

Course report for the Faculty of Education and Society at Malmö University

Course name:

“Research Methodologies and Research Design”

Background information

- Semester: HT23
- Ladok code: HP706E-L3357
- Number of registered students: 3
- Number of students who responded to the summative course evaluation: 3

Implementation	Mark with an X
The previous course report is communicated in connection with the start of the course	
Early dialogue on expectations for the course	X
Formative course evaluation	X
Summative course evaluation	X
Feedback to students	X

Forms of evaluation

Formative dialogue during the course and summative evaluation in Reflex.

Summary of the students' summative course evaluation

Question 1: To what extent do you consider you have achieved the learning objectives of the course?

3 of 3 (100%)	has to a very large extent (level 6)
0 of 3 (0%)	has to a large extent (level 5)
0 of 3 (0%)	has to some extent (level 4)
0 of 3 (0%)	has not to some extent (level 3)
0 of 3 (0%)	has to a small extent (level 2)
0 of 3 (0%)	has to a very small extent (level 1)

Mean: 6,0
Standard deviation: 0,0

Question 2: To what extent do you think that the working methods / learning activities on the course have reinforced your learning and your ability to achieve the learning objectives?

1 of 3 (33%)	has to a very large extent (level 6)
1 of 3 (33%)	has to a large extent (level 5)
1 of 3 (33%)	has to some extent (level 4)
0 of 3 (0%)	has not to some extent (level 3)
0 of 3 (0%)	has to a small extent (level 2)
0 of 3 (0%)	has to a very small extent (level 1)

Mean: 5,0
Standard deviation: 1,0

Question 3: To what extent do you consider that the types of examination on the course gave you the opportunity to show how well you had achieved the learning goals?

2 of 3 (67%)	has to a very large extent (level 6)
1 of 3 (33%)	has to a large extent (level 5)
0 of 3 (0%)	has to some extent (level 4)
0 of 3 (0%)	has not to some extent (level 3)
0 of 3 (0%)	has to a small extent (level 2)
0 of 3 (0%)	has to a very small extent (level 1)

Mean: 5,7
Standard deviation: 0,6

Question 4: To what extent do you consider that the course as a whole has met your expectations?

1 of 3 (33%)	has to a very large extent (level 6)
2 of 3 (67%)	has to a large extent (level 5)
0 of 3 (0%)	has to some extent (level 4)
0 of 3 (0%)	has not to some extent (level 3)
0 of 3 (0%)	has to a small extent (level 2)
0 of 3 (0%)	has to a very small extent (level 1)

Mean: 5,3
Standard deviation: 0,6

Question 5: To what extent has the course given you the opportunity to take responsibility for your own learning?

3 of 3 (100%)	has to a very large extent (level 6)
0 of 3 (0%)	has to a large extent (level 5)
0 of 3 (0%)	has to some extent (level 4)
0 of 3 (0%)	has not to some extent (level 3)
0 of 3 (0%)	has to a small extent (level 2)
0 of 3 (0%)	has to a very small extent (level 1)

Mean: 6,0
Standard deviation: 0,0

Other noteworthy perspectives from formative and summative course evaluation

- The participants appreciated the time given to discussing and critically evaluating the progress of the small empirical study that they were developing.
- Brenda Padilla's lectures on quantitative and qualitative methodology was highly appreciated.
- One issue was with one of the participants now having the necessary equipment to participate in online learning. The participant could not have the camera on, and the microphone was not working properly. This made it difficult to engage in a critical dialogue.
- The participants appreciated that the small empirical study that they were expected to do during the course could be seen as a pre-study before writing their thesis.

Analysis

Overall, the course design worked. The participants got ample time to develop a small empirical study, and they received instruction on how to develop their study. They also appreciated that the teacher had time set aside to supervise their work personally if they needed help in any way.

One issue that the students had was that they had a hard time finding people to fill out a questionnaire or that allowed them to be interviewed.

During the course, the ethical concerns with using a particular methodological approach were not addressed adequately. It mostly came down to the participants reading about it in the course literature.

Action plan

The course design works well. In future courses, the ethical concerns when doing empirical studies should be highlighted more.

Proposed revisions to the course syllabus

The course literature should be changed to Louis Cohen, Lawrence Manion, & Keith Morrison (2017) *Research Methods in Education*. Routledge.