



DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
CENTRE FOR EUROPEAN STUDIES

1 March 2022

To: The University of Bergen, Faculty of Social Sciences
From: Linda Berg, University of Gothenburg

Programme evaluation report, Bachelor programme in European Studies (BASV-EUR) 2022

1) Background Information

This evaluation report covers the year 2021 of the Bachelor programme in European Studies (BASV-EUR), specifically focusing on the European Studies courses and the overall structure of the programme. It is the fourth and final report within the four-year evaluation assignment. The department of Comparative Politics has provided the following mandate for the report: *«det skal være en oppsummering av de siste tre år. I tillegg ønsker vi at du spesielt legger vekt på hva vi som institutt har lært, og brakt med oss videre fra korona-semesterne i 2020 og 2021»*.

Due to continued travel restrictions, there was no physical visit to Bergen, but several interviews have been conducted via Zoom, in addition to written statements, email conversation and documentation provided by the Department of Comparative Politics. The interview with the Director of Studies, Kjetil Evjen, took place the 9 February 2022. Between 15-17 February I interviewed four students: one at the first year of the programme (Edward Rønning Tennøy), two at the second year (Myriam Lazrek and Henrik Heimly Steinnes, both studying the specialisation in comparative politics), and one student who is currently a master's student in comparative politics, but a previous bachelor student of the European Studies programme (Endre Rudi). Study administrator Kristen Steiner has been very helpful in arranging the student interviews as well as providing statistics and other documentation. For the specific European studies courses, Kjetil Evjen is also the course convenor of the introductory course EUR101, and we talked about this course as well during the interview 9 February. In addition, I have also had email communications with the course instructors for the EUR103 course, Ines Prodöhl (Department of Archaeology, History, Cultural Studies and Religion), and the EUR105 course, Raimondas Ibenskas (Department of Comparative Politics). Both of them have provided me with extensive answers to my questions, and written reflections regarding the developments of their respective courses, including the variation in campus, online and hybrid forms of teaching.

2) Evaluation of the study programme

The Bachelor programme in European Studies is administrated by the Department of Comparative Politics at the University of Bergen since 2012. It was previously, before 2012, organised by the Department of Archaeology, History, Culture and Religion. The program is based on cooperation between these two departments, with a focus on two academic subjects; comparative politics and history.

Programme learning outcomes

The learning outcomes for the European Studies programme as a whole (see appendix) are divided in three categories: knowledge, skills, and general competence. The overall reflection is that the learning outcomes are adequate and clear. The knowledge learning outcomes for the programme reflect the expected outcomes of the individual courses. This means that some outcomes are for all students, whereas others are only for either of the two specializations. Albeit clear in connection to the specific courses, it also means that the list of outcomes is rather long. It might be worth considering reformulating the outcomes to capture the overall intended outcomes in a less detailed manner. Especially as in this way, the programme outcomes must be updated any time the courses' learning outcomes change (e.g. the current third programme outcome needs to be updated, as the EUR103 has changed, with less emphasis on demography).

Programme structure and cohesion

After the first year of European studies courses, the students can choose to specialize in either discipline. In the third year they have an exchange semester in the autumn, followed by the spring semester with courses in the chosen discipline, including the bachelor thesis.

Table 1 Structure of the European Studies Bachelor programme (BASV-EUR), 3 years

	Year 1	Year 2		Year 3	
Autumn	EXPHIL-SVEKS Examen filosoficum-skuleeksamen, 10 p <i>eller</i> EXPHIL-SVSEM Examen filosoficum – seminarmodell, 10 p EUR101 Innføring i europeisk historie og politikk, 10 p SAMPOL103 Faglege tilnæringsmåtar og ideologiar i studiet av politikk, 10 p	Samanlikn pol SAMPOL115 Democracy and Democratization, 15 p MET102 Samfunnsvitskapleg metode, 15 p	Historia HIS101 Oversyn over eldre historie til 1750, 15 p HIS113/114 Fordjuping i eldre historie, 15 p	Utveksling (exchange semester)	
Spring	EUR103 Europa etter 1945: Ressursar, demografi, økonomi, 15 p EUR105 European Union Institutions, Politics, and Policies (Jean Monnet Academic Module), 15 p	Samanlikn pol SAMPOL105 Stats- og nasjonsbygging, 10 p SAMPOL106 Politiske institusjonar i etablerte demokrati, 10 p SAMPOL107 Politisk mobilisering, 10 p	Historia HIS102 Oversyn over nyare historie frå 1750, 15 p HIS115/116 Fordjuping i nyare historie, 15 p	Samanlikn pol SAMPOL260 Bacheloroppgave i samanliknande politikk, 10 p 2 valfrie emne på 200-nivå (å 10 p)	Historia HIS250 Bacheloroppgave i historie, 15 p HIS203 Teoriar, metodar og historiske kjelder, 15 p

As illustrated in the overview of the programme structure in Table 1, the students only study together during the first year. In the second year they follow the (much larger) courses within each chosen specialization. According to the students I have interviewed over the four years,

this is a challenge for the programme identity. There is only one more European studies semester at the programme. However, this is the exchange semester, when the students are expected to go abroad and study at another university. Doing an exchange semester is a great experience in itself, but it does not increase the programme identity. The variation over the years thus becomes quite large, depending on the interest and activities among the programme students to keep up social activities, field trips, study groups etc. which helps to preserve a sense of European studies identity in any given cohort. During the Corona pandemic, this informal way of keeping up the programme identity has of course been more difficult.

Moreover, the students have also pointed out that students who chose Comparative politics feel that they study the SAMPOL semesters in the reversed order. Although the method's course (MET102) and the democracy course (SAMPOL115) are good courses, they are also rather challenging, especially in comparison to the three courses (SAMPOL105, 106 and 107) the students study the following spring. For the students choosing history, this seems to be much less problematic, with a more logical order of the courses during their second year.

A third aspect of the programme only having one year of European studies courses, is the lack of in-depth specialisation. We have talked about a potential advanced course during my four year as an evaluator, and it was very good to hear from Kjetil Evjen that the department has developed a plan for a potential new advanced course, with a suggested name: "Current challenges in Europe: historical and political perspectives". If implemented, this course would substitute the SAMPOL115 for the students specializing in SAMPOL, thus also solving part of the problem of studying the SAMPOL courses in the reversed order. However, for students choosing history it would break up the current order of courses. My recommendation would be to substitute HIS113/114 Fordjuping i eldre historie. Even if it means less specialisation in history, these particular students have chosen the European studies programme for a reason. With such an exchange, they would still study older history (HIS101), but gain more of in-depth knowledge in European studies and further modern history perspectives.

To this point should also be added the fact that the students write their bachelor theses in either comparative politics or history. Some of the students I have interviewed have suggested that, in order to increase the programme identity, it would be nice to have "their own" subgroup of theses examination focusing on European issues, and/or discussion seminars along the way, potentially together with the students specialising in history.

Applications, admittance and fallout

There are 30 places available at the programme, which has been the same number since 2012. The admitted number of students varies somewhat over the years. Most years it has been around 30 (see Table 2). During the Corona pandemic, application rates increased for many educational programmes, e.g. the comparative politics programme. This was however not the case for the European Studies programme, which had around the same number of applicants and admitted students as previous years.

Most of the programme students chose the specialisation in comparative politics in their second year. On average over the later years, only one in ten students chose history. At this point, there is also a drop in the number of active programme students. Several students transfer to the ordinary SAMPOL programme, some already after the first semester of the European Studies programme. By the third and final year, the numbers indicate that slightly over half of the originally admitted students remain active in the programme. I would recommend following up this transfer to SAMPOL, to get a better understanding of this situation. It is clearly a different

situation to handle if it is due to students who were not admitted to SAMPOL choose European Studies as an alternative way in, or whether there is something during the first semester that leads to some students wanting to transfer. In general, I would recommend evaluating the pros and cons of the possibility to do this transfer already after one semester.

Table 2 Number of admitted students, choice of specialisation in year 2, and fallout

Start year	Students admitted y1	Specialisation y2		Active y2	% active y2	Active yr3 /current sem.	% active yr3 /current sem.
		SAMPOL	History				
2012		17	2	19			
2013	23	16	1	17	74%	7	30 %
2014	34	17	1	18	53%	17	50 %
2015	35	21	4	25	71%	19	54 %
2016	15	9	1	10	67%	8	53 %
2017	27	21	6	24	88%	17	62%
2018	30	18	5	23	76%	9	30%
2019	37	31	2	33	89%	23	62%
2020	31	17	5	22	70%		
2021	26	13*	3*	16*	61%*		

Source: Figures provided by the Department of Comparative Politics. *The cohort 2021 figures represent the situation in spring 2022, i.e. the number of students who have chosen each specialisation and remain active in the programme in the second half of their first year. As noted, the fallout is larger than previous years.

Fallout obviously happens in all programmes and courses. A typical strategy is to overbook the number of admitted students in the beginning to compensate for the predicted fallout later. In this case, the lower application rate makes such a strategy more difficult. In the interviews with students, they have remarked that the European Studies programme at UiB is not very well-known, and they have suggested some increased marketing. In the interview with Kjetil Evjen, he also mentioned that increased marketing is being considered at the department. This is something I would also recommend.

Lessons from teaching during the Corona pandemic 2020 and 2021

In the evaluation report 2021, the focus was specifically on how the university, department and programme had managed teaching during the pandemic, not least in light of the very sudden closure of the university 12 March 2020, and the lack of prevalent good tools and knowhow for remote teaching at UiB. Despite these extremely challenging preconditions, the department and the teachers of the European Studies courses performed very well. The student performances overall also seemed to be quite good, despite the challenges of remote teaching. However, from table 2, there seem to be a significant drop of active students in their third year for the cohort starting in 2018, i.e. those who did their third year in the academic year 2020/2021. In the interviews, I was informed that since exchange studies to a large extent were stopped in the autumn 2020, several students chose to delay the finalisation of their programme.

From the interviews with Kjetil, the students, and emails with course convenors, it is obvious that the overall situation has much improved during 2021. There is now a higher knowledge and experience among the teachers of how to plan and manage online teaching, as well as various forms of hybrid solutions. During the spring semester of 2021, a large share of the teaching had to be done online due to partially increased restrictions. During the autumn semester of 2021 most teaching has instead been offered physically, but to a large extent in hybrid form, with live streaming, as well as the lectures being recorded, and the films uploaded

to the student portal afterwards. This flexibility was highly appreciated by the students I talked to. All of them were themselves physically present in Bergen, and they tried to attend lectures physically as much as possible. But the flexibility allowed them the opportunity to still be able to follow the lecture if slightly ill, or to prioritize other engagements (other courses, extra work or activities) and still being able to catch up afterwards. Some also mentioned the benefit of being able to repeat the lectures before the exams.

I understood from the interview with Kjetil that the department is considering whether this form of hybrid teaching should be considered the 'new normal', and a standard for the future. After communicating with students and teachers regarding this, I think it is important to first evaluate properly the balance between the potentially positive and negative effects of such a new standard. The potentially positive effects are for example the already mentioned flexibility for the students, less risk of missing something if you are ill, or being easier to combine your studies with other engagements. However, there are also potentially negative effects. Students remark that technical issues can sometimes disturb and negatively influence the lectures, and the quality of sound and image in streaming/recording is not always that good. Students following the streamed version cannot hear questions asked in the classroom, and teachers do not always remember to repeat them, etc. These technical issues will probably be less problematic in the future. However, there are other issues worth evaluating too. Some teachers and students have noted the tendency of less good performance among the students who do not participate onsite, either in terms of grades, or not even finalising the course/assignments. It is thus important to make sure that there will not be a team A and B, where some students, and perhaps those who would mostly benefit from the teaching on campus, tend not to do so. The value of being onsite should not be underestimated, and it might be good to consider how this be made a priority for students. Another issue has to do with forms of teaching. The technical restrictions and issues of student privacy may affect the chosen method of teaching. It is in general easier with hybrid teaching to hold a classic lecture, saving the questions to the end, than to work with more interactive forms of teaching, if everything should simultaneously be streamed and filmed. Finally, there is of course also the issue of who 'owns' the recordings, and how they can be reused or not.

3) Evaluation of different courses

In this section, I will discuss each of the three European Studies courses in more detail. The discussion will be based on information provided by course convenors of the three courses, the meeting with the student representative, and course material.

EUR 101 Innføring i europeisk historie og politikk (Introduction to European History and Politics)

The introduction course of the programme has undergone some positive changes during the last four years. In line with course evaluations, and recommendations from students and teachers, the literature list has had an overview. Some books have been exchanged to newer ones (also for the autumn of 2022) and/or to newer research articles, which seems to be a good change. The course has also a more stable teaching staff situation now compared to some years ago, and the students seem very pleased with the course, the teachers, and the content.

Another important change is the introduction already in the autumn of 2020 of a course essay (oppgave) throughout the course, which seems to have had good results, and helped to prepare the students for the final exam. This first part was followed up by the seminar leader and

counted 30% of the final grade. The final exam was a six hour take home exam and counted 70% of the final grade. The short time for the second exam was considered important to motivate the students to study regularly throughout the course and decrease the risk of plagiarism or cooperation. The overall results are positive in terms of grades, although the throughput was not as good this year, which is something to consider further.

The students I talked to stated that they liked to have the essay as a way of preparing, and they prefer the take home exam to traditional school exams. One student particularly liked the short and intense format of a six-hour exam, to be able to complete it and be done in a day rather than over the course of several days. As discussed already last year, this is a change introduced mainly because of the Corona pandemic, but which seems to work well in the course. It is also in line with some of the earlier student comments and suggestions, where they specifically asked for more of this kind of teaching/examination. The examples of exam questions I have seen also seem very suitable to the course content, exam format and the learning outcomes.

EUR 103 Europe after 1945: Transformations in European Economies and Societies

The course instructor, Ines Prodöhl, is associate professor in history. She has kindly provided me with some reflections on how the course functioned during spring 2021, including supporting material in the form of the course evaluation, as well as potential lessons from the Corona pandemic. In comparison to the year before, when the course EUR103 had to switch from physical to online teaching from one week to the other half-way through the course, the situation was better in 2021, despite still being taught only remotely. One problematic issue in 2020 was that the contact with the students was negatively affected, as most lectures were pre-recorded (as recommended then). In 2021, the student contact was much better as Ines chose to do live lectures in Zoom instead, including group discussions and quizzes, which also seems to have worked much better. Ines did not use any of her own recordings from the year before as she was also not very pleased with them. The course evaluation supports that the course seems to have worked better in 2021, with overall very good evaluations from the students. The only slightly less positive remarks concern the students own reflections of problems to concentrate and being tired of online teaching in general. Moreover, the students I talked to said that the course was good and very interesting. One student even became inspired to also take extra courses on top of their SAMPOL courses during year two of the programme.

Concerning the issue of lessons learned from the Corona pandemic, one obvious answer is thus the lack of student contact when working predominantly with recorded lectures. However, as one of the teachers of this course did, there can sometimes be a possibility to reuse the recorded lecture in a ‘flipped classroom’ style of teaching. Ines commented on this:

“I think it worked well, even though I’m not sure to which degree the students did in fact prepare beforehand. To my understanding, Rolf had recorded his lecture the year before and let the students watch them in preparation for the 2021 lecture. Then, in class, they had a rather big discussion about all the topics/issues the students were interested in.”

The point of students perhaps not watching is important, as the learning and take away from the discussion might be affected negatively for those students. However, more time to discuss the literature in seminar format is something the students I talked to wish for. Seminars would provide more support for their learning, as the course covers a lot and the reading list is extensive.

As for the examination, this course traditionally has had a school exam. Due to the Corona situation, it was changed to a take home exam. In 2020 it was still in the style of a school exam, and hence the students wrote a 6-hours exam from home. The experience was not very satisfactory to the course teachers. Hence, in 2021 they changed the style of exam to an essay style take home exam at the end of the term. The students had several days and could choose between two questions and use all course literature during the essay. This form of exam has worked very well. The students also found the exam highly relevant and felt that the format worked well to also prepare them for their future studies, including the bachelor thesis. Ines states: *“I personally prefer this kind of examination much over school-exams, but we won’t be able to keep it in the future. The reason being staff shortages and the fact that grading a home exams “costs” the institute more capacities than grading school exams.”* I think it is unfortunate not to be able to continue to have home exams when they work better for the course. My recommendation would be to try to work out if there is a way to keep the format, even if it would e.g. entail shorter answers.

In general, this course seems to work very well now. Ines has made important changes to the course and it is now more coherent in terms of the overall themes and has very well-balanced and relevant reading list. The lectures, the content and the exam are coherent. I would not recommend going back to a school exam. This important work is also reflected in the new course title, new course content description and new learning outcomes. As mentioned above, this then also affects the overall programme learning outcomes that needs to be adjusted to reflect this change.

EUR105 European Union Institutions and Politics

The course instructor for the EUR105 course, Raimondas Ibenskas, associate professor at the department of Comparative Politics, has kindly shared his impressions of the course in 2021. The course began with online teaching, but approximately half of the lectures, towards the end of the course, were delivered onsite (they were also streamed and recorded). The students seem to have appreciated the possibility to attend in-person lectures. Since only some lectures last year were delivered on Zoom, the recordings from last year were not used for teaching this year.

At the same time, turnout has been somewhat lower compared to last year. Whether this was because of more students being ill and/or fearful of infection – or rather preferring the flexibility to follow the course remotely, is not clear. It should however be noted that the lower turnout also seem to align with somewhat lower results on the course exam in 2021. Raimondas wrote:

“One variable to consider is that the exam format was changed somewhat: in 2021, students had to answer 2 out of 3 questions, while in the previous year they had to answer only one out of two questions. Two out of three questions also had a practical element embedded in them (students had to illustrate the working of the ordinary legislative procedure with a concrete example and to find information about three specific interest groups), something which students worked with during the seminars. It may be that students who did not attend the seminars did less well on these questions, even if students were encouraged to attend the seminars and were told that the exam questions may build on seminar tasks.”

This reflection illustrates the importance of carefully considering the balance between flexibility and incentives for students to participate onsite. Albeit the difference between the years could of course also reflect cohort variation in motivation. This is a reflection from Raimondas which aligns with his impression from the students work on their digital deliverables (a digital poster, audiocast, or videocast), which is a great addition to this course.

In contrast to last year, when this assignment could not be carried out as intended, the plan for 2021 was that students would be able to produce digital deliverables even if the teaching was fully online. Students received some advice in the Learning Lab session on how to produce deliverables even without having a possibility to meet. But in the end, the changed restrictions made in-person meetings among students possible. The results were satisfactory, albeit the ambition and technical quality could have been higher. Raimondas reflected over some potential explanations, including the different teaching formats and unpredictability of the changing corona regulations; the lack of in-person visit to the Learning Lab (the Zoom session was not the same and had some technical issues), or simply a somewhat less motivated cohort of students.

In 2022, the Learning Lab will provide written notes to the students as opposed to the delivery of the session, because students are considered less motivated to work on the assignment as it does not contribute towards their final grade. Raimondas suggests that a change of assessment structure in the course, giving more weight to the digital deliverable, could potentially be considered. I would recommend testing if an increased weight towards the final grade would increase the student performance, as it is very valuable learning exercise.

The students I interviewed confirmed the impressions from previous years that this is a very appreciated course. They appreciate the teachers, the lectures, and the variation in forms of teachings, seminars, and assignments. The final exam as a take home exam is an appreciated format. My impression is that this is a very well-functioning course. The various forms of assessing and supporting the students learning work well together. The examples of exam questions I have seen matches the content of the course. I do however support the idea of adding more weight of the digital deliverables towards the final grade.

4) Concluding discussion

The overall assessment of the bachelor's programme in European Studies is that this is well-functioning programme, with good courses taught by teachers who are knowledgeable, experienced, and dedicated to their topics and students. For the overall programme, my main recommendations are:

- Increase the programme marketing to raise awareness of the programme, and not least the strong research-based form of teaching (supported by additional strong international recruitments the last number of years).
- Introduce the planned new course at the second year, as it will increase programme identity, add a needed advanced course, and partly solve the issue of the current too steep transfer to the second year courses for students specialising in comparative politics.
- Consider potential ways to let the European studies students who write their bachelors' theses in comparative politics and history meet throughout the spring semester and/or have joint seminars/examination groups.
- Consider an overview of the Programme learning outcomes, with a minimum change to reflect the changes in EUR103, but even better to formulate more overarching learning outcomes for the programme at large.

Regarding the specific European studies courses, I have seen a very good development during the past four years. Some earlier points of criticisms have been addressed, and the courses seem to function very well. A few specific recommendations for the future would be to:

- Keep the (varied forms of) take home exams rather than going back to school exams, as well as the added earlier/shorter essay submissions in some of the courses.
- If possible: some additional seminars to EUR103
- Adding more weight of the digital deliverables towards the final grade in EUR105

The Corona pandemic has hit our societies hard, and not least the students who have had to study the main parts of their programme studies online. There are however some lessons and takeaways from the Corona pandemic that can be useful for the future:

- increased flexibility for students with hybrid forms of teaching, potentially as ‘the new normal’
- knowledge and accessibility of more technological tools (for students and teachers) to facilitate invitations of guest (alumni) lectures, supervision with students with long commute/abroad, increased capacity to handle illness, crises etc.
- the positive lessons learned from shifting to various forms of take-home exams (and shorter paper submissions)
- potentially new courses/modules, or parallel seminar series, to engage with students abroad and/or keep the European Studies programme identity stronger.

At the same time, however, it is also important to remember the drawbacks of remote teaching, such as students feeling tired, less motivated and finding it harder to focus (and thus learn) during online studies. It is important to not only focus on the great positive aspects of being able to offer the students maximal flexibility in the future, with hybrid forms of teaching, onsite, simultaneously online and post the recordings on the student portal afterwards. Hence, I would strongly recommend evaluating the experiences of this form of teaching in 2021/2022 before deciding if this should be ‘the new normal’ (and if so if some adjustments might be needed). In addition to more easily fixed problems of technical nature, the potential drawbacks should also be carefully considered, not least for the students in most need of support and in terms of potential negative incentives regarding forms of teaching.

Göteborg, 1 March 2022

Linda Berg

Appendix: Læringsutbytte European Studies Bachelor programme (BASV-EUR)

Ved fullført program skal kandidatane ha følgjande læringsutbytte definert i kunnskap, ferdigheiter og generell kompetanse:

Kunnskap

Kandidaten

- har skaffa seg grundig oversyn over europastudiar innanfor statsvitskap og historie.
- har tileigna seg grunnleggande kunnskap om den politiske utviklinga i Europa, føresetnadane for europeisk integrasjon og den institusjonelle utviklinga i EU.
- har skaffa seg kunnskap om utviklinga i Europa når det gjeld ressursar, demografi og økonomi og korleis institusjonar, system og prosessar har påverka europeisk historie sidan 1945
- har kjennskap til teoriar om europeisk integrasjon og utviklinga av EU frå ein mellomstatleg økonomisk fellesskap til ein overnasjonal og grunnlovsstrukturert politisk union
- kan oppdatere og utvikle kunnskapen sin om europeisk politikk og samtidshistorie ved å innhente og vurdere ny informasjon, og kjenner til forskings- og utviklingsarbeid på området
- har kjennskap til drivkreftene i stats- og nasjonsbyggingsprosessane og kva for stadium desse prosessane har gått gjennom i ulike land i Europa (spesialisering i samanliknande politikk)
- har utvikla kunnskap om vilkåra for demokratiske styreformar, faktorar som har avgjort tempoet i demokratiutviklinga og kvifor demokratiske system er ulikt utforma (spesialisering i samanliknande politikk)
- har godt oversyn over både eldre og nyare europeisk historie (spesialisering i historie)
- har tileigna seg grunnleggande kunnskap om sentrale hendingar, institusjonar, system og prosessar innanfor økonomisk, sosial og politisk historie. Kunnskapen omfattar norsk, europeisk og global referanseramme (spesialisering i historie)
- har særskilt god innsikt i nokre sentrale historiske tema, teoriar og forskingstradisjonar (spesialisering i historie)
- har god kunnskap om sentrale kjelde- og metodespørsmål i faget (spesialisering i historie)

Ferdigheiter

Kandidaten

- forstår og kan analysere europeisk politikk kritisk.
- kan vurdere statsvitskaplege og historiske problemstillingar kritisk.
- kan kritisk analysere faglitteratur, formidle kunnskap og synspunkt frå denne litteraturen, argumentere for eigne konklusjonar
- har evne til å formulere presise og relevante problemstillingar om europeisk politikk og historie, evne til å planlegge og gjennomføre analysar og utgreiingar av slike problemstillingar og evne til å justere si eiga gjennomføring av desse under rettleiing
- har opparbeidd seg kjennskap til ulike statsvitskaplege analysemåtar og fått øving i bruk av statistiske og kvalitative metodar (spesialisering i samanliknande politikk)

Generell kompetanse

Kandidaten

- evne til kritisk refleksjon kring sentrale faglege problemstillingar og respekt for vitskaplege verdiar som god kjeldebruk, presisjon og etterprøving
- har analytiske evner som gjer kandidaten i stand til å tileigne seg kunnskap ut over lærestoffet i studiet
- har evne til å formulere presise og relevante problemstillingar og til å gjennomføre analysar og utgreiingar av desse.