6 %	18.4 %	13.9 %	4.9 %
The small group teacher gave us good advice on how to work appropriately with the course material and how to solve the exercises	222	3.3	24.3 %	23.0 %	23.0 %	18.0 %	11.7 %

**You are welcome to elaborate on your answers regarding student teacher/the classroom teaching here**

Comment

Not Answered

## Standard comment fields

**Which parts of the course have been particularly beneficial for your learning?**

Students
Holdtimer
Skriveøvelser! Særligt godt med personlig feedback.
Læsningen var det mest forståelige, da fx forelæsningsne i høj var uforståelige grundet mumlen på engelsk.
EU-delen
Læsegruppe
The lectures and the classes
Ingen af delene.
Holdtimer
?????
Holdtimerne. Grundbogen er god.
Enkelte forelæsninger har været gode - især Anthony skal have ros.
Reading / lectures.
Det har været holdtimerne, der har været mest udbytterigt for mit vedkommende.
Den sidste del omkring EU, hvor der har været en god dybde på. Og brugen af det institutionelle teorier
Læsegruppearbejde
The lectures and the study group
The EU-part. It's a comprehensive and complex issue, and this has helped me understand the EU system. And it has helped me realize a lot of its flaws, and what approaches that might solve this issues.
Trial exam var det eneste, der har givet mig lidt. Jeg føler på ingen måde ellers, at jeg er forberedt til PI eksamen.
EU-forløbet, det forskellige politiske systemer i Tyskland, USA og Frankrig.
Instruktortimerne er klasse
Kursusplanen
Det har være interessant at lære om EU
Holdundervisning og læsegruppearbejde.
Den sidste blok om EU var godt struktureret og har givet stort udbytte for mig
EU part was better than the rest
Delen om EU har været den mest brugbare.
Jeg har fået en del ud af holdtimerne, i og med at vi har gennemgået mange dele af pensum mere dybdegående.
The entire EU topic.
Holdtimerne har været basis for at få noget lærerigt ud af dette fag - at man arbejder med stoffet gør det mere håndgribeligt
The EU part.
jeg synes at holdundervisningen har været god, ift at få det væsentlige fra teksterne med.
Meget lærerrige redskaber og spændende teorier. Det var rigtig godt at de samme teorier (New-Institutionalism/Neo-Functionalism/Intergovernmentalism) blev brug gennemgående gennem kurset. Man har faktisk nået forstå dem og lære at bruge dem sikkert.
Holdtimerne har været rigtig gode, og suppleret forlæsningstimerne.
Jeg synes ikke, at der har været meget, som man har fået udbytte af. Det har på ingen måde fungeret, at der bliver undervist på engelsk. Underviserne er simpelthen ikke gode nok til det engelske sprog, og derfor er det svært at høre og forstå, hvad de siger. Samtidig er mange af teksterne for svære, og vi skal igennem alt for meget på alt for kort tid.
Ugesedler/holdtimer
Jeg har generet haft svært ved at holde fokus i kurset, da det er et eller andet, der slet ikke fungerer.. Jeg kan dog ikke rigtig sige, hvad det specifikt er.
Det er gået hånd i hånd med IP, hvilket var meget rart!

Students
Holdtimerne har helt klart fungeret bedst
Study group
Enkelte forelæsninger har været gode og tydelige. Særligt Rasmus Bruuns forelæsninger har været gode. Helenes forelæsninger i starten af semestret, som ofte føltes som oplæsning, var rigtig svære at følge med i det. Samme gjorde sig gældende for Daniels forelæsninger - man får simpelthen ikke de væsentlige pointer med.
I liked the fact that I now have more knowledge about the EU
Holdtimer har været gode, men som sagt har det været lidt en hæmsko, at det var på engelsk - jeg synes dog personligt, at det har været spændende at prøve. Det er også fagets indhold, der har været svært, som blot er blevet endnu sværere, da det både var på engelsk og forelæsere og holdundervisere ikke havde engelsk som modersmål
Ikke nogle dele bestemt, faget har været svært og mange af forelæsningerne har været dårlige.
Det må have været holdtimerne, men generelt har jeg efter både forelæsninger og holdtimer været mere forvirret end jeg kom.
Holdundervisningen.
Arbejdet med ugesedlerne i læsegrupper.
Being with the student-group teacher, as he was very specific as to what was right and wrong and he was excellent at explaining, when I and my fellow students had questions or problems.
holdtimerne
Holdtimerne og ugesedlerne
Doing the weekly questions for the class and reading the pensum.
Arbejdet mellem forelæsning og holdtime
Nogle af forelæsningerne har været fine - men det bedste sted at forstå faget har (desværre) været ud fra teksterne (som så må læses flere gange ved uklarheder). Emnerne i sig selv har potentiale til at være meget spændende!
Holdtimerne har fungeret rigtig godt for mig. Det har været svært at sidde med mange af teksterne i læsegruppearbejdet, men man har ofte kunne få styr på det på holdtimerne.
Læsegruppearbejde
Holdtimerne. Jeg synes dog mange har forelæsningerne har givet et meget lille udbytte, da det har været svært. Dette gør selvfølgelig at man kommer med dårligere forudsætninger for at deltage på holdtiden.
Dem hvor anthony har undervist. Men ingen af kursets dele af haft særligt stort udbytte. Kurset virker ikke særlig gennemtænkt og mangler generelt indhold. Dernæst ser jeg ingen pointe i at det er på engelsk.
Forelæsningerne
Teksterne
Holdtimerne/skriveøvelserne har været ubrugelige
Prøveeksamen var god! Det var rart at få en idé om, hvad forløbet skal ende ud med. Man kan diskutere om det er en god idé at have det i læsegruppen, frem for individuelt som vi har i nogle af de andre fag. Det var en relativt lang opgave at skulle skrive i gruppen.
Anthony var dygtig - det var nogle gode forelæsninger
Forelæsningerne - særligt første par forelæsninger om teorier og institutioner generelt
Forelæsninger, hvor "native English speakers" har forelæst.
Det vi har haft om EU har været rigtig fint. Jeg synes, at jeg har fået et fint indblik i, hvad EU handler om.
The classes have been the best. The lectures have been very difficult, uninspiring and boring.
De overordnede forklaringer i starten af kurset.
Ikke særlig meget generelt. Faget er ustruktureret og flere af forelæserne af lav standard i forhold til hvor svært stoffet er.
The instructor sessions were essential. But I did like how the course was structured in the different institutional levels, it does however not connect well later on, so the structure is lost in memory of the lecturers.
The debates, for example the autonomy of the ECJ, have been interesting and rewarding.
Skriveøvelserne. Forelæsningerne kunne også være gode
Jeg synes, at forelæsninger med Anthony har været gode. Han er meget mere eksplicit i sine forventninger til, hvad

<b>Students</b>
man skal have ud af den pågældende uge. Derudover synes jeg, at der har været nogle gode ugesedler i forbindelse med intergovernmentalism vs. neofunctionalism og de forskellige institutionalismer.
<b>The classes</b>
Jeg har særligt haft udbytte af læsegruppearbejdet, da der har været mulighed for at gå i dialog om afklarings spørgsmål og hjælpe hinanden til forståelse. Derudover synes jeg at grundbogen har være god - sommetider bedre til forelæsningsernes indhold.
Selvom strukturen på holdtimerne til tider har været ret forvirrende så er det dog der, jeg har fået størst udbytte. Det er her, at det er blevet nemmere at forstå og blevet lidt mere klart, hvad vi har skulle tage med fra hver enkel undervisning. Jeg synes det er enormt vigtigt at vi hvordan institutioner virker og jeg forstår godt ideen bag at lave det til et separat fag, men.....
<b>Læsegruppe</b>
Mest holdtimerne fordi man kunne stille spørgsmålstegn og komme på banen
Umiddelbart har det fungeret godt, at vi har skulle tale engelsk på holdtimerne.
Overblikket i starten om forskellige valgsystemer og forskellen mellem præsidentalistiske- og semipræsidentalistiske osv. systemer var interessant og brugbar - mere af det!
<b>Holdtimerne</b>
Forelæsningerne med Anthony Kevins, især hans slides, hvor han skrev de væsentlige pointer på. Samt den aflevering vi lavede i læsegrupperne.
Holdtiden. The classes worked well and were well structured!
<b>Holdtiden</b>
Jeg har haft højest udbytte af når jeg har læst selv, og har haft utroligt lidt udbytte i alle andre dele af kurset. Samtlige forelæsere har være svære at forstå, pga. at de har skulle snakke på engelsk og enten har mumlet, spist ordene eller bare haft forkert udtale hvilket gør at flere ord går tabt.
Praktiske opgaver har været gode, i sær anvendelse af teorierne, så som EU opgaven af lobbyarbejde var berigende.
Gruppearbejde med spørgsmålene på ugesedlen.
Anthony er i min optik den eneste forelæser, som jeg rigtig har fået noget ud af. Den engelske barriere er selvfølgelig en ting, men måden han holdte forelæsningerne på var gode.
Classes and preparation for classes. The His & Høyland book is also good, but it is really difficult to remember all those facts. And it takes to long to note down all the key points.
<b>Holdtimerne.</b>
Holdtimerne fik jeg mest ud af, selvom de ikke har været til meget hjælp. Imodsætning til forelæsningerne, som desværre har været på det laveste niveau ift. mine oplevelser med andre forelæsninger.
Særligt EU blokken har været meget givende, herunder diskussionerne om det indbyrdes magtforhold mellem Kommissionen, Ministerrådet og Parlamentet har været interessante.
class teacher (Anthony) was very good to get a better understanding of the material. without he's class lectures the course would be very difficult to grasp
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Learning about the three different institutionalisms and the two approaches to EU-integration was useful.</li> <li>- Good to get an introduction to different political systems</li> <li>- Good with a thorough understanding of the EU</li> </ul>
<b>The first two blocs.</b>
<b>Læsegruppen!!</b>
Forelæsningerne - når vi har haft Anthony, fordi han snakker på sit modersmål. Jeg synes også de andre er ok, men udbyttet er ganske enkelt langt større, når forelæserne snakker dansk, hvis de er danskere fx.
<b>Holdtimerne med Anthony</b>
Applying theories on real life institutional situations - for instance institutional theories as tools for explaining different situations in EU. - Also the overlap between International Politics and Political institutions course created an experience of coherence - but should perhaps be even more prevalent.

Students
Mulighed for afleveringer og feedback!!! Rigtig godt, at det er en mulighed.
Skriveøvelser, omend deadlines på dem har været meget korte ift. at vi har haft forelæsning om tirsdagen og også har andre fag at forberede os til.
EU-blokken har givet meget ny viden. Grundbogen er fremragende. Så har holdtimerne været rigtig gode. Herudover er det rigtig godt at man på pensumlisten får et overblik over hvad formålet med diverse timer er. Det giver en god ro til at arbejde med stoffet mere koncentreret.
Hix og Høyland bogen - supergod. Fungerer fint at faget er på engelsk - dog dejligt at eksamen er på dansk. Helene og Anthony super gode forelæsere. Anthonys måde hele tiden af samle op, virker utrolig godt. Man vil hele tiden var vi snakker om. Godt med summe pauser til forelæsninger. Daniel Finke er også klar og tydeligt at forstå - emnet er desværre bare meget tørt. Summepauser og små opgaver til forelæsning.
Holdtimerne
the compendium is really good and makes it clear what every class and lecture is about - the tables for every week makes a good overview of the topics.
Holdundervisningen! Det er oftest først her jeg har fået ordentlig forståelse for ugens pensum_mne. Den kommenteret undervisningsplan giver rigtig godt overblik og forståelse for, hvad ugens emne/pensum indeholder og forventninger til, hvad vi skal have styr på!
Læsegruppearbejde
Holdtimer med Anthony
Udelukkende holdtimerne
Godt spørgsmål - det må blive Helenes og Antonys forelæsninger. De andre forelæsninger har været svære at høre.
Non.
The classes where we have had the chance to apply the theories under some guidance and ask questions from both the readings and the lectures.
Instruktortimerne.
intet - kun lit forelæsningerne

## Do you have any suggestions for improving the course? Have you missed anything?

Students
Det virker ikke helt gennemtænkt, at alt foregår på engelsk. Særligt har de danske forelæsere haft tydelige problemer med at forelæse på engelsk. Jeg synes også det er vigtigt at kommunikere klart ud hvad det betyder, at der forelæses på engelsk. Jeg og mange af mine medstuderende vidste ikke der blev forelæst på engelsk før vi sad til første forelæsning. Også hvad der kan forventes til eksamen, siden det er et så nyt fag. En LANGT bedre pensumliste. Brug evt. almen statskundskabs undervisningsplan som inspiration.
Det er et ret avanceret kursus og det ville hjælpe gevaldigt, hvis det foregik på dansk.
Der er alt for meget læsning per uge. Supplerende tekster til fx holdtimer fik ofte det "rigtige" pensum til at virke sekundært.
Hvis undervisningen skal foregå på engelsk er det vigtigt, at der ikke er noget der går tabt grundet underviserne.
Synes kurset skulle være på dansk, det er svært at fange alle pointer, specielt når kvaliteten af det engelske ikke har været særlig god hos alle. Brug evt kun engelske undervisere
There were two lessons in the middle of the course that repeated points made during our international politics-course, which isn't just boring, it's a waste of time.
Der mangler i høj grad en rød tråd. Det virkede som et meget abrupt kursskift da der blev skiftet til fokuset på EU midt i semestret, og denne undervisning bliver nærmest aldrig koblet til undervisningen i starten af semestret. Samtidig er det svært at vide hvad det reelt er fra kurset man skal tage med sig til eksamen (er det teorierne, er det viden om de forskellige dele af EU?). Generelt virker det hele som en stor gang rod.
Det er svært at finde en rød tråd - den har været meget savnet. Det er svært at finde frem til, hvad jeg skal bruge til eksamen, især fordi undervisningsforløbet af virket så rodet.



**Students**

Den første blok og blokken om EU har været svære at relatere til hinanden.

Især i starten synes jeg, at der manglede en sammenhæng mellem holdtime tekster og spørgsmål.

Formidlingerne fra undervisernes side har været skidt. De har ikke taget nok hensyn til, at vi skal forstå et andet sprog, indholdet og samtidig skrive noter. Der har været for høj grad af hurtig snak og mumlen. Jeg synes desuden ikke, det giver mening, at forelæsere, der har dansk som modersmål skal forelæse på engelsk, når eksamen alligevel må skrives på dansk!

Rasmus kan man slet ikke forstå

Jeg synes det er en stor svaghed ved kurset at det er på engelsk. Det fungerer rigtig dårligt når de danske forelæsere skal forelæse på engelsk. Jeg har fået rigtig lidt ud af forelæsningerne, fordi stoffet i forvejen er svært og forelæsere generelt er ret uninspirerende. Det ville være en fordel hvis de måtte forelæse på deres eget sprog, således at de danske forelæsere måtte forelæse på dansk. Samtidig giver det ikke så meget mening for mig at lave skriveøvelse på engelsk, når jeg vil skrive på dansk til eksamen. En måde at løse problemet ville klart være danske instruktører. Desuden går nogen af tingene på forelæsningerne igen fra IP (og omvendt), derfor kunne en koordinering mellem de to fag være en god ide.

Mange af holdtime-teksterne er alt for svære, og jeg har fået meget lidt udbytte af dem (især holdtiden om ICJ). Generelt synes jeg niveauet er for højt, i forhold til at det også foregår på engelsk.

Bedre introduktion til faget som helhed. Hvad er fagets overordnede mål, hvad skal vi forvente mm.

Helt vildt svært og rodet generelt. Har fået meget lidt ud af kurset.

Man skal være mere forberedte på hvilket pensum man vælger, så vi ikke får en masse uddybende bilag, fordi man har fortrudt de tekster man sætter på pensum efterfølgende.

Være mere opmærksomme på de instruktører, som ikke kommer fra AU - det kan ikke passe at nogle hold ikke får noget ud af det, fordi deres instruktør selv er forvirret, mens andre hold har en forelæser, som skriver masser af noter og ekstra pointer - det giver SLET ikke de samme vilkår til eksamen og jeg er reelt bange for at jeg har lært det jeg skulle, med den undervisning jeg har fået.

A more streamlined pensum.

Week 1: Read text 1, author, link, ompendium...

It is annoying to have to read the author+publishing date and then go on a treasure hunt further down in the document.

Jeg synes det er svært at se den rødetråd i forløbet og den måde, kurset er bygget op på.

Langt mere klarhed i pensum

Sidetæl på slides ville være rigtig dejlige. Undgår denne tekst: Carrubba, Gabel & Hankla (2008) Judicial behavior under political constraints, da den var næsten umulig at forstå og man derfor ikke fik særlig meget ud af at læse.

Stricter rules for how the class teachers organize the course. Often, we only covered 1. questions on the class.

Formidlingen og strukturen af faget, har været skidt.

Ikke klargjort fokus, til trods for faget i bund og grund handler om EU.

Svært at tage så meget med fra dette fag.

Perhaps more focus on the English-speaking skills. Everyone was able to speak an acceptable level of English, but I know of people who would have benefitted from either first-language English speakers, or people who have learned it to almost perfection.

Mere om FN's organisatoriske udtryk, R2P spændende men mere!

Jeg synes man skal droppe EU delen, fordi de er for kompleks til at forstå på halvanden måned. Enten skulle kurset udelukkende handle om EU. Det havde været optimalt hvis vi havde forstat i samme spor som vi startede med at lære grundlæggende om institutionsteorier også inddrage empiri. Jeg synes EU delen gør kurset meget skizofrent.

Forelæsningsstrukturen var ikke helt logisk. Ved at bytte om nogle af forelæsningerne vil det være blive lettere at forstå institutionerne i EU.

Der har været mangel på en retning. Det har været meget vanskeligt at finde ud af hvad pointen med forløbet har været.

Det er begrænset hvor godt faget fungerer på engelsk, da nogle af undviserne og instruktørerne kan have svært ved at formidle stoffet præcist nok, til at det bliver forståeligt for de studerende.

Meget mere klarhed i, hvad der forventes af os ifm. eksamen, skriveøvelser m.v. Det er meget uklart, hvordan vi fx skal anvende teori. Hvorfor behandler man fx rationel institutionalisme som én teori? Det er meget inkompatibelt med, hvad

## Students

vi lærer i andre fag om teoribrug, hvor man aldrig bare forklarer noget ud fra en hel skole. Samtidig har det virket lidt søgt i fx prøveeksamen, hvad vi skulle nå frem til. Det er en dårlig kombination, når der kun er én løsning, og det samtidig er uklart, hvad man skal.

Den første blok var kaotisk og det var svært helt at forstå hvad det var man skulle holde fat i. En underlig blanding af empiri og teori, og deskriptiv redegørelse af institutioner samt analyse

Det kan være vanskeligt når så kompliceret stof formidles på engelsk.

Desuden er det til tider svært at se forbindelsen mellem de tre overordnede temaer som der har været i kurset, dvs. politiske institutioner.

Too much RC institutionalism VS. Sociological institutionalism. I felt that we where doing the same analysis over and over again. The lectures was to basic.

More structure on slides and during class lections (Also between the two)

Gøre det mere klart hvad formålet er. Måske samarbejde mere med faget Almen Statskundskab, idet fagene har dækket over nogle af de samme emner men på forskellige tidspunkter, hvilket gjorde det svært at holde fagene adskilt. Tydeliggøre hvad der forventes af os til eksamen.

Inddrag noget mere teori og forklaring. Det har simpelthen for meget karakter af redegørelse og deskriptiv formidling.

Jeg synes, det har været lidt svært at få et overblik over, hvordan de forskellige forelæsninger hænger sammen.

Desuden mangler jeg lidt information omkring eksamen, og hvordan en eksamensopgave kan struktureres og bygges op.

I had trouble comprehending the first two lectures and text readings. The whole process of knowing what the historical, sociological, etc. analogies was to be used for, was not very clear to me at first.

Gør det mere interessant. Forelæserne mangler arrangement og 'power' - når man følger, at ikke finder deres emne så interessant, så er det svært som studerende at finde emnet interessant.

Det er et rigtig svært fag, hvorfor det også et mærkværdigt, at det netop er dette fag som skal være på engelsk. Det er svære begreber, udtryk og emner vi arbejder med, og derfor gør det det ikke lettere at man skal lære det på engelsk.

Pensumlisten! Selvom i har prøvet at give en kort introduktion til hvert emne, er det lidt intetsigende.

Forelæserne har ikke gjort os opmærksomme nogen gange, hvis der var en svært tekst til holdtiden, eller nogen rettesnor.

En mege tydelig udmelding omkring hvad eksamen kan indeholde og hvad der forventes. Undervisningen var ok, men hvad af det skal vi egentligt bruge?

Mere eksamensforberedelse. Det ville være rart med en ekstra mulighed for at øve sig ved en selvstændig skriveøvelse. Det er lidt uklart lige nu præcis, hvad der forventes til eksamen.

Generelt har jeg forståelse fra folk af, at kurset er enormt dårligt. De færreste forstår det og mange decideret frygter den kommende eksamen - inklusiv mig selv.

Jeg synes, at faget skal være på dansk. Det er kun ok at tale engelsk, hvis man ikke kan dansk. Derudover skal man revurdere pensum - det er for stort og for svært.

Jeg har savnet at gå fra en forelæsning med en følelse af at have forstået tingene - det har jeg ikke gjort én eneste gang i dette fag. Så generelt har jeg savnet at lære noget. Så alt i alt: et meget dårligt fag, som ikke er struktureret ordentligt og som ingen udbytte giver.

Eksempel på en struktur til en eksamensopgave

Det er generelt et meget rodet fag. Jeg har svært ved at følge med på forelæsningerne, idet de udenlandske forelæsere mumler meget (dog ikke Anthony) og de danske forelæsere snakker så ekstremt hurtigt, at man ikke kan følge med. Teksterne er svære at læse og forstå, og så er de små oplæg på holdtimerne ikke særlig lærerige (Her kunne man have ladet oplæggene gå på runde mellem læsegrupperne, så det blev mere gennemarbejdede oplæg).

Det er problematisk, at nogle af underviserne er svært forståelige på engelsk (fx Rasmus Bruun, Daniel Finke) Synes desuden, at de i nogle tilfælde kan være svært at adskille faget fra IP

More structure and clear lines about what to get from it

– Bedre kvalitet i holdundervisningen. Mere klare linjer. Hvad skal tages med fra en holdtime, hvad er pointen?

- Forelæsningerne har også ofte synes uklare. Når forelæserne mumler, eller midt i en sætning pludselig skifter fokus, så kan man miste hele dét, der var en måske vigtig pointe.

- Måske er det de "jura-begreber", som vi ikke kender til (og slet ikke på engelsk), der kan forvirre og gøre, at man slet ikke forstår en pointe. Kan man på en måde gennemgå begreberne, få udleveret nogle stikord til dem, eller på anden måde få en forståelse for begreberne, inden de bruges så flygtigt i forelæsningerne?

## Students

- I andre fag taler forelæserne klart, tydeligt og langsomt - kan det også lade sig gøre i PI, så ville det betyde usandsynligt meget for forståelsen.

No hidden litteratur on the weekly sheet.

It is annoying to have to read 10 pages when we are assembled, put that on the list.

A link between the block before EU and the EU-block would be nice

Very confused about the exam.

Det virker håbløst at evaluere på denne måde, når man har haft forskellige undervisere, jeg syntes undervisningen med Helene fungerede optimalt, men undervisningen med Daniel var for højt niveau.

Eksamensformen bidrag på ingen måde til at den studerende skal have en læringsudbytte og burde ændres. Hvis det skal være en skriftlig eksamen foreslår jeg en ugeeksamen

Det er meget tydeligt, at nogle af de undervisere, som har dansk som modersmål, er hæmmet af at skulle tale engelsk. Det fjerner en enorm del kreativitet og formidling at tvinge dem til at gøre det på engelsk. Jeg forstår tankerne bag og har fået et udbytte af undervisningen, men udbyttet ville have været større, hvis underviseren helt selv kunne bestemme sproget.

Bedre struktur på undervisningen og klare hvad det forventes at man skal bruge stoffet til. Det er meget bredt og flyvsk hvad udbyttet af kurset er. Det ville være gavnligt hvis man kunne få en opfølgning efter holdtimerne, når det hele er så rodet. Vigtig at man kan få lov til at aflevere skriveøvelser på dansk, når man må det til eksamen. Undervisning matcher ikke krav til eksamen.

Bedre eksempler på, hvordan man skal anvende teorier i en opgave.

En mere overskuelig gennemgang af, hvordan vi anvender analysen til diskussion

Tal langsommere, skriv hovedpointer på slides. + teksterne har været meget svære, og det har været svært at få afklaret dem efterfølgende.

Et eller andet skal laves om i hvert fald, så man kan få noget mere ud af kurset. Bedre forelæsninger, forelæsere - så man kan få mere ud af dem. Og bedre struktureret holdundervisning.

Der er rigtig meget der er uklart og er svært at forstå fordi det foregår på engelsk, hvorfor jeg tror at man mister meget af forståelsen af elementerne i faget.

I særdeleshed har det været svært at forstå, hvordan en opgave skal opbygges, hvilket har været langt mere klart i de to andre fag på fjerde semester.

Der kunne godt bruges mere tid på dette samt, hvordan man implementerer de teorier, som vi har lært i løbet af undervisningsforløbet.

- Der skal laves bedre pensumliste og nogle gange meget lange tekster til ugesedler, svært at arbejde med to tekster af 25 sider også sidde og finde det helt relevante nogle gange.

- Det er ofte svært at høre, hvad nogle forelæsere siger, de mumler

- Det er meget svært at se sammenhængen mellem at have et fag på engelsk som alle har det svært med (EU er også meget svært på dansk) og at vi til eksamen på skrive på dansk, som nok 90 % procent vælger at gøre - virker som en del spildt arbejde

- Ville kunne få meget mere ud af faget, hvis det var på dansk.

Jeg foreslår, at undervisningen skal foregå på dansk med mindre forelæseren ikke kan tale sproget. Formålet med at undervisningen foregår på engelsk står ikke klart og at undervisningen foregår på engelsk gør det vanskeligt at arbejde med stoffet.

forelæserne skal være bedre til at formidle stoffet - og snakke tydeligere  
eventuelt kunne det gøres på dansk

Lad venligst være med at have en så stor mængde skjult pensum på ugesedlerne.

Mange af teksterne i pensum har været meget svære og det har været svært at se, hvad vi substantielt skulle få ud af dem.

Det kunne være rart med en klarere struktur på forløbet - det giver ikke mening, at hele kurset afvikles på engelsk, hvis eksamen godt må foregå på dansk. Dog har det også været for begrænsende for deltagelsen, at undervisningen har været på engelsk (kombineret med den høje sværhedsgrad), men måske ville det hjælpe, hvis folk faktisk også vidste, at eksamen var på engelsk.

I personally do not have a problem with english, but I do with mumbling, all lecturers should have a course in how to

Students
<p>Speak in front of a crowd, but except for that, everything has been good.</p> <p>Slå jer enten fast på at det hele er engelsk - også eksamen, eller giv de studerende lov til også at aflevere skrivelser på dansk i stedet for kun engelsk.</p> <p>Lav flere individuelle skrivelser, da det er det vi skal til eksamen.</p>
<p>Danske forelæsere skal snakke dansk tak.</p> <p>Det skal formidles tydeligere ud hvad der forventes af vi skal kunne i dette fag og hvordan vi skal kunne anvende det efter. Da faget er helt nyt er mange forvirret.</p> <p>Underviserne skal være bedre til at formidle stoffet. Da vi bliver undervist på et andet sprog, er det vanskeligt at forstå det hele, da mange mumler eller står og læser deres noter op. Mange af forelæserne har været ekstremt dårlige og uinspirerende.</p>
<p>Teachers speaking more clearly at the lectures.</p> <p>Spreading the workload to more student teachers - Will inevitably create better class sessions</p> <p>– Der skal være meget bedre struktur mellem holdtimerne og forelæserne.</p> <p>Mangel på struktur især i holdtimerne.</p> <p>Det har nogen gange været svært at finde en sammenhæng mellem det pensum man læser til forelæserne og forelæserne man har været til.</p> <p>Noget af pensum har været meget uoverskueligt, og nogen gange har man ikke fået bedre styr på det efter at have været til forelæserne.</p>
<p>Jeg har gennem kurset haft svært ved at forstå, hvad det egentlig handlede om.</p> <p>Det har været svært at forstå, hvad der blev sagt på forelæserne, især dele Rasmus Bruns, men og i nogen grad Helenes.</p> <p>I see the relevance of having a course in english, but then I don't understand why you get danish people to lecture in english. That has been disturbing for me.</p> <p>The list of syllabus was confusing. Please take a look at the one from almen statskundskab, as this is the best way to do it.</p>
<p>Bedre struktur på holdtimer, gerne flere øvelser og mere variation - og gerne lidt mere skarp på, hvad der er vigtigt fra pensum. Mere overskuelighed i forelæserne - klarere pointer i nogle tilfælde. Og jeg har ved sidste forelæser stadig ikke en klar idé om, hvordan opgaver i dette fag skal struktureres, og hvad man skal lægge vægt på.</p> <p>Det er ikke meningsfuldt at kurset undervises på engelsk, når eksamen er på dansk; det bidrager ikke med noget positivt til kurset og gør det kun sværere. Jeg ved, at kurset har rykket sig langt siden sidste år, og jeg synes at jeg kan se at strukturen er blevet forbedret. Formidlingen af pensum er imidlertid langt svagere end de øvrige fag. Dette tror jeg både skyldes, at det undervises på engelsk og af instruktører, som ikke nødvendigvis er ansat på baggrund af deres kundskaber i dette fag, men fordi de er PhD'ere. En anden årsag synes at være en manglende koordinering mellem instruktører, forelæsere og en manglende rød tråd i faget, som gør det tæt på umuligt at vide, hvad der forventes af os til eksamen.</p> <p>Mere overskueligt pensum og tilhørende ugesedler. Overvej evt at tage det ned på et lavere niveau, når det forventes at vi skal tale engelsk. Vi når ikke at have styr på basisviden, inden vi bygger på i undervisningen. Det skaber forvirring og man bliver hurtigt "tabt" i forelæserne og holdtimer. Ydermere kunne det være gavnligt, at man fik mulighed for at lave prøveeksamen på dansk, da det jo er en mulighed til selve eksamen.</p> <p>Det er svært at gennemskue, hvad der forventes af os til eksamen, og også hvordan man forbereder sig på dette.</p> <p>Mere fokus på hvordan man går til eksamen. Hvilken struktur forventes og hvordan ser den gode opgave ud?</p> <p>De forelæsere der kan snakke dansk bør snakke dansk under forelæserne. Nogle er til tider så dårlige til engelsk at det skader udbyttet og kan være svært at forstå hvad de siger. Generelt er det dog ikke noget problem at sproget for faget er engelsk.</p> <p>Det er svært at forbedre et emne, der er redegørende - det er nærmere emnets skyld at det ikke har været interessant, end det har været underviserne.</p> <p>Sprogligt har forelæserne været svære. Helene snakker vildt hurtigt og var derfor svært at fange alle pointerne. Rasmus Bruun og Finke mumler rigtig meget, og da det er på engelsk er det svært at forstå! Samtidig synes jeg at materialet til forelæserne og især holdtimer har været rigtig svært. Dette kunne være rart med noget nemmere og mere præcis litteratur, for at forstå institutionerne helt.</p>

## Students

Jeg synes man bør overveje om det giver noget til de studerende at kurset er på engelsk, istedet for et fag som IP som jeg personligt vil mene var mere relevant at det var på engelsk.

Stop skjult pensum

Manglende individuelle skrivelser (ingen kendskab til, hvad man skal gøre til eksamen)

Det virker påtaget at tale engelsk under undervisningen, da engeske færdigheder ikke indgår som en del af fagets mål.

At underviserne fra udlandet forelæser på engelsk er fint. Men de danske forelæsere og instruktører fungerer mindre godt + skrivelser, der foregår på engelsk. Men at man under eksamen har mulighed for dansk.

Forlæsningen om judicial politics in the EU/+ pensum hertil var meget forvirrende, da man ingen juridiske færdigheder har.

Formidlingen af pensum er ikke altid helt klar - det virker som om vi læser utroligt lange tekster, hvor vi reelt set kun bruger enkelte afsnit, og det er først her til sidst, der er begyndt at komme læsevejledninger til, hvad vi skal fokusere på. Det kan man med fordel benytte sig af fremover. Når der bringes instruktører ind, der ikke er "opvokset" på IFSK, som vi andre er, skal man være opmærksom på at give grundig vejledning i, hvordan tingene skal struktureres og gøres. Jeg er slet ikke i tvivl om, at det også bidrager med noget godt at have instruktører udefra, men vi taler bare ikke helt samme faglige sprog og har meget forskellige tilgange til tingene, hvilket kan give nogle udfordringer.

Jeg har savnet en klarere struktur mellem forelæsninger og holdtimer, samt mere overskueligt pensum.

Mange tekster er svære at forstå og dårligt formulerede/upræcise.

Savnet mere løbende information om hvordan de ting vi lærer skal anvendes og bruges i en eksamens situation.

Sproget er efter min mening et stort problem! Niveaue af diskussionerne bliver meget lavt, fordi sproget er en stopklods for meningsfuld dialog på et højt fagligt niveau! Forelæsningsindholdet er krævende og indviklet, hvilket gør det nærmest absurd, at man forsøger at gøre det endnu svære ved, at insistere på at det skal være på engelsk! Jeg er med på at det sikkert har været en god ide, da i fandt på det oppe på kontorgangene, at give studiet et internationalt snit med et engelsk sprog fag, men det går så meget ud over indlæringen og diskussionerne, at det ikke er det værd! Jeg har snakket med mange der tænker det samme som mig. Ideen var god, den fungerer ikke i praksis!

Rasmus Bruun skal IKKE forelæse på engelsk. Det var ikke optimalt.

Bedre overblik over hvilke teorier der skal bruges.

Mere tydelige forelæsninger - man kan ikke forstå, hvad de fleste af forelæserne siger: Daniel Finke: Virker rar, men mumler meget. Rasmus Bruun: Taler alt alt for hurtigt. Anthony: Fin nok. Helene: Taler for hurtigt.

Mere tydelige mål for faget - hvad er det, vi skal kunne? Mere udpensling af, hvad I forventer af os.

Jeg er klar over, at det er for vores skyld, at vi kan aflevere eksamen på dansk, og det sætter jeg pris på. Men vi lærer alle fagudtrykkene på engelsk, og alle afleveringer er på engelsk, så det er ikke en optimal brugbar løsning.

Jeg savner mindre kompliceret pensum, så det ikke gør så meget, at udbyttet fra forelæsningserne er så lavt. Også fordi EU er ekstremt kompliceret.

Bedre forbindelse mellem holdtimer og forelæsning.

Latterligt, at danske forelæsere snakker på engelsk til os. Især på holdtiden (hvor vi havde dansk underviser). Det skaber en unødvendig distance og reducerer udbyttet af timerne.

Generelt føler jeg mig MEGET usikker på, hvad der forventes af os, hvor meget vi skal kunne om EU, traktater osv. Det hjælper ikke at lave et skema og bare minutløst gennemgå det på forelæsningen.

Det har til tider også været vanskeligt at få fundet holdtimeteksterne. Enten fordi, at sidetal eller årstal ikke passer, eller fordi, at der fejlagtigt står, at de skal hentes fra AU.

Jeg foreslår, at de danske forelæsere underviser på dansk, hvis dette er muligt

Jeg synes, at man måske skulle flytte nogen af teksterne fra holdtimerne til forelæsningen, da jeg synes, at de tekster ofte har været sværere at forstå end de tekster, vi har til forelæsningen.

Kig lidt på de andre fag. Man må simpelthen bare kunne låne en skabelon fra et andet fag/nogle andre undervisere.

Ideen om, at kurset skal foregå på engelsk og specielt at instruktør-undervisningen (med dansk instruktør) skal foregå på engelsk virker kunstigt og meningsløst! Udbyttet af undervisningen bliver langt mindre!

Desuden er der flere af underviserne, specielt de dansktalende, som har et kludret og svært-at-forstå engelsk.

Derudover er valget af tekster til forelæsning og holdtimer til tider meget svære og indforstået. Det ville give mere mening, at bruge flere introducerende tekster. (selv instruktør måtte flere gange bekende, at han/hun også havde meget store vanskeligheder ved at forstå tekster.)

En bedre pensum liste, se evt. hvordan de laver den i almen. Det gør det meget mere overskueligt at læse når pensum listen ikke er så rodet. Mere udførlige ugesedler med mere præcise spørgsmål - selvom det sikkert er tænkt som en del af øvelsen at lære at forstå ugesedlerne, så er stoffet så svært tilgængeligt at det bliver unødigt svært. Skriv hvad vi skal fokusere på i teksterne, hvilken tekst der passer til hvilket spørgsmål og hvilke teorier vi forventes at inddrage. Vi



## Students

har ofte brugt 1 time - 1,5 på et spørgsmål der blev gennemgået med to korte pointer på holdtiden, hvilket er frustrerende. Generelt set giver det ikke mening at have et så svært fag på engelsk, det er uoverskueligt, svært og hindrer både forståelse og deltagelse. Særligt er det fjollet når nu vi må skrive eksamen på dansk...

At gøre faget, forelæserne mere interessante, aktuelle. Der har fra min egen side været en kæmpe mangel på motivation i dette kursus. Hvorfor/hvordan skal jeg bruge dette - har især været besværligt at finde ud af.

Det skal gøres mere klart fra start, hvad der forventes at vi skal lære af hele faget. Rasmus Bruun skal aldrig forelæse på engelsk igen - alle forelæsninger med ham har været 100% uden udbytte, da han taler så lavt, at man ikke kan høre noget. Så må de danske forelæsere undervise på dansk. Det andet giver ikke mening.

Helene er rigtig god, men stoffet er stadig virkelig svært.

Det er derudover ikke fair, at nogle hold undervises af forelæserne, mens andre hold undervises af PhD-studerende, der aldrig har undervist før, og som ikke deltager på forelæserne. Derfor mener jeg at hele undervisningsformatet bør nytænkes, eller at alle undervises af forelæsere.

The course should be put into a PS context. Tell the students how it is connected to other PS courses. This will provide the students with an overview and an understanding of the course's place in the bachelor in general.

Furthermore, no STRUCTURE for written assignments has been provided. This stands in vast contrast to courses such as KP or "almen" where the structure is central element in the classes.

Rasmus Brun skal øve sig på sit sprog - enormt svært at forstå.

Vær opmærksom på de problemer der kan være med udenlandske instruktører (De er enormt dygtige, men mangler måske en forståelse af hvordan man får mest ud af en holdtime).

Vær opmærksom på at pensum kan være meget svært. Sværhedsgraden i nogle af de juridiske tekster specielt har været meget svær. Kan nogle gange gøre det meget svært at applicere teorier på ting man ikke rigtig forstår, og så ender det med at fokus bliver på blot at forstå teksterne.

Jeg synes simpelthen at EU-delen har været alt for svær. Man kan nævne forelæseren om juridical politics in the EU som et eksempel på, hvor lidt forelæserne sætter sig ind i de studerendes forudsætninger for at kunne begå sig på det niveau. Som 4. semester-studerende på statskundskab har man ikke haft kendskab til jura eller forvaltning overhovedet og alligevel blev forelæseren kørt som om man var inde i begrebsapparatet. Det synes jeg er ærgerligt. Derudover er der flere af forelæserne, der er dårlige formidlere. Man bør arbejde seriøst med, hvordan man formidler et fag som PI, hvor der er mange svære systemer og institutioner at holde styr på. Det kan systematiseres bedre og så bør man gøre sig mere umage med at sætte instruktørerne ind i stoffet. Nogle gange kan man føle, at man spilder sin tid og andre gange kan det være rigtig interessant. Der er plads til forbedring overordnet set, selvom jeg synes, at nogle af delelementerne i kurset fungerer fint. jf. min kommentar ovenfor.

jeg synes det er en skam at det er på engelsk. Det gør, at jeg aldrig får den forståelse af stoffet som jeg kunne have fået, hvis forelæsninger og holdtimer var på dansk. Og især det, at skriveøvelser har været på engelsk har gjort det endnu sværere.

Jeg forstår godt jeres "dannelses"-argument, men det resulterer også bare i, at min viden om EU, FN og NATO er langt fra så optimal som hvis undervisningen var på dansk. Det er jeg personligt ret ked af.

Forelæserne gør mig ofte mere forvirret og frustreret over faget.

Sproget er svært at forstå, og det bliver ikke gjort lettere af, at nogle undervisere taler lavt, utydeligt eller for hurtigt.

Derudover savner jeg mere vejledning på dansk, og mere diskuterende ugeseddelsspørgsmål, som i højere grad er forberedelse til eksamen.

Et forslag til forbedring kunne være, at udarbejde spørgsmål til forelæsningssteksterne, så man fik et fokus for læsningen.

Derudover er pensumlisten meget besværlig - udarbejd gerne én, i stedet for at man skal lede i et dokument.

It do not work very well, that teachers with danish as their first language do the lectures in english.

It has in some of the lectures not been clear which points that were most important to understand.

Anthony has been doing a great job!! - both in lectures as well as classes.

It should be more clear, how the exam will be done and what is expected of us. A lot of the stuff on lectures and readings have been quite factual, but I guess we are supposed to be able to discuss more to the exam? - there should be a clearer connection then!

Hele konceptet med at det skal foregå på engelsk virker ikke efter hensigten.

Først og fremmest fordi, flere af de undervisere der ikke har engelsk som modersmål er decideret vanskelige at forstå. Særligt Rasmus Bruun, har jeg ikke kunnet forstå. Deres engelsk er fint, men de taler så mumlende og uforståeligt, at det går ud over det faglige udbytte. Mit råd er, at dem der taler dansk, de forelæser på dansk. Alle andre gør det på engelsk.

Til den første forelæsning blev det begrundet med at "det skal forberede os til erhvervslivet". Vi er på 4. semester. Vi skal

## Students

nok nå at arbejde på engelsk senere. Ideen er god, men når forelæserne ikke kan artikulere tilstrækkeligt på engelsk til at de kan tale en forelæsningsal op mister det sit formål og skader mere end det gavner.

Derudover er det ikke klart for mig, hvordan vi skal gå til eksamen. Meget af pensum er empirisk materiale, hvorimod i alle andre fag er der et mere teoretisk fokus. Er det meningen at vi skal kunne redegøre for fx EU's interne strukturer by heart, eller er der et andet formål med det? Et empirisk fokus kan være godt nok, men det er ikke klart, hvordan det skal bruges til eksamen. Et råd ville have været at starte semestret med at vise mulige eksamensspørgsmål, måske endda en god besvarelse fra året før og bruge det som introduktion til, hvordan faget er tænkt i forhold til eksamen.

Jeg synes mange af forelæsningerne har været svære at følge med i. Desværre har en del af forelæserne haft tendens til at enten at komme til at snakke meget hurtigt eller mumle, og når det så foregår på engelsk, så bliver det hurtigt svært at få det hele med. Det skal måske tænkes lidt over formidlingen på forelæsningerne.

Samtidigt synes jeg også, at en del af pensum, særligt til holdtimerne omkring EU, har været svære at læse og dermed meget svære at arbejde med. Det kunne være fordelagtigt at vælge nogle mere indbydende tekster!

Premissen bag faget er at Institutions matter, og det føler jeg ikke at jeg har fået særlig meget at vide om. Lige nu er det mere bare "institutions exist". Jeg kunne godt tænke mig hvis der var mere fokus på hvordan det påvirker at have institutionerne og betydningen af dem.

Desuden ville det være rart med en ide om hvordan eksamen kommer til at fungere, for på nuværende tidspunkt er jeg helt blank.

Helt konkret savner jeg en begrundelse for, hvorfor kurset ikke bare hedder EU.

Det er nok det mest åndssvage kursus at have på engelsk. Hvis der skal være et engelsk kursus, hvad så med IP eller komparativ.

God ide at lægge faget så sent på bachelor, hvis det havde været noget af det første var jeg out of here.

Spænd more time on the things that are difficult and less time on the rest.

Det vil være en stor fordel, hvis der var mere fokus på, hvad der var det mest relevante stof, og hvordan vi evt. kunne anvende det i en skriftlig opgave.

Anthony var rigtig dygtig, men kan med fordel samle lidt mindre op. Resten af forelæserne var af svingende kvalitet.

Især ham med tysk baggrund kan med fordel fokusere på at sige sine pointer i en sætning - og gerne gentage dem en ekstra gang, da det kan være lidt svært at fange pointen pga. accenten, hvilket han selvfølgelig ikke kan gøre for.

At man havde en bedre kursusbeskrivelse, dvs. rød tråd. Forståelsen af, hvordan de forskellige emner hang sammen. Savnede at instruktorerne havde en klarere ide om, hvordan opgaver/skriveøvelser skal struktureres. Hvilke ting er vigtigst at komme ind på?

Dernæst at de var mere inde i stoffet de underviste i. Emnerne virkede svære og komplicerede og spørgsmålsformuleringerne var uklare både for instruktoren og de studerende

Jeg synes ikke der har været særlig god overensstemmelse mellem forelæsningsstekster, forelæsning og holdtime - vi har overhovedet ikke (som de i de andre fag) brugt meget af det, som vi har fået præsenteret på forelæsningen i de efterfølgende holdtimer.

Jeg er helt med på ideen om, at vi skal have noget undervisning på engelsk og at vi selv skal tale engelsk på holdtimerne, men jeg synes det er rigtigt ærgeligt, at det bliver på bekostning af hvor meget vi kan lære. Det er vigtigt et vigtigt fag, men jeg synes ofte forelæserne har været uforståelige eller ikke har gået nok i dybden med stoffet - noget som jeg tror kunne løses, hvis man havde faget på dansk.

Klarere struktur på forløbet. Elementer spiller ikke godt op ad hinanden. Klarere svar fra instruktorer på uklarheder i pensum eller på ugesedlerne - fortæl os, hvis man siger noget forkert!

En forbedring til kurset kunne være enten at det foregik på dansk eller også at forelæserne var mere klar over, at når de snakker hurtigt og lavt på engelsk, så er det en del svære at få fat i de vigtigste pointer. Derudover så blev den første del af kurset meget presset, og der var alt for meget man skulle have styr på, på alt for kort tid - især taget i betragtning af at stoffet er ret svært at forstå og at faget var helt nyt.

Teksterne især holdtime-teksternes størrelse må MEGET gerne revurderes, fordi det er ofte meget lange og svære, og når det så er på engelsk, at undervisningen foregår, så er det ofte svært at få afklaret evt. spørgsmål eller forståelsesproblemer med holdtime-teksten.

Det går ofte til forelæsningerne meget hurtigt (med undtagelse af Athony Kevins), hvilket gør det svært i og med, da man ikke kan følge med og ej heller skrive noter undervejs.

Udbyttet af faget havde nok været langt større hvis det var på dansk!!!

## Students

Det er et problem, at undervisningen altid skal være på engelsk, fordi det kan være svært at høre hvad der bliver sagt på forelæsningserne. Det er naturligvis fint at de undervisere der ikke taler dansk, taler engelsk, men derudover gør det udbyttet markant dårligere.

Stoffet er svært. Det er værd at genoverveje, om tilvalgsstuderende kan følge dette kursus, fordi vi har haft ganske lidt samfundsfag tidligere.

Forelæsningserne med Finke ville være rart at flere af de væsentlige pointer står på slidesene, især når hans sætninger bliver for lange og forvirrende.

Holdtimerne kunne godt foregå på dansk, for at være sikker på, at alle har forstået pointerne og kan bidrage på holdtimerne noget mere.

Forelæsningserne på engelsk er fint (selvom det kan være udforderende), men hvis pointerne bliver skrevet på slidenes og sætningerne ikke bliver for lange, så kan det gå.

Most of the lectures in Søauditoriet have been badly organized and the communication has been bad as well. The greatest problem was to understand the lectures. The English that has been spoken has been very unclear and with a lot of mumbling.

Undervisning kunne været lidt mere spændende og måske burde det blive bedre koordineret mellem holdundervisning og forelesning. Jeg føler stadig ikke jeg ved hvad jeg skal kunne til eksamen, så savner et mere klar eksamenvejledning.

Find forelæsere der er dygtigere til at tale et tydeligt engelsk.

Drop holdtimer til engelsk, det virker overflødigt når man ikke behøver skrive selve opgaven på engelsk (isæt da det ikke giver ekstra credit)

Mere dynamisk undervisning hvor holdtimer og forelesning (+tekster til begge) knyttes mere sammen.

Særligt ringe har det været med engelsk. HVORFOR er dette fag på engelsk? Jeg har forståelse for at vi har et vidst antal fag som skal være på engelsk, men det kunne da sagtens være IP i stedet for, det ville da give mere mening. Jeg synes i fremtiden at fagets praktiske og meget tekniske form med mange begreber af institutioner gør det oplagt at netop dette fag skal være på dansk.

Læringsmålene er noget uklare i faget. Ved cirka halvdelen af alle forelæsningserne har jeg tænkt ved mig selv, at det overordnede fokus/mål med ugens emne var forvirrende eller uklart.

Der mangler en rød tråd. Især EU-kurset virker lidt ustruktureret.

Man er på bar bund i forhold til eksamen og de analysestrategier, som virker hensigtsmæssig - det virker enormt uklart, hvad man kan komme ud for og hvordan man skal løse opgaverne bedst muligt.

Det er svært at vurdere, hvor meget man har fået ud af at arbejde med de forskellige institutioner - den første blok virkede lidt som om, at man skød lidt i blinde.

Der har været stor forvirring omkring forelæsningserne - mange gange har det været svært at følge med grundet forvirrende slides og forelæsere, som dels snakkede meget hurtigt, men også var svære at forstå.

I would prefer it if we focused on some aspects of EU and really got to understand the mechanisms and look at different theories regarding this aspect - in stead of getting a little bit of knowledge on many different aspects on the EU. All of the lectures are mainly about facts and procedures in the EU, which is really difficult to remember, when we don't get to work that much with the topic.

The EU is complicated and to be honest I still lack an overview.

Also the professors sometimes mumbles. It would be nice if the key point could be (even more) pointed out :)

– Helt generelt mangler kurset struktur og overblik. Der mangler et direkte link mellem undervisningen og eksamen.

- Pensumlisterne er struktureret meget besværligt (se evt. hvordan de er lavet i Almen).

- Desuden mangler der ofte sammenhæng mellem pensum og det, der bliver gennemgået på forelæsningsen. Ofte bliver pensum gennemgået meget overfladisk, upræcist og ofte utydeligt. Jeg har flere gange oplevet, at jeg har læst pensum grundigt hjemmefra og forstået stoffet. Efter forelæsningsen er jeg efterfølgende blevet forvirret.

Forelæsningserne med især Daniel Finke har skabt uklarheder omkring begrebsdefinitioner og teoretiske forklaringer.

Jeg savner en bedre indføring i, hvordan man besvarer en opgave på en god måde i dette fag.

Jeg synes det er en fejl at køre dette kursus på engelsk - det er kompliceret nok i forvejen, og det har hæmmet læringen, at man også skulle forholde sig til et andet sprog på holdundervisningen. Det har betydeligt reduceret mit holds engagement på holdtimerne, set i forhold til de andre holdtimer vi har.



## Students

Forelæsningerne har været utroligt "tunge", i sær forelæsning 1, 2 og 6.

Få mere struktur mellem forelæsninger og holdtimer. Man har ofte gået fra forelæsningen med flere spg. end da man læste artiklerne og pesumet til den specifikke forelæsning. De eneste forelæsninger man virkelig fik noget ud af var hos Helene (er ikke helt sikker, at det er det hun hedder), men hun var faktisk okay. Instruktoren virker ikke helt til at have en klar struktur. Må desværre indrømme at meget kan forbedres.

Do it in danish instead - especially the danish teachers. It is difficult to even understand and hear what you are saying. Speak clear and load. (Rasmus Bruun Pedersen, Helene and Finke)

There aren't any clear structure - the course is just a mix of international relations and EU, which does not make much sense. moreover its it quite difficult subjects to understand and especially in english. The lecture of the juridical politics in EU had a lot of difficult juridical terms and I had no clue what that meant.

PHD student might not be the righth teachers and it is unfair that some classes has Anthony.

I also miss clear guidance for analytic tolls or how to write a assignment. the trial exam and other written exam is good practice, but not much good without clear evaluation

Jeg synes overordnet forløbet i Politiske Institutioner har været meget spændende - og svært. Jeg er klar over, at på bacheloren skal have et fag på engelsk, men man kunne måske overveje om dette fag bedst egner sig til at være på engelsk, når det omhandler fx tekniske procedurer i lovgivningen.

for improvements: better sight for what the exam demands in line with empirical and theroetical knowledge

I think the perspective of institutions have been interesting. Despite the interesting stuff, I think the lesson in general have been hard to follow. The perspective in politisk institutioner is difficult because most of it is brand new, for mine position. A better introduction and maybe place it in perspective would be an suggestion. However, the theme: institutions have been great. Good luck >>

The International Organization-bloc was good, but it tended to have quite an overlap with the class of International Politik. That seems like a bit of a waste. Furthermore, some times the classes (especially on the EU) could be very descriptive of how the different things work, but not really understanding how/putting it into an analytical frame.

The EU block was so dry and descriptive, that is was almost impossible to understand/remeber. Maybe this could be revised.

Jeg har savnet struktur, forventningsafstemning, bedre forelæsere. Det kan også være en ide til fremtiden, at danske forelæsere taler dansk. Pensum har virket stort og mange tekster har været svære at forstå, og samtidig at forstå hvad vi skulle bruge dem til. De ikke-dansk talende forelæsere er samtidig svære at forstå. Jeg har simpelthen svært ved at se, hvordan udbyttet af dette fag kan være særlig stort med den måde det bliver udfoldet på.

Det er demotiverende og ikke formålstjenesteligt, at vi skal trækkes med folk som er ok til engelsk, men så heller ikke mere end det --> dette gælder ISÆR holdtimerne, hvor udbyttet har været utilstrækkeligt, bla. fordi det er foregået på engelsk. Desuden forstår jeg ikke idéen med at have forskere fra instituttet, som IKKE er EU-eksperter. Såfremt I ikke ændrer det til forskere med speciale i EU og institutioner, så ansæt i stedet ældre studerende som i andre fag. Opsummerende; undervisning og forelæsninger på modersmål + instruktorer, som er dygtige til EU/institutioner

Der mangler sammenhæng mellem forelæsninger og holdtimer

Jeg forstår ikke hvorfor Helene og Rasmus skal forelæse på engelsk, når alle i rummet har dansk som førstesprog - derimod giver det mening, når man trækker på ikke-dansktalende forskere

1) Det er for svært for tilvalgsstuderende, når vi ikke har nogen forudsætninger overhovedet

2) Jeg har virkelig ikke fået noget ud af forelæsningerne - tværtimod har jeg følt mig mere forvirret end efter bare at have læst pensum. En stor del af dette skyldes, at underviserne har været tvunget til at tale engelsk, hvilket bare medfører mumlen og dårlig mikrofonteknik. Det er simpelthen druknet, hvad de har sagt.

3) Vi har brug for flere øvelser i løbet af semestret. Jeg aner ikke, hvad der forventes af mig til eksamen - også fordi vores instruktors feedback på den ene skriveøvelse var meget anderledes, end det notat, som underviserne havde sendt ud

4) Pensum er svært. Det ville være mere brugbart, hvis mere af forelæsningen gik med at gennemgå teksterne i stedet for at inddrage nyt materiale.

Det er vildt svært at forstå, hvad forelæserne siger - ikke fordi det er på engelsk, men fordi flere af dem mumler på engelsk, udtaler ord forkert, snakker et mærkeligt dansk-engelsk, bare har en mærkelig udtale generelt. Her var Anthony klart lettest at forstå!

Jeg kan (stadig) ikke se det logiske i, at de danske undervisere skal forelæse på engelsk - specielt når ingen af de andre engelske forelæsere er til stede under forelæsningerne. For mig har denne undervisningsform givet mig et minimalt udbytte; ikke fordi, at de danske undervisere ikke er dygtige - men fordi de har været dårlige til at formidle

## Students

stoffet til os på en forståelig måde. Der har været mange svære engelske ord og lange sætninger, når de har forelæst, hvilket har gjort det mildest talt umuligt for mig at skrive noter. Dette har været meget frustrerende og har også medvirket til, at jeg ikke føler, at jeg har fået et særligt stort udbytte af kurset. Derudover har mange af pensumteksterne været meget lange og svære - og mængden af pensum til holdtimerne synes jeg ikke har stemt overens med, hvor meget tid vi har haft til at gennemgå dem på holdtiden.

Når man bliver præsenteret for så mange nye sagsforhold i form af aktører organisation etc, så kan det være en god idé at gentage og gøre det meget klart hvad der er hvad, før man går i gang med teorier. Det gælder særligt på forelæsningerne. Måske endda sige eksplicit, når man skal kunne huske et særligt sagsforhold.

Forbedre ugesedlerne!! Spørgsmålene er tit svære at forstå og kan misforstås. Hav flere under spørgsmål, så man forstår, hvad I gerne vil have fat i. Skriv det i undervisningsplanen, hvis der er meget bilagsmateriale til ugesedlerne - så kan man nå at forberede sig til læsegruppe. Læs teksterne inden I skriver spørgsmålene.

Nogle af teksterne er alt for svære. fx. den første tekst om institutionalisme, teksten om amerikansk regeringsdannelse (Coleman 1999). Selvom vi anvender RI, SI og HI i mange holdtimer er der stadig mange, inklusiv mig selv, der ikke har begreberne under huden, fordi den første tekst om det, var så svær.

Synes generelt 4. semester har været rigtig rigtig travlt. Både politiske institutioner og international politik er ret svære fag med svært pensum, og jeg føler ikke der har været tid til at komme i dybden med nogen af de to fag. Teksterne i begge fag tager lang tid at læse og forstå. - jeg føler ikke, jeg har kunnet nå det.

Har manglet hjælp til, hvordan jeg forbereder mig til eksamen. Selvom vi har haft en prøve eksamen i læsegrupper, har jeg stadig kun en ringe fornemmelse af, hvad eksamen går ud på. Jeg er i tvivl, om jeg skal kunne alt det super-svære deskriptive om EU (fx. ECJ) udenad.

EU-blokken er utrolig teknisk - være mere skarpe på, hvad der vigtig at vi skal kunne - og hvordan det skal bruges. Og hvordan det f.eks. kan blive spurgt ind til til eksamen.

Forelæsning 6 - kæmpe overlap med international politik.

Lav spørgsmål til forelæsningspensum i stedet for alt det brødtekst fra undervisningsplanen.

Rasmus Bruun er svær at forstå på engelsk - arbejde med stemmeføring. Evt. sammen med en stemmecoach.

STOP skjult pensum på ugesedlen. Hvis der er bilagsmateriale på ugesedlen så skriv det i pensumlisten eller fortæl det på forelæsning, så man har en chance for at forberede sig til læsegruppearbejde.

Oversat liste over EU organer på dansk. Jeg ved f.eks. ikke om ministerrådet er Council eller European Council.

Den kommenterede læseplan er virkelig god og godt struktureret, denne struktur kommer dog ikke til udtryk i selve faget, og det har været svært at finde ud af, hvad det egentlig udbytte af faget skal være. Forelæsningerne har ikke været gode! De fleste af forelæserne har meget svært ved at formidle stoffet og er dårlige til at motivere de studerende. Derudover er snakker nogle forelæsere (læs specielt Rasmus Brun) meget hurtigt. Han er i forvejen ikke til at forstå på dansk og det bliver kun være på engelsk, og udbyttet af hans forelæsninger rammer bunden. Den eneste der formår at snakke i et ordentligt tempo er Anthony, og hans forelæsninger er klart dem med det største udbytte.

Som studerende synes jeg, dette fag har været meget ustruktureret sammenlignet med de andre fag, og mit udbytte har været minimalt. Det har ikke været klart hvad formålet og målet har været.

There should be more individual and group assignment, where we are turning in a paper and get comments on it. Because there have only been very few (and they were really difficult), and that makes it hard to psychical write a paper where we use the theory, because we haven't really learnt how.

try to make the notes on the power point as simple in language as possible, because sometimes they are difficult to understand even when you hear what the teacher is elaborate the sentence.

All teachers have to talk slow and clear, so we have the time to make notes and so that we understand what is being said (wich can be difficult if there is mumbling or talking low in voice)

It is a good idea to have more "summing up/summary" though out the lectures, because it makes it clear what was the most important parts of the lecture - Daniel have them and that is good.

There is a lack of "focus" on the exam though the semester. in that way that it is unclear what we are going to end up making in the exam, normally we can look at old exam questions, but that we can't here, so it is difficult to no what we are going to make in the exam, therefor making it hard for us to know how we should focus though the semester.

Forelæserne har været absurd dårlige primært grundet sprogudfordringer - de mumler, læser op eller har så stærk dialekt at det gør det næsten uforståeligt. Dog med Anthony som undtagelse, han er dygtig til at tale langsomt og tydeliggøre vigtige pointer! Overordnet har jeg virkelig savnet at gå fra en forelæsning med forståelse og nysgerrighed i det introducerede emne....

Det er rigtig godt med skriveøvelse, dog kunne der med fordel være individuelle skriveøvelser og så har jeg savnet en

## Students

mere omfattende feed-back fra instruktoren, kommentarerne har været meget ufyldstgørende...

Pensum består af nogen utrolig kompliceret og indforstået tekster. Bogen Hix og Høyland er utrolig teknisk og jeg er fortsat i tvivl om, hvorvidt vi skal have en så teknisk forståelse af EU.

Find nogle nye forelæsere, på nær Anthony han var som sagt rigtig god!

Giv de danske forelæsere nogle engelsk kurser, hvis forelæserne absolut skal foregå på engelsk!

### STRUKTUR!

Det er absolut ikke en fordel at faget er på engelsk, da stoffet i forvejen er svært nok på dansk.

Forelæserne har generelt været elendige. Især Rasmus, Daniel og Helene snakker ikke særlig tydeligt og for hurtigt, så det er nærmest umuligt at følge med i forelæserne. Derudover skinner det tydeligt igennem når det er danskere (eller tyskere) der snakker engelsk, hvilket gør det endnu sværere at forstå.

Jeg må indrømme, at mens jeg har gået på dette studie, har jeg aldrig oplevet at skulle lave en så dårlig evaluering til et fag. Så der er en hel del jeg har savnet! Først og fremmest noget struktur og forventningsafstemning. Både mig og mine medstuderende er stadig ikke helt klar over, hvad der forventes af os til eksamen. Jeg synes også det er dårligt, at vi ingen individuelle prøveeksamener har haft - og at den vi så havde ikke måtte afleveres på dansk, når dette jo er tilladt til selve eksamen. Som sagt er jeg ked af at denne negative evaluering må falde - men jeg synes virkelig at burde fag burde revurderes.

Honestly we have learned what could have been learned in about three weeks. It should be included in another course.

Lecturers need to focus more on their articulation, since it is already a challenge to understand the lectures in english (although lecturers have been mindful of this), but sometimes mumbling and lack of attention to the articulation has been the main challenge for the learning outcome of the lectures.

I think it would have been nice to have more guidance to how to apply theories before attending the class, so the preparation would have give a greater outcome as well. In general, I think it has been hard to feel fully prepared for classes, because it has been hard to figure out exactly what we were supposed to do in the questions. Maybe this could be overcome by more application during the lectures or some sort of hints for the application on the question sheet?

Jeg synes, kursuset har budt på en for snæver tilgang til, hvilket aktører der er i EU-politik og hvad EU-udenrigspolitik indebærer.

EU-politik er notorisk kendt for at være påvirket af store virksomheders lobbyisme på EU-niveau. Hvorfor har vi så ikke haft bare en enkelt uge om lobbyisters effekt på de forskellige institutioner i EU? Hvilket adgangskanaler i EU-systemet de bruger? Hvordan lobbyismen kan være med til at skabe demokratisk underskud, fordi det "frie" marked er styret lobbyismens beskyttelse af virksomheder på bekostning af mennesker og natur? Måske en uge under overskriften "EU and the business of business?". Det kan jeg næsten ikke forstille mig, der ikke er studier om?

Fokusset på vestlige lande og EU-medfører også, at man i faget mangler blik for, hvilke konsekvenser EU har for de tredje verdenslande, der bliver holdt uden for "fri"handlen i EU. Forsvinder denne tematik i tomrummet ml. IP og PI?

Emnet feltet har også været for snævret, når det har handlet om EUs udenrigspolitiske ageren. Hvorfor har vi stort set kun beskæftiget os med handelspolitik, når det har handlet om EU som en global aktør? Hvorfor ikke klimapolitik, der potentielt fører menneskeheden ud i store katastrofer?

I mine øjne fører denne snævre afgrænsning af faget til politisk ladede udeladelser. Dette opstår måske i forsøget på at neutralisere eller videnskabeliggøre studiet i EU, men resultatet er i mine øjne, at man kommer til at reproducere den politiske orden som EU er bygget op om uden at forholde sig kritisk til den.

dårligt at nogen bliver undervist af forelæsere på holdtiden, mens andre ikke gør!

Efter min mening kunne de tre institutionalismer og teorierne om EU godt fylde lidt mere af pensum. Vi har brugt meget tid på at anvende de samme teorier i forskellige sammenhænge, men det er svært, når man kun har et ret overfladisk kendskab til teorierne.

Forelæsning 6 og 7 virker til at være meget relevante, men de står ret løsrevet fra resten af forløbet. Det ville være bedre, hvis de teoretiske perspektiver herfra blev inddraget mere senere i forløbet.

Jeg har stadig svært ved at forklare, hvad en institution er. Det afspejler nok, at det er svært at finde ud af, hvad faget egentlig handler om.

En klar struktur - en rød tråd, der samlede kursets formål.

	Responses					Response	
	(A)Enig	(A)Overvejende enig	(H)Hverken- eller	(U)Overvejende uenig	(U)Uenig	Antal	Gns. score
Holdunderviseren/Instruktoren var god til at forklare stoffet	71.4 %	19.0 %	4.7 %	4.7 %	.	21	4.6
Holdunderviseren/Instruktoren gjorde sig umage for at forstå, hvor vi kunne have vanskeligheder med	52.3 %	33.3 %	9.5 %	4.7 %	.	21	4.3
Holdunderviseren/Instruktoren var god til at give os råd om, hvordan man bedst muligt arbejder med stoffet og løser opgaver	57.1 %	28.5 %	4.7 %	4.7 %	4.7 %	21	4.3
Instruktorens/holdunderviserens formidling_ Instruktoren/holdunderviseren var god til at strukturere relevante læringsaktiviteter	33.3 %	28.5 %	28.5 %	.	9.5 %	21	3.8

### Translation

- 1) The instructor was good at explaining the course content
- 2) The instructor made an effort to understand where we were having difficulties
- 3) The instructor was good at giving advice on how best to apply the course content and solve problems
- 4) The instructors/tutorial leaders were good at structuring relevant learning activities

Response Range: Agree / Predominantly agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Predominantly disagree

NB: Antal = number of students, and Gns. score = average response. Student comments follow on the next page.

**Q14\_Uddyb evt. dine svar vedrørende instruktør/holdundervisningen her**

our instructor was amazing (Anthony), but the course is very difficult to understand and the assignments each week was difficult to understand.

Anthony's teaching have been quite beneficial - it has been a pleasure to follow his courses.

Anthony is really good at teaching. He is good at taking the hard stuff down to a level where we understand it. His notes on the board is good, very structured and simple.

Anthony som instruktør er den eneste grund til at jeg har fået bare en lille smule ud af faget, da han har været virkelig god til at strukturere holdtiden og formidle stoffet, så det var letforståeligt

Anthony is great, he is really good :)

Anthony definitely made this course much easier to grasp. The overall purpose hasn't been clear to me but still I understood much more after a holdtime than from the forelæsning.

Anthony er en meget kompetent og pædagogisk holdunderviser, der er god til at formidle stoffet på en forståelig måde.

Holdtimerne har været der, hvor jeg faktisk har lært noget, da Anthony er en god underviser med forståelse for, at stoffet kan være svært. Anthony har reddet mit udbytte af faget.

Hold 7: Vores holdtimer med Anthony føler jeg er det eneste tidspunkt, hvor jeg faktisk har fået et ordenligt udbytte af faget!

Anthony did an excellent job turning something very complex into something we could understand. He was patient and understood where we might have difficulties.

Instruktøren, Anthony, har været utrolig dygtig til at undervise og sikre, at man har fået forståelse for det basale i pensum. Han har virkelig formået at udvælge det mest relevante og sørget for at gøre det så enkelt som muligt, så man har virkelig fået noget ud af holdundervisningen.

	Responses				Response	
	(A)Enig	(A)Overvejende enig	(H)Hverken- eller	(U)Overvejende uenig	Antal	Gns. score
Holdunderviseren/Instruktoren var god til at forklare stoffet	75.0 %	25.0 %	.	.	12	4.8
Holdunderviseren/Instruktoren gjorde sig umage for at forstå, hvor vi kunne have vanskeligheder med	75.0 %	25.0 %	.	.	12	4.8
Holdunderviseren/Instruktoren var god til at give os råd om, hvordan man bedst muligt arbejder med stoffet og løser opgaver	50.0 %	33.3 %	8.3 %	8.3 %	12	4.3
Instruktorens/holdunderviserens formidling_Instruktor/holdunderviseren var god til at strukturere relevante læringsaktiviteter	33.3 %	33.3 %	25.0 %	8.3 %	12	3.9

### Translation

- 1) The instructor was good at explaining the course content
- 2) The instructor made an effort to understand where we were having difficulties
- 3) The instructor was good at giving advice on how best to apply the course content and solve problems
- 4) The instructors/tutorial leaders were good at structuring relevant learning activities

Response Range: Agree / Predominantly agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Predominantly disagree

NB: Antal = number of students, and Gns. score = average response. Student comments follow on the next page.

**Q14\_Uddyb evt. dine svar vedrørende instruktør/holdundervisningen her**

God struktur, let at følge med, masser af mulighed for at stille spørgsmål.

Anthony has been both very patient and attentive to the challenges we have met during our preparations for the classes. He has been very good at communicating difficult material in a way that ends up seeming so simple.

Good job Anthony.

Well structured, excellent time management - always time to ask questions and have receive a complete answer. He's good at following up on questions, especially if it's a complex question and requires a small bit of research before answered.

Anthony: Very good at interacting with students! Good at understanding what is difficult for us and very good at explaining things simply.

	Responses			Response	
	(A)Enig	(A)Overvejende enig	(H)Hverken- eller	Antal	Gns. score
Holdunderviseren/Instruktoren var god til at forklare stoffet	86.6 %	6.6 %	6.6 %	15	4.8
Holdunderviseren/Instruktoren gjorde sig umage for at forstå, hvor vi kunne have vanskeligheder med	73.3 %	13.3 %	13.3 %	15	4.6
Holdunderviseren/Instruktoren var god til at give os råd om, hvordan man bedst muligt arbejder med stoffet og løser opgaver	86.6 %	6.6 %	6.6 %	15	4.8
Instruktores/holdunderviserens formidling_Instruktoeren/holdunderviseren var god til at strukturere relevante læringsaktiviteter	66.6 %	26.6 %	6.6 %	15	4.6

### Translation

- 1) The instructor was good at explaining the course content
- 2) The instructor made an effort to understand where we were having difficulties
- 3)The instructor was good at giving advice on how best to apply the course content and solve problems
- 4) The instructors/tutorial leaders were good at structuring relevant learning activities

Response Range: Agree / Predominantly agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Predominantly disagree

NB: Antal = number of students, and Gns. score = average response. Student comments follow on the next page.



**Q14\_Uddyb evt. dine svar vedrørende instruktør/holdundervisningen her**

Anthony have been really great. He explains things so everyone can understand it and he makes sure there's an atmosphere in which everyone can participate and ask all kind of questions (even though our English isn't that good).

Our teacher did an excellent job incorporating what the students in the class has to say without fishing for one specific answer. This creates a good learning environment where people want to participate. He also has a good sense of when the class is onboard and when students are failing behind or not understanding what is going on.

Anthony Kevins (class 9). He was:- Very engaged and knowledgeable - Very good at creating a space in which the students feel comfortable participating- Very good at incorporating the students' answers in the class rooms discussions in a way that makes the students feel they have something smart to offer. This certainly makes class room discussions more enjoyable and it makes more students participate. - Very open to different answers and having an ease in finding the relevance of these- Crea

Anthony was our instructor, and he was very good. Even though it was often very difficult, he was able to take out the important pointers so we would get the basics of the topic and walk out of the class with a sense of having understood something. He was very, very good!

Anthony was amazing.All the other lectures have been some of the worst I have had so far. It seems so forced to have danes speak english!

Anthony var en rigtig god instruktør og forelæser. Han kunne forenkle det ret svære stof og havde tålmodighed når vi ikke forstod det.

very good

Det har bare været super godt på holdtimerne, hvor der har været mulighed for at få afklaret alt det svære både undervejs i timen, men også i pausen. Anthony har virkelig formået at få forklaret tingene på en måde så de har været til at forstå - altså med gode eksempler osv.