

**UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN**  
**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH PROMOTION AND DEVELOPMENT**

**MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY IN HEALTH PROMOTION**

**REPORT ON STUDENTS' EVALUATION OF HEPRO 302 : INTRODUCTION TO  
RESEARCH METHODS**

**Compiled by:**

**Ernest Darkwah & Stand Hiestand (Class Representatives, 2014 – 2016)**

**January, 2015**

## CONTENT

### A. Different approaches to research

All students were satisfied with the information presented through lectures and the textbook on the different approaches to research.

### B. Research Design

Most students were also satisfied with explanations on research design. One student however suggested that more time and lectures on quantitative designs would have been helpful as there was only one lecture on quantitative techniques. Others were also interested in the option of allowing students to be trained in both quantitative and qualitative research instead of having to select one or the other.

### C. The Creswell book

Generally, students liked Creswell. There was one suggestion that online versions of such books could be made available to students.

### D. The teaching & learning methods used

#### *i. Lectures*

Overall, students felt the lecturers for this course were effective. One student found the quantitative lecture more interesting than the qualitative

#### *ii. Annotations*

Students were fine with annotations. Comments were made that previous experiences with annotation writing in HEPRO 300 helped make annotation for this course easier.

#### *iii. Group work*

Students generally showed dissatisfaction with the group work especially regarding the grading. One student said: “The class was told that group work for this course was not PBL ⇒ were they using the rubric for PBL in assessing individual performances?”

Several students want an explanation of the differences in the marks that were given within the group. They didn’t understand the criteria for getting different marks, and they felt the criteria were not explained to them, and that the grades given were unjust.

## THE EXAM

Students were generally satisfied with the exam. Some however felt that five lines for answers were too short especially when there were some questions that called for multiple answers. Other

students also felt that the weight given the exam in the total grade mark (30%) was too small, but majority felt it was reasonable.

## **THE OUTCOME**

### **A. Knowledge**

Some students felt they had been adequately introduced to research methods. Most felt they came away with appropriate knowledge of the course.

### **B. Competencies**

Students agreed that they have acquired significant knowledge and feel able to apply such knowledge in real-life situations. One student felt the class is gradually growing into “Salutogenic Babies”.

## **STRONGEST FEATURES OF THE COURSE**

Maurice’s lectures were specifically noted as especially helpful (both action research and the first “practical” lecture). Creswell was also appreciated by many students as easy to understand and contributing to their learning. The quantitative lecturer, Robert Smith, was also valued and several students would have liked for him to lecture longer or more than once.

## **SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

The following are suggestions made by students:

- i. Opportunity should be given for students to take both quantitative and qualitative training (Or, there should be a mixed methods class offered)
- ii. There should be a considerable time break between courses. Some students complained feeling exhausted from switching from one course to another without any break in between
- iii. Robert Smith should be given more slots on the timetable to teach quantitative research

## **THE PACE OF THE COURSE:**

Everyone said the pace was just right.

## **NB:**

Students are requesting a meeting with the course officials for an explanation to the issues raised concerning the grading of the group work.