

Cognitive Control in Action (PSY4312)

Feedback report

The course consisted of seven seminars, taught by three different seminar leaders. The format was 15-20 minutes introductory lecture, followed by paper discussions within smaller student groups and then at the whole group level. The course concluded with an oral examination. Out of 12 students that took the exam, 5 responded to the feedback questionnaire.

General about the course

Students generally reported having a good academic benefit from the course. Positive comments specifically mentioned the paper discussions as being "mint" and finding the knowledge about cognitive control and executive functions "quite useful" for their field of study. However, one comment noted that the topics did not follow a clear logical sequence explained in class.

There was a general consensus that some changes are important for the course. While the core concept was viewed as great, some felt that certain articles might be outdated. Suggestions for changes included the need for more lessons to better understand the foundational aspects of the topics covered in the articles. There was also a preference expressed for more interaction, such as students presenting articles, and a desire for more learning directly from teachers rather than primarily through discussions among students, particularly given that students might be new to the topic.

Regarding the learning objectives, responses were mixed. Some felt they learned a lot, while others indicated learning less. Specific areas where students felt they did not learn as much included stable traits and relating cognitive control to higher-order cognition concepts like intelligence and creativity.

Size, curriculum and own effort

A majority of respondents felt that the workload required for the course was more than suggested by the credits (studiepoeng). Attendance was very high, with most respondents attending all the teaching sessions.

Teaching, lecturers and learning environment

A significant number of students felt there was too little teaching in the course. Several free-text comments explicitly requested more teaching and more discussion (seminars). While the initial short lecture before article work was appreciated, some felt teachers were simply reading notes instead of actively teaching. Some also found explanations after the initial part of the lesson to be few and confusing. The preference for being taught by teachers rather than focusing heavily on student discussions was reiterated here.

Benefiting from teaching yielded mixed responses. Some felt they benefited greatly, while others felt they benefited less. Comments highlighted benefiting from discussions but also felt they could have benefited more if there had been a greater amount of teaching.

The quality of teachers/lecturers was generally viewed positively, with a majority rating it favorably. Teachers were described as involved and presenting their topics well, though one comment again mentioned a teacher reading notes. However, a recurring theme was the expectation that teachers should explain more and intervene more actively in discussions, with respondents feeling that teachers were primarily providing discussion prompts rather than teaching.

Satisfaction with the framework conditions (technical conditions, classrooms, etc.) was very high among most respondents.

Concluding comments

Additional feedback was broadly positive, with students expressing enjoyment of the course. Some wished for more seminars, while others described the course as "really well made and enjoyable" and "nice and interesting", believing the knowledge gained would be useful for future projects.