

## Ideas of Freedom OSL report 🗝️

### Ideas of Freedom OSL Report

Working with OSL has been an enlightening and encouraging experience, as we've gained insight into developing teaching practices and had the opportunity to take part in research. It has allowed us to forge connections with other research students, as well as to engage with students from the year below us. We are excited at the what this mode of learning might hold in store for philosophers in academia, although it may be that students and staff require greater exposure to OSL in order to appreciate how fully it may be relevant.

### Structure

We were invited to attend a meeting in which the aims of OSL were explained to use in some detail. We understand Open Space Learning to be *a performance-oriented mode of learning that encourages students to use their entire bodies to more fully explore issues and texts in relation to their disciplines*. As Philosophy and Literature students with experience of the Ideas of Freedom module, we were asked to follow the journey of the first year students taking that module.

We were tasked with documenting the OSL workshops on Monday of week 7, as well as with interviewing students before and after the event. We were given all the support we needed and asked to include core elements in our investigation, but we were encouraged to be creative and our ideas were welcomed as ways to enhance and personalise the investigation. We were also offered free tickets to accompany the Phil Lit students to see Fail Better's production of Gogol's *Diary of a Madman*.

### Students

Student	Course	Position (pre-workshop)	Position (post-workshop)
A	Philosophy	Open-minded; anticipatory	Claims views have completely changed, that now fully convinced of OSL's potential
B	Politics and Philosophy	Reserved; initially sceptical	Enjoyed, but perceived only limited application to Philosophy
C	Philosophy and Literature	Experienced the Gogol workshop in the autumn; moderately enthused	Moderately enthused
M	Philosophy	Has some experience with theatre; prepared to give the workshop a go	Considers OSL to be inferior to traditional styles of learning
J	Philosophy	A little reserved, but enjoys performance	Thinks it was great to have everyone getting involved, but would want OSL methods in conjunction with traditional lectures
Y	Philosophy	Reserved, sceptical	Felt as though 'put on the spot'

			<b>during workshop; prefers having time to give well-considered responses; staunchly against compulsory OSL in future</b>
--	--	--	---

## **Diary of a Madman**

### **Ceara:**

Jamie and I were both invited to watch Jonathan Broke on stage in the Gogol play ‘*Diary of a Madman.*’ Jonathan graduated from Warwick University having studied Philosophy and Literature so I felt it was a great opportunity for all of the current first-year Philosophy and Literature students, not to mention ourselves, to see where our degree could take us. His performance was well-thought out and very well executed. The only things on-stage were Jonathan, a desk, a chair, a few other unobtrusive props and three enclosing walls. So, though this interpretation of Gogol was minimalist, it was high-impact. I felt like I was being given a window of insight in to the world of a ‘madman.’ Although the stage was supposed to represent the personal space where one typically feels comfortable enacting their most private thoughts and feelings, Jonathan’s repetitive actions made it seem like he was not in any way carrying out the act of living. His mind seemed trapped in a different space to his body.

At the end of the play we were allowed a question and answer session with Jonathan who gave us an idea of what it is like to perform such a dramatic character. He described the difficulty in portraying a personality so far displaced from his own and the process of embodying the estranged mentality of a madman. Some of the students questioned whether Jonathan had always known he wanted to be an actor and he responded that he had always had an interest in theatre which had encouraged him to apply for Warwick’s Philosophy and Literature course. Encouragingly he told the students that theatre is a career open to anyone with the interest and enthusiasm to pursue it.

Having watched *Diary of a Madman* performed I felt that the students who had also attended the play may understand the aims of the OSL Ideas of Freedom workshop a little clearer than those who hadn’t.

### **Jamie:**

While I agree with much of what Ceara has said, I felt that the second half of the performance – the disembodied heads – was an intriguing and comparatively underrated aspect of the evening. It was a technical performance, one that I found emotionally and conceptually challenging due to its disturbing fixation on words and phrases out-of-context. It was a highly experimental piece, exploring the delivery and textures of words; that said it was by no means superior to *Diary of a Madman*, which was executed with flare and absorbed the audience into the narrator’s obsessive, deluded world. However, I felt *Heads* provided scope for reverie and free interpretation, an interesting contrast with Jonathan’s tight performance in the previous piece. I, like Ceara, believe those who attended the play must have understood the workshop better, because both pieces showed how texts can be explored, rendered philosophically engaging through physical

performance, and the *Heads* piece in particular was almost deconstructive in its isolation and continuous reworking of utterances.

## **Pre-Workshop Interviews**

### **Ceara:**

A week before the Ideas of Freedom workshop Jamie and I both held a group interview with six students. Four were pure Philosophy students, one studied Philosophy and Literature and the last was a Politics student who was taking Ideas of Freedom as an outside module. The interview proved to be extremely productive resulting in a range of engaging responses.

We began the interviews with the intention of understanding what these students felt studying Philosophy involved. Refreshingly none of them regarded it as a subject that just regurgitates ancient Philosophical theories. They all agreed that it was a subject which had its foundations in *questioning* accepted doctrines and *exploring* new perspectives. These kinds of responses were exactly what Jamie and I had hoped to hear because it enabled us to present OSL as an excellent way of studying this conception of Philosophy.

Furthermore, when asked if studying Philosophy at University had changed their ideas of what Philosophy is, the almost unanimous response was that they had so far felt quite rushed and exam-directed in their learning. Philosophy had become an act of memorising particular theories and left little time for creative thought. Unfortunately the realistic situation is that we all study at University primarily to pass at degree level and in order to do this we must be taught methods that enable us to perform well in exams. Open-Space Learning though is a brilliant example of teaching methods that fulfil the academic requirements of the Philosophy course but still allow students to explore creatively.

This we explained to the students, but they did not seem fully convinced that OSL methods would be able communicate the vast amount of information that lectures cover.

One of the Philosophy students expressed the thought that OSL could perhaps be very useful in helping to '*remember specific texts, but may not be so useful in learning all the information we're given in lectures.*' So, though, he was able to recognise that OSL was not a pointless exercise, he was still speculative that this form of teaching could be as successful as the current forms.

The other two males in the group similarly felt that OSL may not be the most effective way of learning and yet no one was averse to giving OSL a chance.

### **Jamie:**

To expand on a particular concern, I noted manifestly different attitudes between the male and female students respectively: the girls were generally more open-minded with regards to trying new methods of learning; the boys' attitudes were unanimously reserved, and they were more vocal about their scepticism. If further research is conducted in future, it would be worth

studying the associations that students forge between performance and gender; whether utilising the body is considered by any student as a challenge to masculinity; whether girls are less uninhibited in trying new activities, or whether there is any correlation between perception of the feminine as body-oriented, and the masculine as mind-oriented. I doubt whether many of these “prejudices” would be maintained overtly, but it would be interesting to quantitatively explore the level of threat that students experienced when posed with the prospect of compulsory performance. Student Y was to confess in the post-workshop questions that he strongly disliked being ‘*put on the spot*’, and I would like to know whether this is linked to a desire/need to be seen, as a male intellectual, to be competent, especially in the context of academic peers/competitors, in a mixed group.

## **Documenting the Workshops**

### **Jamie:**

There were three workshops; I was able to attend all three. Ceara and I participated in the first of these so that we had insight into the OSL experience. The second I documented by myself, taking notes on the general structure of the workshop as well as any interesting observations. Then Ceara took notes on the last one and, once we were confident that the students were comfortable in their milieu, I tactfully filmed some of their activities and responses.

Students were challenged as soon as they entered the space. They entered a dim-lighted room with a video playing on the far wall. It was a version of Beckett’s *Not I*, the camera fixated, close-up, on the speaker’s mouth, which gaped, gnashed and intermittently shot spittle-projectiles at its unseen audience. For my part, I had never seen a mouth form such ghastly shapes and, when combined with the fragmented text and rapid delivery of the performer, it was altogether an unexpectedly disconcerting start to the session.

Accordingly, after allowing the audience to watch the mouth, transfixed, for several minutes, Johnny introduced himself, assured them that he would *not* be doing anything frightening with him, and asked them to write their responses to the footage on a white board entitled: ‘Beckett’. Adjectives used included: ‘freaked’, ‘uncomfortable’, ‘intimidated’, ‘uneasy’, ‘unsettled’, and ‘hypnotised’.

Next, students read five aesthetic statements scattered on the floor, and were asked to gravitate towards the one that most grabbed their attention. Johnny encouraged them to discuss with one another the reasons behind their respective choices, and gave them a few minutes before they were asked to feed back to the group. It was refreshing to see tutors actively engaging in the activities alongside their students; I felt this was useful to the tutors’ understanding of the OSL experience, and was important in breaking down antagonistic pupil-tutor divides that, ultimately, are counter-productive and discouraging, especially in this type of learning.

Johnny listened attentively to the ideas put forward by each contributor, and made explicit links between the contributions, the aesthetic statements, and philosophy. He drew attention to Beckett’s endless cycle of repetition and remaking of the same material; suggested that actors are most convincing when they stop acting, thereby calling into question identity and performance;

and, ultimately, initially quiet discussion gave way to smiling faces and laughter. The bodies and voices of the students were increasingly engaged by the succession of activities, as Johnny challenged their basic notions about social conventions and textual meaning.

In one memorable exercise, Johnny asked students to speak aloud for several minutes on a topic of their choice. They first had to do this at intensity 5, on a scale of 1 (monotone, reserved) to 10 (intense, passionate). He didn't give them time to get nervous and over-think the task. Instead, he briefly explained the task, counted them down, and started them off in a loud voice – a useful technique, as in all but the last workshop this helped prevent silence induced by the reluctance of individuals to be the first to speak out. The exercise was challenging, and students became aware that speaking is a performative act. Further, they were encouraged to explore ideas of freedom and constraint on what they could say and how they could say it. This was, in my view, the exercise most relevant to the Ideas of Freedom module: it constituted a beautifully clear example of how students can explore philosophical and political concepts with their voices and bodies. Even more usefully, the social awkwardness they experienced and were encouraged to overcome was a material embodiment of social pressure and constraint that, in a nice safe classroom, remains abstract. This exercise didn't tell students that they would feel pressured to perform speech-acts in view and earshot of others; it allowed them to experience it for themselves.

This and many other activities were ingeniously led by the charismatic, attentive, engaging Johnny Heron, who performed his role as guide with enthusiasm all day long. One imagines it would be difficult to match the flare with which he conducted the workshops, a potential problem to be considered by others attempting to adopt a similar role. His personality, as the students told us in the post-workshop interviews, was key to the success of the workshop; in the words of student A, 'Johnny worked.'

Lastly, it should be noted that Ceara and I had to approach documentation with sensitivity. Johnny emphasised the need to allow students to feel safe and secure in the space. Accordingly, we took a few photos in the first session, as well as recording a voluntary interview at the end; in the second session, I took notes, and interviewed a student at length (but off record) at the end; and in the third workshop, we felt the students were comfortable enough with the activities to record a few minutes of footage for later analysis.

I would like to bring attention to the student I interviewed after the second workshop. This particular lad is currently a philosophy student, but has been disillusioned with academic philosophy to the extent that he is seriously considering switching to a more 'relevant', 'practical' subject at the end of the year. He explained that he desperately wanted to engage with philosophy in the context of other subjects, rather than for its own sake in an abstract, analytic form; he suggested that the ideal format for him would have been to take a range of modules from other departments, then return to the philosophy department so as to philosophically engage with those experiences and subjects. This merging of the abstract would allow him to feel he was investing his time in a discipline relevant to his life.

On which note, this same student was present at the Forms of Identity taster session 16/03/2011, run by Nicholas Monk in conjunction with Susan Brockwell of IATL. I was immediately struck by two things: when asked his name and subject by the convenor, this student reiterated his

intention to leave philosophy; however, having attended OSL, here he was continuing to explore non-traditional modes of learning, and what's more, he asked the convenor if, in light of his intention to change subject, he would still be able to take the interdisciplinary module next year. When the convenor replied that first years would be unable to take the module for credit, the student asked if he would at least be able to audit. The convenor was unable to make a commitment, despite the student's enthusiasm. For me, it was almost poignant to see this same student continuing to explore other avenues, and to see that he had persisted in his intention to leave the philosophy department.

### **Ceara:**

The workshops were interesting to document. The first thing that became obvious when we arrived was that, though the Philosophy and Literature coordinator Eileen John had made it clear that the workshop was compulsory for all those that study Ideas of Freedom, many students had ignored this. In the first two workshops only half of the students with their names down to attend showed up. Although, surprisingly, there was a much higher turn-out in the third group. When we brought this up in our post interviews, the students assured us that this was not a reflection of people's enthusiasm towards OSL, but was actually a reflection of the usual attendance in the lectures.

I was pleasantly surprised to see in each workshop the students did appear engaged. No one refused to participate in any of Jonny's exercises and in fact many of the students seemed to be thoroughly enjoying their experience. In preparation for the workshop the students were expected to have read Beckett's short play '*Not I*' and have attended Eileen's lectures on freedom in the realm of aesthetics, with particular emphasis on Plato and Schiller.

Jonny, wisely, did not begin with individual exercises but let the students express themselves in a group situation. Each student was required to speak, but only briefly and with the support of other students in their group. An important feature of the whole workshop was that there were no chairs and no seating area. The students were always moving around the room, exploring the space and, more importantly, filling the space.

One of the most challenging exercises Jonny asked of the students was for them to speak out loud continuously for 30 seconds on a subject of their choice. There was only one false start of all three workshop when, comically, the entire room went silent and looked at Jonny bemused. On the second attempt, though, everyone began talking.

This exercise demonstrated brilliantly how OSL is not just about performing with one's body, but also performing with one's voice. In projecting their thoughts verbally each student was, perhaps unwittingly, filling the space they had been given. This idea Jonathan brought out very well in his interpretation of *Diary of a Madman*, but Beckett brought out with even more clarity in *Not I*.

Jonny was able to show the effectiveness of OSL teaching when at the end of the workshop the students all had to write a question or statement on the white-board that related to either Plato, Schiller or Beckett. This produced some fruitful results, in the first workshop someone asked:

*'We may not be free to create art, but are we free to interpret it?'* This question is central to Ideas of Freedom and the exploration of its relation to the aesthetic. Another asked: *'What is it to be heard?'* This question is also extremely relevant not only to the Beckett workshop, but also to Gogol's Diary of a Madman.

The workshop provoked some really insightful thoughts and seemed highly successful in its aim of getting the students to consider Philosophical issues in relation to a different spatial environment.

## **Post-Workshop Interviews**

### **Ceara:**

Two weeks after the workshops we then conducted a further group interview with the same students to gather an idea of whether their expectations had been met or they had been disappointed in what they had gained from the workshop.

We once again asked them if they felt any difference in their ideas of how it is possible to experience Philosophy. Most of the students did agree that they saw the benefits of this style of teaching, but that specific to Philosophy they did not see how, *'there could be any application to the metaphysical aspects of the subject.'* Interestingly, we had discussed this during the workshops and saw some potential for OSL teaching that focused on Descartes or Kant. This, however, may best be left to further consideration by future Lead Learners.

Equally all the students agreed that the space they had been left to explore did make for a much more engaging place to learn. They were constantly asked to think and speak, instead of having to listen and write. This active style of learning was indisputably a successful way of getting all the students to express an opinion about what they were studying.

However, there was a drawback which one of the Philosophy students pointed out: *'I felt the need to think of anything just so I had something to say.'* This feeling led us to think that perhaps some of the other students who participated had also felt the same and that maybe we hadn't got the most authentic reactions during the workshop because everyone was just speaking in order not to *'feel stupid.'*

On the opposite side of the spectrum, a Philosophy student who gave us his immediate reactions after the work shop said:

*'I found the session really interesting. It helped me explore the subject in a way I've never explored it before...I think there's a creative element to all disciplines and while at University it is vitally important we look in to this and this is a great way of doing it.'*

We discussed the idea with our interviewees that perhaps a more frequent exposure to this kind of workshop would allow them to feel freer and more at ease with the tasks set. Though one student was thoroughly in agreement with this, several others felt that it *'would lose its special quality if made weekly for example. It would lose its novelty'* The students felt to make the

workshops a compulsory part of the course would make it a less attractive way of learning and maybe strip it of its fun-element. This is a serious concern for OSL, as the most important challenge it has is to not lose the aspect that makes its approach to learning so unique.

What we did discover was that among all of the people we interviewed there was a strong sense that the reason the workshops had been so successful was because of Jonny Heron. His enthusiasm and genuine love in helping students learn through OSL made their experience what it was. A character like Jonny is rare and we discussed if they thought that there could be the same amount of success if current lecturers had tried to teach in such a way.

Everyone's faces were dubious. While they acknowledged a couple of lecturers that have the character they think is needed to run OSL sessions, the majority of tutors they believe have a style of teaching incompatible with the performance aspect of OSL. Though this may be true, I do not feel there is any reason why it should be any different introducing new teaching techniques to lecturers, than it is introducing new learning techniques to students. If the resources are available I think all the students, bar one, were convinced that OSL could be an equally effective way of learning.

So we did encounter both the advantages and disadvantages of the OSL way of teaching, like in any teachings methods. Overall, though, I felt like we did gain a very positive response to Jonny's workshops and a feeling that these types of sessions should be held on a more regular basis, though not in replacement of lectures.

### **Jamie:**

The broad consensus amongst the students was that they had enjoyed the workshop, but that it was a novelty. Some wanted to see OSL methods employed more regularly on the course, others less so; nobody wanted those methods to replace traditional teaching methods. There was concern as to the potentially limited application of OSL, especially with regards to abstract philosophy. Students M and Y seemed to be against the idea of regular OSL classes: M didn't find the workshop especially helpful in exploring Ideas of Freedom; Y felt more comfortable with other modes of learning. It was suggested that literature students might find such methods useful in engaging with a fictional text, but that academic philosophy required significantly more depth than an OSL workshop could provide. Johnny's handling of the sessions was unanimously praised, and we briefly discussed how much difference it makes to the quality of the learning experience, as well as the quantity of information retained, when the tutor (or in Johnny's case, "guide") delivers in a witty, engaging manner rather than a dry, convoluted one. Student A's response was by far the most positive: she would very much like to see a greater use of OSL in future, as she found it helpful in understanding the text and far more engaging than sitting in a lecture theatre.

### **Reflections**

#### **Ceara:**

The experience of being a Lead Learner has given me a fantastic new perspective on studying at University. Typically I don't consider myself someone whose forte is performance. However, having observed and furthermore participated in several OSL workshops I have definitely come to appreciate the different elements OSL provides that traditional teaching methods cannot.

More than anything I have found that the emphasis on articulating my feelings has really helped me come to better grasp my own views on aesthetics and freedom in art. Having experienced Jonny's workshops alongside my current Aesthetics module, I have been inspired to think closely about what *I* use to evaluate works of art and whether I do this freely or I am influenced by the author or external conditions. This is difficult to think of on a purely intellectual basis and so the way in which I have been asked my *feelings* about the topic so often has helped me to form much more substantial opinions.

I was highly impressed with the confidence the first-year students demonstrated in expressing their views and the way they were not scared to share their thoughts. This I found very encouraging as it becomes very easy for a Philosophy student to forget that their subject is about forming personal opinions and not just taking up the view they have been taught is least objectionable.

The student's concern that OSL workshops may lose their unique quality if they are introduced as a regular feature of their course, I think is unfounded. Like with any change the initial transition is a difficult step to make, but when embraced to the extent that it is no longer seen as an *addition*, the new thing becomes an integral part of learning. It will not lose any feature that it has currently. In fact OSL may present further benefits that will only become apparent when students become practised in such sessions. For example in feeling more and more confident speaking aloud a group could really develop some new way of thinking about a topic. The only thing, I think, that will change in making OSL more regular is an increase in the productivity of the sessions.

Having been involved in several other projects that have required me to take a leading role, I have found this experience familiar yet also very different to anything I have been a part of. One of the best things about OSL is that, whatever your role, you are always taking part in a process. In each workshop Jamie and I were given the opportunity to participate and in doing so we were given an idea of the difficulty of Jonny's exercises and were able to appreciate what was required from the students.

I have thoroughly enjoyed being a part of this project and have learnt a lot about what can be achieved when everyone is actively involved in offering thoughts and insights to the topic of study.

I would be excited to help in other areas of OSL and see the results that can be, and have been, achieved in different departments, like Chemistry, Physics and other Humanities subjects. The inventive nature of these workshops is inspiring and I hope has showed the Philosophy students of Warwick University that this form of learning is not just about communicating knowledge, but is also about motivating one to adopt the role of a Philosopher.

It is uplifting to think that we have been able to show these students that they are not primarily the receptors of information, but are the creators of new ways of thinking.

**Jamie:**

There's a problem in academia: young people congregate in tightly packed lecture halls, day dream while lecturers bombard them with a torrent of information, and then sit still for hours at a time reading books in libraries and bedrooms. This, admittedly, is part of being a student, but it gives the occupation a bad name. Traditional academia encourages a sedentary lifestyle, passive absorption of knowledge, and is often associated with the ivory tower.

Enter OSL, bandying insane concepts like: utilising one's whole body in active learning, interacting together in the classroom as producers of knowledge, engaging students consistently for an hour and a half, ensuring that every person contributes an original thought to a discussion, etc. Who would have thought it possible? Apparently it is, as I witnessed in workshop after workshop.

True, workshops running regularly would require a strong theoretical background. This is because, as the students told us and as I felt myself, the workshops are not condensed enough to cover all the relevant concepts in, say, a philosophical paper; in this sense, lectures have an edge. Hence, the students agreed that OSL might be useful in conjunction with a lecture, and presumably with the reading too, but never by itself. This is something that Nicholas Monk's interdisciplinary course looks set to address with weekly reading.

But, if certain traditionalist academics are against dividing time between traditional modes and OSL methods, they should look at the evidence: a glimpse at the footage will show a room full of students with beaming faces, each of them attending to the topic at hand. No one was on facebook, no one texted their absent mates, and no one fell asleep! From start to finish a group of nineteen year old first year undergraduates participated fully in the activity at hand. Individuals were challenged; group work was facilitated; personal views were encouraged, rather than reserved for a seminar or risk-free non-assessed essay. Students made friends with one another. There was, horror, laughter! What, laughter, in relation to philosophy? Yes, and what's more, they covered topics from aesthetics to identity, and tied the session together by referring back to thinkers they had studied in the lecture.

I plan to follow the developments of OSL and other IATL programs with interest over the rest of my time at Warwick. I believe we're witnessing part of the wider phenomenon that is the shakeup of the education system. While students face the potentially unattractive prospect of being labelled consumers rather than learners, I believe there is an increasing recognition of the need to adapt teaching methods to facilitate the new perspectives and ways of understanding implicit to generations of young people reared on mobile phones, internet, and social media. If universities want to avoid coming second to long-distance education applications, they have to show that there's more to the experience of scholarship than bending over a screen or book, and assimilating vast quantities of information.

OSL is one form in which that unique university experience might manifest itself. It offers the opportunity for genuine collaboration and creative engagement with ideas, the likes of which aren't possible by simply reading downloadable texts and chatting on forums. In terms of the humanities, this form of learning is just about the only thing that can't be turned into a video or interactive tutorial, and made available over the internet as a part-time course. OSL is also necessarily interdisciplinary, which is useful in a society that increasingly widely relies on collaboration (and dare I say it, eclecticism) rather than professorship and narrow expertise.

My time as a participant in research has been entirely worthwhile, and if my contribution has been of the slightest use, I will be happy. I do wish IATL all the best with its projects, as I get the impression that schemes like OSL are not given as much credit as they deserve. I would like to see a trial year, in which philosophy students were provided these regular workshops alongside their lectures, and then asked to write a short piece about their experiences at the end of the course. It might be interesting if they were given a philosophical topic, to be assessed half by theoretical essay and half by creative embodiment or alternative discourse. In future courses, perhaps students will be actively engaged in designing and contributing to their OSL programme: there might be competitions for proposals, or it might be part of group work in classes.

These are speculations. I look forward to OSL's future.

## **Appendix**

### **Before Questionnaire**

1. What do you feel is involved in studying Philosophy?
2. Have your feelings about Philosophy changed since starting the Course?
3. Has studying Ideas of Freedom provided you with new insights in to what freedom could mean?
4. What do you understand by OSL?
5. Have you done anything that sounds similar to this before?
6. How do you feel about this prospect? What do you expect from it?
7. Do you think this workshop will help you explore Ideas of Freedom and do you think it could be relevant to your other modules?
8. Can you see OSL as having the potential to help you develop skills traditional teaching methods could not?

9. Do you think these workshops should become a regular part of the course, if so, why?

### **After Questionnaire**

1. Have your conceptions about how it's possible to study Philosophy changed?
2. Did you have fun? Did you feel more engaged in this space than in a lecture theatre?
3. How do you feel about it now it's over?
4. Which aspect did you enjoy the most?
5. Which aspect did you feel didn't work?
6. What application do you think this activity will have on your subject? Do you see it as integral to your University study?
7. Is there anything about your subject you feel you've learnt in the workshop that you hadn't learnt from lectures? If so, what?
8. Do you anticipate any application beyond the parameters of your subject?
9. Would you like to see OSL teaching methods on your course in future and, if so, how frequently?
10. Do you think it's important you have a say on how the course is taught?