

TEACHING

The course was taught using the principles and parameters (P&P) theory within the theory of Generative Grammar (more specifically, TGG). The course literature consisted of readings from *Syntax: A Generative Introduction (3rd Edition)* by Andrew Carnie. At the beginning of the course, we discussed the theory of Generative Grammar and the various frameworks that have stemmed from this more general theory. I introduced the framework that we would be working under and began introducing how we can analyze language using the scientific method. Next, we created basic phrase structure rules (PSRs) step by step, introducing how to use these PSRs to create a simple syntax tree. After discussing the terminology regarding a tree structure, we discussed the binding theory and its syntactic restrictions, along with domination, precedence, c-command, and government. Then we moved on to X-bar theory, slowly changing our previous basic PSRs to more advanced rules using bar levels. In the end, we were left with three general parameters that could be applied to all languages. Next, we covered Theta Theory and theta grids, the four main types of movement (V-to-T movement, T-to-C movement, DP-movement, and *wh*-movement), and island constraints. Finally, we discussed empty categories, Control and Raising, ellipsis, and the evolution of the P&P framework to minimalism. I gave a brief introduction of LFG at the end of the course so that the students would understand how to apply the knowledge from this course in order to understand other linguistic frameworks. I also used exercises from the book and Carnie's workbook companion throughout each lecture.

GRADES OBTAINED

A: 2
B: 3
C: 3
D: 4
E: 3
F: 2

PRACTICAL CONDITIONS

There were no problems concerning rooms, scheduling, or access to the literature. The students also did not report any problems in these areas, or issues with mitt.uib.no.
(any problems with rooms, scheduling, access to literature, mitt.uib.no, etc.)

REACTIONS FROM STUDENTS

See the attached document for a copy of the evaluation survey completed by the students. One of their top concerns is that they would like more class time and time for completing exercises in class.

TEACHER'S COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS

The course went well in general. I had some students who were enthusiastic to participate and complete exercises outside of class time. I believe that the course would be improved with two or three smaller obligatory assignments throughout the semester. Students commented that they would have liked more time to work on more exercises and practice what they learned in the course. The addition of a few assignments outside of class will enable them to work on exercises outside of class time without having to increase the number of lecture hours.

Egenvurdering på emne- og programnivå

Emnenivå: Fylles ut av emneansvarlig

Programnivå: Fylles ut av programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)

Emne/program	LING116 Semantikk
År	2019 (Fall semester)
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Vadim Kimmelman
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	The course this year was given using a new book (Kroeger 2018), and the evaluated written assignment also was based on completely new topics. Everything went fine, although the results of the written assignment were not all very good, maybe due to the scheduling issues: too many exams are done at the same time in the fall semester.
Emne: Er emnet student- evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrapporter sist år.	No
Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok? Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/ programmet? Hvilke?	1. The students point out that one lecture a week is not an optimal amount of work, and they would be happy to also have some seminars to work on exercises. 2. The students appear to have difficulties looking for scientific sources and working with the literature. Maybe we should teach them that either separately or within this course.
Andre kommentarer eller innspill	

Egenvurdering på emne- og programnivå

Emnenivå: Fylles ut av emneansvarlig

Programnivå: Fylles ut av programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)

Emne/program	LING122 Språk og kognisjon
År	2019 (Fall semester)
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Vadim Kimmelman
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	The course was given using the textbook and the slides from the previous year, without many changes. Everything went smoothly, although attendance was variable between the weeks.
Emne: Er emnet student- evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrapporter sist år.	No
Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok? Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/ programmet? Hvilke?	1. A separate lecture on visual word recognition might be excessive. 2. It is not good to plan the last chapters for the last lecture because the exam is very close in time to the last lecture. 3. The final exam this year was too easy.
Andre kommentarer eller innspill	

Egenevaluering LOG110/111/112 V19

- studenttall

LOG110: rundt 90 studenter. Jeg er usikker på hvor mange som tok eksamen, men tipper over 70.

LOG111: Rundt 30 studenter.

LOG112: Rundt 20 studenter.

På LOG110 er det færre som møter opp til forelesninger, mens på LOG111 er det svært godt oppmøte. LOG112 er det større frafall.

- behov for endringer i emnebeskrivelsene.

Ingen umiddelbare behov. LOG112 er forholdsvis nytt, så her er det mulig jeg vil gjøre endringer etter V2020. Men jeg tror det er en fordel å kjøre det en gang til før vi vurderer det. Det er i så fall ikke snakk om store endringer.

- det faglige nivået på studentene

Helt klart tilfredsstillende, og trenden er at studentenes nivå er at studentenes ferdigheter blir bedre for hvert år. LOG110 og LOG111 har svært gode resultater, til tross for at noen studenter fortsatt opplever kursene som vanskelige. Det er svært få som stryker, og flere studenter som gjør det veldig bra. Dette skyldes muligens til dels at nivået på KOGVIT-studentene har gått opp de siste tre årene.

- er det noe som ikke fungerer tilfredsstillende (og hvordan kan dette ev. kan fikses)

Pensum på LOG112 har ikke fungert optimalt. Det skyldes mangel på passende lærebok. Her kan vi kanskje med fordel skrive en egen tekst, men dette vurderes etter hvert.

En utfordring for LOG112 er at det kommer svært tidlig i løpet for noen studenter. Det ville klart vært mer naturlig at studentene først hadde teoretisk fil, og deretter LOG112. En slik inndeling er imidlertid ikke så enkel å få til, fordi LOG112 også må gå etter LOG110.

- andre forhold av betydning for kvaliteten på emnet

...

Ole T. Hjortland