

**PERIODIC COURSE REPORT**  
**MEVIT3220 and 4220 (Media and Globalisation) - Fall 2006**

From: Responsible teacher Knut Lundby  
To: Department of Media and Communication, UiO  
Date: 14 December 2006

**THE COURSE**

This report relates to the combined BA-MA course on Media and Globalisation as it was given fall 2006. Knut Lundby and Sarah Chiumbu then replaced Tore Slaatta and Dumisani Moyo as teachers who had been in charge of the course the former years. In 2006 Lundby had the main responsibility for the lectures, Chiumbu for the seminars. However, Chiumbu also gave some lectures and Lundby chaired some seminars. There were three guest lecturers (Liesbet van Zoonen, Dag Asbjornsen and Tore Slaatta). Marius Bakke was responsible for the three excursions, to NRK, to Schibsted and to Dagbladet. See attached plans and the course web pages:

MEVIT3220: [www.uio.no/studier/emner/hf/imk/MEVIT3220/index-eng.xml](http://www.uio.no/studier/emner/hf/imk/MEVIT3220/index-eng.xml)

MEVIT4220: [www.uio.no/studier/emner/hf/imk/MEVIT4220/index-eng.xml](http://www.uio.no/studier/emner/hf/imk/MEVIT4220/index-eng.xml)

All teaching has been in English.

The course attracted a great number and a wide range of international students. They were actually in majority. When the course started there were present one or more students from some 15 countries across the globe, included China, Japan, South Korea, New Zealand, South Africa, Uganda, USA, Spain, France, Germany, Italy, Lithuania, Finland and Denmark. 46 students were initially registered for MEVIT3220 fall 2006 and 16 for MEVIT4220. By the end of the course the registered number of students for MEVIT3220 had dropped to 37 with still 16 for MEVIT4220

As there are no comparable evaluations available, this report concentrates on the course fall 2006. There is an evaluation form from 2004 with average scores from students on several dimensions. This is attached for comparison. However, the course underwent changes since 2004. International news was from 2006 left out as a topic as it is offered in as separate course. The course description changed from 2004 to 2005. It was kept for 2006.

**The course content:**

"The course focuses on the role of the media and the cultural industries in processes of globalisation. Scientific theories of global, social and cultural change vary in the way they include media and communication as part of the causes or structures that condition globalisation outcomes and processes. In the theoretical part of the course several theories are discussed (information society, network society, global flows of communication, structuration theory, time/space disjunctures). In a second part, the course focuses on the economic and technological changes within the media and cultural industries in a combined political economy and cultural studies perspective. On this basis, the course discusses the changing conditions for symbolic creativity and the production, distribution and reception of mediated communication in various cultural fields (news, film, music, audiovisual media, internet, etc)."

The **learning goals** ("Learning outcomes") for the course was kept from 2005 to 2006: The course is particularly suited for international students and gives both theoretical and methodological understandings of how media research that focuses on globalisation and globalisation processes can be conducted. Students will learn to analyse the way in which media and communication, in a wide sense, can be seen as important causes and dynamic drivers in contradicting and complex globalisation processes. The course will make students familiar with political economy perspectives and cultural studies approaches to the study of the global media and cultural industries. This will enable them to analyse and understand similarities and differences in the various cultural fields and subfields. The course work is aimed to develop the students' skills of both oral and written presentation and argumentation.

Comment: The course description as well as the learning goals is exactly the same for the BA-students and for the MA-students. The department has not yet worked out criteria for assessment of student works on the BA-level compared to the MA-level. From the master students of this course one should expect more maturity and more independent reflection than from the bachelor-students of the same course. However, written criteria from the Department would have been helpful.

## **ASSEMENTS BY THE PARTICIPANTS**

### **The students**

A one-page evaluation form (attached) was circulated among the students at the beginning of the last lecture (30 Nov 2006). Before filling in, the lecturer repeated the learning goals (cf. above) and went through the aspects that the university wants to be addressed in the student evaluation:

- Teaching start and initiation of the course
- Study information
- Lectures and seminars, curriculum
- The learning environment
- Opportunities for subject criticism
- The examination form (Home exam / Essay)
- Implementation of the student evaluation
- Your own efforts as student

The students were instructed to comment on these items only if they had anything positive ("This has been good") or negative ("This could be improved") to mention. They were told that no comment would be interpreted as fairly OK.

28 students were present at the evaluation. The number is less than the half of those who registered for the course. The attendance at lectures has usually been somewhat higher than at this last summing up lecture.

The 28 present were 7 men and 21 women. They were 5 MA-students and 23 BA-students. 18 of them were international students, 10 were Norwegians.

The overall assessment of the course fall 2006 from these 28 students along a scale from 1 to 5:

1 (poorest)	1 student
2	1 student
3	8 students
4	15 students
5 (best)	3 students

The overall mark on the course (teaching, curriculum, etc as a total) leans towards the positive side. The tendency is the same among BA as among MA students. The MAs seems a bit more positive but the number of students is low. There is no difference between Norwegian and International students in this overall assessment. One of the international master students that gave a '4' wrote when asked what could be improved"; that I "can not think of anything. I found it perfect."

A summary of their comments on the said dimensions:

- *Teaching start and initiation of the course*

Only two comments were given, both positive. Conclusion: This seems to have worked well.

- *Study information*

One of four students made a note on this. The study information on the web is well received. At one specific incident, a Norwegian student found it "very irritating!" when it was not put on the net that a seminar had been cancelled. One BA-student found that "the flow of information" in the seminars "was not always clear and precise". Conclusion: The study information was satisfactory.

- *Lectures and seminars, curriculum*

In general:

11 positive and 4 negative general comments were made, the critical comments all from BA students. A Norwegian student regretted that the advertised focus on Europe vs. Africa for lectures and seminars was not reflected in the curriculum. Another Norwegian found "that the whole course has been very unserious, and it has not met my expectations." One of the international students felt that "some discourses are too difficult for BA students. For instance, network society and information society was too complicated to understand. I would rather dispute more concrete subjects." However, the great majority gave favourable comments on the course.

The lectures:

In addition to the just mentioned Norwegian BA student, even another from the same category was outright critical: "It does not seem that the lecturers actually have so good knowledge about this topic of Media & Globalization. They have failed in providing relevant and important information through the lectures and seminars. The lectures have been very disappointing, without any clear focus. Further there has been a very weak link between what is covered in lectures and what is emphasised in the readings. The overall impression is that the teaching has been of little use in understanding and learning processes in this course." The first-mentioned very critical student did not think the lecturer usually added anything to what was in the books and would have preferred to stay home. However, to this student the lecture on the Cartoon conflict was a good exception. He

or she found the course very difficult to understand, it was difficult to grasp the “essence” of this subject of Media and Globalisation.

These two comments are exceptions. Of course, the feedback varies, but 17 of 25 comments on the lectures were positive, like these examples:

International MA student: “The methodology of lectures was very consistent and understandable (for example all lectures were followed by the discussions and practical things, it very much helped to understand theoretical background.)”

Another international MA student: “The lectures are arranged very well, and all the lecturers are very interesting and helpful!”

An international BA student: “The lectures and guest lectures have been very well structured and interesting. All of the course subjects were covered and discussed thoroughly. Discussion questions were most often very valid and thought provoking.”

Another international BA student: “Having two different teachers from different backgrounds I found to be an interesting experience. Both teachers seemed to encourage debate and discussion which is a good thing (even though the class didn’t always respond).” However, “I think too much time was spent in class on explaining the theoretical approaches. This time could have been better used to assess different country policies, have more open discussions ... etc.”

Several students on the BA level, maybe Norwegians more than international students, were missing concrete examples. Another Norwegian BA student said: “I found the lectures very good, even though ... I sometimes found it hard to understand media’s specific role in globalisation; the connection between the two. I think they too often were discussed separately.”

#### The seminars:

The use of excursions and films on media cases were well received as part of the seminar programmes. Three of the Norwegian students expressed very positive evaluation of the seminars, although the Norwegians could be very critical on what they must have perceived as misuse of their time, when they “received or handed in assignments and then could leave”. Among the international students there were quite many (7-8) that wanted more structured seminars, covering more topics, examples and feedback.

One international BA-student specifically pointed out that “there should have been an attempt to develop oral presentation skills. Although this is stated in the course goals, and presentations were planned in the syllabus, we were never given an opportunity to present individually or in groups. I think the students would have benefited from this.”

#### The curriculum:

Two of the international students commented that the course required too many expensive books. One of them wrote: “There were way too many books that needed to be purchased for this course. I, of course, did not buy all of them, which means I didn’t read as much out of the course as I could and may be under-prepared for the exam.

To quite a number there was a lot of reading. One Norwegian BA student did lack a clearer view of what’s most important; how to use the curriculum. Another from the same category said: “Too big curriculum and too few definite answers. I feel I’ve only learned what is being researched but not really got a better understanding of the world.” However, there are others, Norwegians and

international students alike, that find the curriculum “good” or “adequate and quite interesting”. 15 students commented upon the curriculum, 5 positive and 10 critical comments.

Conclusion on teaching and curriculum:

The student’s assessments vary a lot. One should strive for more examples in the lectures and for more structure in the seminars. An even more coherent list of set readings, could be in a compendium, may help the students to buy fewer expensive books. One should strive to bring the media- and the globalisation aspects even closer in touch with each other.

• *The learning environment*

All 13 students that commented on this found the learning environment “interesting”, “good” and “comfortable”. On of the Norwegian students said that it has been a “great atmosphere in the classroom and you have really taken advantage of all the international students. Discussing with people from all over the world has been really interesting.” Conclusion: A satisfactory context. A popular initiative for a social come-together was taken by the lecturer early in the semester.

• *Opportunities for subject criticism*

An international student wrote that the learning environment “was very open and gave plenty of room for subject criticism”. Among the four that commented upon this item, there was only one more critical voice: “It’s not because we are lazy, but reading such texts is rather time-consuming, and there is little time left for critical analysing, making our own conclusions.” Conclusion: There have been sufficient opportunities for subject criticism.

• *The examination form*

The three MA students commented positively on their Essay or term paper exam. One of the international students said: “Writing a term paper provided me with an opportunity to read widely and in-depth about my topic, which made me more enlightened.” The two Norwegian BA students that commented were positive to their Home Exam, given for the first time in the Media and Globalisation course. It is “very good to have 3 day exam, you learn and repeat everything”, one of them wrote. However, international students could feel more uncomfortable. “I am a bit afraid of the home exam because I am not used to this form of examination.” Conclusion: There is no need to reconsider the exam forms at this point.

• *Implementation of the student evaluation*

There was just one comment, stating that the implementation of student evaluation has been good. Conclusion: The student assessment was meaningful with the applied one-page form.

• *Your own efforts as student*

Only two Norwegian BA students did comment. One said: “I found the curriculum hard to understand and this affected my efforts when it comes to reading by myself.” This was the student who found that in the lectures and in the curriculum media and globalisation “too often were discussed separately.” The other simply said: “My efforts as a student have been poor. I could have done more”. Conclusion: Hopefully, the low number of comments could be interpreted as a “normal” workload on this course, whatever “normal” may be.

We added a separate question on the excursions: "How useful were they for your learning outcome in this course?" First, asked how many excursions each student did take part in, the 28 answered:

None	3 students
1	6 students
2	13 students
All 3	6 students

The students that did not attend the excursions either regretted or explained that they clashed with other courses. Some of the BA-students thought that the usefulness would depend on the topic for their home exam. In general the students found the excursions useful and interesting, and concrete in relation to the curriculum. Especially the excursion to NRK got favorable comments (where there recently returned correspondent of Africa was the main host). Some also gave such positive comments on the excursion to Schibsted, fewer on the one to Dagbladet. A small number said the lectures given by the company representatives were "boring" or "self-advertising". The good excursions provided "insight". One of the international students would like more excursions, in addition to and not instead of seminars. Another would like more follow up from excursions in the seminars. A third international student did not find the excursion focus on Norway very useful as his or her interest was in transnational activities, while a fourth simply said, "Without any information about Norway's media, it would be useless to visit here".

## Teachers

Involved teachers in this and previous year's course on Media and Globalisation comment:

*Knut Lundby* (course responsible, most lectures, seminars in academic writing):

It was a privilege to teach such an international group of students. It was possible to check out general statements on media and globalisation by asking students from so many different countries how the situation were in their home context, e.g. on a globalized media product as *Big Brother* or a globally mediated conflict as the Cartoon controversy over the Prophet Muhammed. However, it is a challenge and maybe a problem that so many of the international students for this course do not have a specific background in media studies. This comes on top of the general challenge of bringing the BA and MA levels together in one course. This variety in background and presuppositions may explain quite a lot of the diversity in reactions to this course.

*Sarah Chiumbu* (main seminar responsible, lectures on selected topics):

Taking the seminars and three of the lectures was both interesting and challenging. It was interesting because of the number of international students who brought in different perspectives, but at the same time challenging because very few of them had background in media studies. The students, especially the BAs found it hard to connect the different concepts in globalisation theories to the media. I had three seminar groups (1 MA and 2 BAs). Attendance was generally good, save for the second BA seminar held on Friday between 12h15-14h00 which had very low attendance. Many students, especially from the BA group, were shy and not confident with their English and this made class discussions very difficult. An attempt was made to stick to the original timetable as much as possible. I sensed that some of the students found this too rigid. Maybe in the future there is need for flexibility and negotiation with the students in line with their expectations. The MA seminars were good and attendance was high. The term paper preparation process went very well and the students seemed satisfied with this process. However, although the students were

generally good, the main problem was that they did not read the books prescribed in the syllabus. This affected meaningful dialogue in both the seminars and lectures.

*Marius Bakke* (responsible for the three excursions):

His summary, in Norwegian, of how the excursions were organized, is attached. Marius Bakke further summarizes and comments:

I found it very interesting to arrange excursions for a large group of international and Norwegian students, to some of Norway's largest and most influential media companies.

I believe it would be a good idea to have a closer connection between the excursions and the seminars. I found it quite difficult to ensure the students came well prepared, as I have also commented in my enclosed evaluation. With no or little contact between the students and myself, the only way of prompting the students' preparation was via the course's web pages, which I suspect was not visited frequently by the students.

The companies we visited varied in level of preparation for our visit. Schibsted gave a very professional presentation of the company's international activities, certainly with quite a promotional angle, as commented by the students. The NRK gave the most "honest", reflected and perhaps the presentation that most opened up for debate. We were lucky to get a chance for a debate between Tomm Kristiansen, Gro Holm and the students, which proved very interesting.

Dagbladet.no in both visits used PowerPoint presentations that were made for other groups, one of which was in Norwegian, and thus not very well suited for an English-speaking audience.

I am certain that challenges regarding the companies to visit are difficult to solve from the IMK's side. I think the solution will be making sure that the students see the excursions as an integrated part of the course, come well prepared and provide the excursions with insightful questions and comments. In this way, the companies will see the value of taking the visits from the IMK seriously.

*Tore Slaatta* (responsible for this course the previous years, guest lecturer this fall)

I was invited to do a lecture on European public space, which I think is an interesting middle-range perspective in comparison to globalisation. There are important and interesting differences between globalisation and europeanisation; e.g. the history as a more or less collectively constructed experience, religious aspects, ancient Europe, the world wars, modernity, etc. and now the EU and the transnational aspects of governability, legitimacy, etc., the political challenge. This puts culture on the political map, and identity politics becomes important. It's a huge topic in itself, and the lecture touched upon many issues and themes. The lecture drew theoretical perspectives, arguments and concepts from literature that used to be on the curriculum in previous years, Morley/Robins, Collins, Schlesinger, but these references were no longer on the course literature, and the European perspective was not covered. This did not prevent the lecture from being a good experience, and I sensed it was well received.

The course has been changed and elaborated successively and much work has been put into the new course description. This was also used for 2005, but since the wrong webpages were put on the Internet, the course had to be structured according to the "old" information on the net. Thus, the 2005 course was a mix of old and new, and not an ideal model for this year's course. Dumisani Moyo took a larger share of the lectures in 2005. But otherwise, lectures and curriculum was mostly the same as the 2004 course and although we did not intend it, we had to keep up the African/European perspective from 2004. A lot of focus was put on the seminars and the

presenting of papers. There were structural problems with student information, problems with the differencing of bachelor and master students (they had to have separate seminars, different curriculum, separate exam, and many things had to be adapted and changed on the spot. Several students complained about the administration and problems with information. Nevertheless, we experienced important improvements with the quality of papers and presentations, particularly regarding how much difference the seminars and the two student assistants, Karoline Ihlebæk and Erlend Krogstad made.

### **Administrative staff**

Executive officer *Alexander Nilssen* had the main administrative responsibility at the department for international students:

From an administrative point of view, the Media and Globalisation course is very popular. In fact, most international students coming to our department, as well as a good number of students coming to other units at UiO, ask about permission to register for this course. As the teachers have noted, this might be a problem because it appears that few of the international students have much background in media studies. In the future, we might have to take this into account when permitting foreign students to do these courses, in order to improve the teaching. We do not get much feedback from the students on the specifics about the lectures or seminars, but the little we have received has been positive, apart from a few mentioning the steep price of books required for the course. Most of the international students seem generally happy with the course offerings and the availability of both scientific and administrative staff.

His colleague *Maren Kristine Moen* has not received any feedback from students on MEVIT3220 and MEVIT4220, either positive or negative.

### **Quantitative results:**

*Fall 2006:*

Number registered for exam: 38 students, mostly single course students and international students.

79 % of these passed the exam.

16 % did not take the exam, these were mostly single course students.

2 % students failed the course.

*Fall 2005:*

Number registered for exam: 35, which constitutes a 9 % increase in 2006.

14 % did not take the exam.

7 % failed the course.

### **Assesment of**

- *Target group/ recruitment (numbers, level, previous knowledge, programme affiliation)*

The course is attractive for international students, and it is fairly popular among Norwegian students as well. This is of course pleasant. However, many of the students in this course do not have a background in media studies. This specifically applies to the international students. On top of the need to reach the BA as well as the MA level with the same lectures, this makes it quite a challenge to build a coherent

scholarly core in this course.

- *Teaching and evaluation forms, especially in relation to the learning goals*

The teaching forms: Given the combined BA-MA context, there are no real alternatives to the joint lectures and separate seminars. Excursions are popular and help make things concrete.

Training in oral presentations, as stated in the learning goals, could be used more.

The evaluation forms with home exams for the BA students and term paper (essay) for the MA students seem to work well..

- *Frameworks: resources and infrastructure*

This seems satisfactory.

- *Report from external examiner (tilsynsinsensor(er)):* None available.

### **Concluding evaluation on the course MEVIT3220/4220 fall 2006**

#### **1. Description of and comment to possible deviations from the course plan**

There are no significant deviations from the course plan.

#### **2. Summary and comment to FS-report 754.001 with quantitative data on the course**

##### MEVIT3220

38 students, mostly single course students and international students. 79 % passed the course.

16 % did not hand in their exam; most of these were single course students.

2% failed this course.

Autumn 2005: 35 students (9% more in 2006). 14 % did not hand in the exam.

##### MEVIT4220

18 students, international and media studies. 22 % did not hand in the term paper and no students failed.

Autumn 2005: 7 students (157 % more in 2006). No fail.

### **Are there indications or examples of extraordinary good quality? How are they followed up upon?**

The course evaluation in sum leans towards the positive side, although not the extraordinary.

Please cf. the need, commented upon under “The Course” above, to develop criteria for how to distinguish between student performances on the BA compared to the MA level, as the stated learning goal is the same for both levels.

**3. Are there indications of failing quality? How are they followed up upon?**

There are no indications of really failing quality in this course. One may look further into the dropout tendency, especially among the Norwegian students. However, this may not be higher than with other courses.

**4. What has been the focus in this period re. development of quality of studies?**

Fall 2006 there has been a focus on a clear and consistent structure of relationships between lectures, seminars and excursions and on the continuous study information about this structure as well as upcoming changes. This has worked well. There were nearly zero complaints from the students.

**Proposals to improve the course**

It is advised to

- reconsider the reading list and rebuild a larger compendium of texts that bring ‘media’ and ‘globalisation’ as close in touch with each other as possible. Such a compendium could be cheaper for international students that complain about the cost of books. Core books should still be used, monographs more than anthologies. Terhi Rantanen’s book *The Media and Globalization* should be considered for the MA level as well (it is developed and used with MA students at LSE in London).
- If the listing of specific theories in the course content is kept (theories on information society, network society, global flows of communication, structuration and on time/space disjunctures); there need to be good coverage of them in the reading list. As these theories were not covered well in the books, they took up too much of the lecture time fall 2006. A better alternative is to rewrite the course content on this point.
- It seems necessary to work on the structure of the seminars, according to the feedback given by the students.

Mid term evaluation  
Course 4220/3220 Media and Globalisation

**FOR COMPARISON**

## **Autumn 2004**

Please indicate your answer as low or high on a scale from 1 to 7,  
where 1 is very low and 7 is very high

### **A. General impression of course, in terms of**

Importance and relevance for degrees in media studies at IMK, University of Oslo

7    6    5    4    3    2    1    **Average: 5,93**

---

Relevance and connection to other courses (in media studies at IMK or for combinations with  
other courses outside IMK)

7    6    5    4    3    2    1    **Average: 5,75**

---

Relevance for personal interest in following a degree in media studies at IMK

7    6    5    4    3    2    1    **Average: 5,87**

---

Other remarks about this course in relation to programs and other courses at the university

### **B. The quality of the course when it comes to**

Course description and course information from lecturers

7    6    5    4    3    2    1    **Average: 5,42**

---

Student registration and administration, student information

7    6    5    4    3    2    1    **Average: 4,06**

---

Curriculum

7    6    5    4    3    2    1    **Average: 5,53**

---

**And when it comes to lectures:**

Dumisani Moyos introductory lecture on David Held's book  
 7    6    5    4    3    2    1    **Average: 5,78**

---

Tore Slaattas introductory lecture on Hesmondhalgh's book  
 7    6    5    4    3    2    1    **Average: 5,42**

---

Tore Slaattas lecture on international news  
 7    6    5    4    3    2    1    **Average: 5,53**

---

Dumisani Moyos lecture on culture and politics  
 7    6    5    4    3    2    1    **Average: 5,30**

---

**And when it comes to seminars in general**

7    6    5    4    3    2    1    **Average: 4,80**

---

**C. How do you think the following methods for student participation has been successfully employed in this course?**

Independent reading after introductory lectures  
 7    6    5    4    3    2    1    **Average: 4,93**

---

Obligatory presentations of curriculum  
 7    6    5    4    3    2    1    **Average: 5,07**

---

Obligatory term paper proposal with deadlines  
 7    6    5    4    3    2    1    **Average: 5,46**

---

Seminar for plenary discussions of term papers  
 7    6    5    4    3    2    1    **Average: 4,73**

---

Lectures  
 7    6    5    4    3    2    1    **Average: 5,26**

---

**D. Other remarks:**

Institutt for medier og kommunikasjon/KL

3. nov 2006

Evaluering av emnet

EXFAC03-MVIT - Høst 2006 (Kommunikasjon og mediering)

**UNDERVISNINGEN** (forelesninger, seminarer m.v):

Dette har vært bra:

Dette kan forbedres:

**PENSUM:**

Dette har vært greit:

Dette har vært for vanskelig:

**SAMLET VURDERING AV OPPLEGGET FOR EMNET HØSTEN 2006:**

Gi din samlede vurdering av undervisning, pensum m.v. på en skala fra 1 til 5, der 1 er dårligst og 5 er best (sett ring rundt tallet):

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

## Lectures Media and Globalisation MEVIT3220/4220 Fall '06

The lectures were on **Thursdays 14.15–16.00** (in week 35 on Tuesday 14.15–16.00 as well)

- Wk 34: Introduction, overview**  
24 Aug *Knut Lundby*: Dimensions in the course description. Introduction to the field.
- Wk 35: Guest lectures 1-2,**  
*Liesbet van Zoonen* (University of Amsterdam and IMK)  
31 Aug (Tue) Big Brother as a glocal format  
31 Aug (Thurs) The supposed Americanization of politics
- Wk 36: Comparative perspective 1**  
7 Sept Sarah Chiumbu: Africa vs. Europe – in a political economy perspective
- Wk 37: Comparative perspective 2**  
14 Sept *Knut Lundby*: Africa vs. Europe – in a cultural studies perspective
- Wk 39: Theoretical approach 1**  
28 Sept *Knut Lundby*: Structuration theory
- Wk 40: Guest lecture 3**  
5 Oct *Dag Asbjørnsen* (Filmfondet): Film from South vs. Hollywood as cultural industry
- Wk 41: Theoretical approach 2**  
12 Oct *Knut Lundby*: Network society theory
- Wk 42: Theoretical approach 3**  
19 Oct *Sarah Chiumbu*: Information society theory
- Wk 43: Case**  
26 Oct *Knut Lundby*: The cartoon conflict
- Wk 44: Guest lecture 4**  
2 Nov *Tore Slaatta* (IMK): European public space and the media
- Wk 45: Theoretical approach 4**  
9 Nov *Knut Lundby*: Theory on time/space disjuncture
- Wk 47: Theoretical approach 5**  
23 Nov *Sarah Chiumbu*: Theory on global flows of communication
- Wk 48: Summing up**  
30 Nov *Knut Lundby*

## Seminars Media and Globalisation MEVIT3220 Fall '06

Time: Fridays 10h15 –12h00 (First Group) and 12h15 – 14h00 (Second Group)

Number of excursions - 3

<b>SEMINAR</b>	<b>Teacher</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
Seminar Week 34	Seminar 1 <i>Sarah Chiumbu</i>	Curriculum presentation
Seminar Week 35	Seminar 2 <i>Sarah Chiumbu</i>	Introduction to media and globalisation studies- major issues and themes.
Seminar Week 36	<i>Marius Bakke</i>	First excursion: NRK
Seminar Week 37	Seminar 3 <i>Knut Lundby</i>	Seminar on academic writing
Seminar Weeks 38/39	No seminar	No seminar
Seminar Week 40	<i>Marius Bakke</i>	Films on media industries
Seminar Week 41	Seminar 4 <i>Sahra Chiumbu</i>	Discussion of comparative perspectives in media and globalisation (Africa & Europe)
Seminar 42	Seminar 5 <i>Sarah Chiumbu</i>	Writing exercise. Students write a two-page report on any chosen topic
Seminar 43	Seminar 6 <i>Sarah Chiumbu</i>	Roundtable discussion on major issues/ theories discussed so far in the lecturers
Seminar Week 44	Seminar 7 <i>Sarah Chiumbu</i>	Feedback on writing exercises done in week 42
Seminar Week 45	<i>Marius Bakke</i>	Second excursion: Schibsted
Seminar Weeks 46	<i>Marius Bakke</i>	Third excursion: Dagbladet
Seminar Week 47	Seminar 8 <i>Sarah Chiumbu</i>	Presentation of case studies distributed in week 45
Seminar Week 48	Seminar 9 <i>Sarah Chiumbu</i>	Group discussions- theoretical aspects of the course
Seminar Week 49	Seminar 10 <i>Sarah Chiumbu</i>	Summing up (main themes and reminder on guides to academic writing) and discussion of logistics related to the home exam.
Week 50		Home Exam 11-14 December

## Seminars Media and Globalisation MEVIT4220 Fall '06

Time: Tuesdays 08h15-10h00

Number of excursions - 3

<b>SEMINAR</b>		<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
Seminar Week 34	Seminar 1 <i>Sarah Chiumbu</i>	Curriculum presentation and focused discussion
Seminar Week 35	Seminar 2 <i>Sarah Chiumbu</i>	Introduction to media and globalisation studies- major issues and themes.
Seminar Week 36	Seminar 3 <i>Sarah Chiumbu</i>	First presentation of term paper proposal
Seminar Week 37	<i>Marius Bakke</i>	First excursion: NRK
Seminar Weeks 38/39	No seminar	No seminar
Seminar Week 40	Seminar 4 <i>Knut Lundby</i>	Seminar on academic writing
Seminar Week 41	Seminar 5 <i>Knut Lundby</i>	Second discussion of terms papers
Seminar 42	<i>Marius Bakke</i>	Films on media industries
Seminar 43	Seminar 6 <i>Sarah Chiumbu</i>	Roundtable discussion on major issues/ theories discussed so far in the lecturers
Seminar Week 44	<i>Marius Bakke</i>	Second excursion: Dagbladet
Seminar Week 45	<i>Marius Bakke</i>	Third excursion: Schibsted
Seminar Weeks 46/47	Seminar 7-8 <i>Sarah Chiumbu</i>	Group discussions and individual tutoring on terms papers
Seminar Week 48/49	Seminar 9-10 <i>Sarah Chiumbu</i>	Final presentation of terms papers (first group week 48 and second group week 49), all students to attend both weeks
Seminar Week 50	Seminar 11 <i>Sarah Chiumbu</i>	Final submission of terms papers

## **ORGANISERING AV EKSURSJONER FOR MEVIT3220/4220 HØSTEN 2006: MEDIA AND GLOBALISATION**

v/ Marius Bakke (November 2006).

H06 besto kurset av totalt 66 oppmeldte studenter, hvorav 20 på masternivå. Det var planlagt tre ekskursjoner, i utgangspunktet for bachelor- og masterstudentene separat. Motivasjonen for denne organiseringen var at ekskursjonene skulle gjennomføres til samme tidspunkt som det vanligvis var seminarer for studentene. Datoer for besøkene ble også satt opp i planleggingen av semesteret.

I kontakten med mediebedriftene, har vi gjort følgende erfaringer: Det er fornuftig å først gå ut med et formelt brev på instituttets vegne for å oppnå den tidlige kontakten. Brevet bør rettes direkte til én person, som for eksempel en informasjonssjef el. l. Det som så har vist seg viktig er å følge raskt opp med telefonkontakt, gjerne etter noen få dager, direkte til samme person.

I kontakten med mediebedriftene er det viktig å påpeke viktigheten for instituttet å få en klar avtale på plass så raskt som mulig. Et kurs ved IMK innebærer en god del logistikk, og endringer i timeplaner viser seg tunge å organisere. En god ide kan være å ha en annen dato i seminarplanen som er satt til f. eks filmvisning, som man har en mulighet til å bytte med tenkt ekskursjon, dersom dette tvinger seg frem. Dette var et grep vi ble nødt til å ta for å kunne gjennomføre ekskursjonsplanen.

Etter som vi kom i kontakt med de aktuelle mediebedriftene viste det seg vanskelig å få til ekskursjoner akkurat på de tidspunktene vi ønsket oss. Forholdsvis raskt bestemte vi da å slå sammen BA og MA-studentene til to av tre besøk, samt å se på muligheter for forandringer i vår egen timeplan.

Det er en god ide å ha klart noen temaer instituttet kan tenke seg som aktuelle for besøkene. Både blir ekskursjonene mer interessante og pensumrelevante for studentene, og presentasjonene hos mediebedriftene blir oftere skreddersydde for kurset, og langt mindre "standard" presentasjoner. I vårt tilfelle bestemte vi oss for besøk hos tre bedrifter, men overordnede temaer for besøket: NRK – om utenriksjournalistikk, Dagbladet.no – om ny teknologi og nettmjournalistikk, og Schibsted – om internasjonalt medieieierskap. Den som arrangerer ekskursjonene bør være godt forberedt på å forklare og diskutere hva man ønsker seg av presentasjonen i kontakt med bedriftene.

I vårt tilfelle ønsket Schibsted å få tilsendt spørsmål fra studentene på forhånd. Vi organiserte det slik at studentene skulle sende spørsmålene til ekskursjonsansvarlig innen en gitt frist, før de ble sammenfattet og oversendt Schibsted. Denne måten å gjøre det på ser vi i ettertid at ikke var den beste, da svært få studenter fulgte opp. Sannsynligvis burde dette vært gjort felles på et seminar eller lignende.

Det samme gjelder studentenes grad av forberedelse generelt. Vi har hele tiden oppfordret til å møte forberedt med gode spørsmål, noe som har blitt fulgt i begrenset grad. En ide kan være å bruke fem- ti minutter på siste seminar før ekskursjon til en sammenfatning blant studentene ("hva har vi funnet ut om Schibsted?"), for å tvinge dem til å sette seg litt inn i bedriftenes virksomhetsområder på forhånd.

### **Våre kontaktpersoner:**

*NRK Utenriks:* Gunnar Myklebust, utenriksredaktør. gunnar.myklebust [at] nrk.no. Vi fikk en innledning av Tømm Kristiansen og Gro Holm, men gikk via utenriksredaktøren.

*Dagbladet.no.* Helge Øgrim, reportasjeleder. hogrim [at] gmail.no

*Schibsted:* Ane Bang Imsgard, kommunikasjonssjef. ane.imsgard [at] schibsted.no. Imsgard var behjelpelig med å organisere det aller meste, og fant frem til Robert Steen, som ga oss en interessant og fyldig presentasjon av Schibsteds internasjonale aktiviteter.