

GLODE 302 – Introduction to Methodology – 10 ECTS
Overall evaluation – Autumn 2018

Learning Outcomes

Knowledge:

The student has in-depth knowledge of:

- Different knowledge paradigms and explanatory models, and their implications for choice of methodological strategy
- Key concepts and theories within quantitative and qualitative methodologies, mixed methods and action research
- Research designs in quantitative and qualitative research, including the formulation of research questions
- Ethical principles in research and their application in quantitative and qualitative research

Skills:

The student has the ability to:

- Develop research problems, argue for their relevance and identify research methods appropriate for the selected problems
- Discuss key concepts of quality in both qualitative and quantitative research
- Discuss and deal critically with basic principles of research ethics

General competence:

The student:

- Can make qualified choices between different research methods
- Can communicate and discuss different research designs and account for their respective advantages and uses
- Can evaluate critically research literature

Teaching methods

Lectures, group work, and individual and/or group feedback on the two written exercises. Not in the study plan, practical exercises on data collection and analysis, expert lectures, and review podcasts.

Compulsory assignments

Two written exercises (500 and 1000 words respectively) on topics related to the learning outcomes of the course.

Assessment

Take home exam with a word count target of 2500 words.

The course started on 30th October and ended on 14th December. The core teaching of the course included eight double lectures and ten double seminar/workshop periods¹.

Twenty students were registered for the course, however, two were GLODE students who were retaking the exam, and one GLODE student withdrew from the course after GLODE301 without removing her name from the registry. Thus, **seventeen students** attended the course sessions. Of this group, ***four students were Erasmus undergraduates***², and the other ***thirteen were from GLODE***.

The purpose of the course was to introduce students to key theories and concepts for undertaking research in the field of global development. The course progressed in the following order: Knowledge Paradigms I, Knowledge Paradigms II, Qualitative (qual) methodologies, Quantitative (quant) methodologies, Managing Quality/Mixed Methods, Ethics, and Participatory Action Research. There were seminars connected to the following lectures: Qual methodologies (2), Quant methodologies (2), Ethics, and Participatory Action Research. There were also free-standing seminars on: Writing about theory and methodology, Critical appraisal of qual research, Critical appraisal of quant

¹ Two more than last year. The course leader from last year did not remember two seminars had been added.

² Please see notes later in this document about future participation of Erasmus students.

research, and research proposal presentation skills. The teaching materials were revised and sometimes written anew to suit the lecturer's specifications. Moreover, new, more rigorous content pertaining to the development of research questions was included.

Before the course began, students responded to a brief survey about their experience of, interest in, and comfort with research methodologies. The results guided the content of the introductory lectures to ensure that all students understood the concepts required to engage with the subsequent material. Lectures were delivered in a manner that sought to break up didactic lecturing, with frequent Socratic-style engagements with the course content. Students were frequently made aware that the lectures were meant to complement their course readings, and so these Socratic discussions were means for students to synthesise their knowledge from readings/lectures, as well as allow the lecturer to check in on their progress. All the lectures delivered by the course leader were also accompanied by a 5-7 minute review podcast to allow students to self-monitor their progress.

The seminars sought to actively engage students with the material in a range of formats: fling-mediated discussions, practice and reflection on interview techniques, qual data analysis practice using dedoose, a tutorial on quant data analysis using spss, 15-minute mini lectures from qual and quant practitioners, a debate, reading and discussing articles from development journals utilising quality check lists, among others. **NOTE:** Last year's course leader had added an additional double seminar period to both the Qual and Quant topics (moving from 1 to 2 for each topic), but could not remember why. Thus, the lecturer generated a strategy fill out the seminar content for both these topics involving 4 components: a mini-lecture from a practitioner of the methodology, a data collection exercise, a data analysis exercise, and a reading/discussion exercise. The students seemed to find this balanced strategy useful and comprehensive given the short duration.

Paul Kellner (the lecturer) taught six of the lectures; and he led 9 of the seminars, but was involved in all of sessions. **Victor Chimhutu led the lecture on Ethics,** and **Maurice Mittelmark led the Participatory Action Research** lecture and seminar.

Two obligatory assignments were designed to provide a formal progress check, synthesize knowledge, and prepare the students for the final exam. One was focused on writing about epistemology and the other was about aligning a research design properly within ontology, epistemology, and methods. The lecturer provided individual feedback for all students on both assignments.

The Take Home Exam ran from 7th to 14th December and was a compare and contrast essay of 2500 words. It asked students to select one of three topics, briefly describe one qual and one quant design for studying that topic, and then spend the majority of the work comparing the relative strengths and weaknesses of these two methodological approaches. The exam question was designed to be equally difficult for students inclined towards qual or quant approaches, and interested in any topic. The exercise prompt detailed enough so that the students could focus on the purpose of the exercise – demonstrating their knowledge of the core concepts and skills from the course. In the first days of the exam, the lecturer ensured that he was online regularly to quickly field questions (about topics that could be answered). Students generally performed well, and the task also proved effective at differentiating between adequate, good, very good, and excellent performances.

Note on Erasmus students relevant to other courses: *We had four visiting Erasmus students in the course. Toril Salen requested that they join in May and sent me their transcripts. The Lecturer asked GLODE colleagues about this topic and was told that we are obliged to accept these students, so he should do so. He did. However, during the course it became clear that the goals of these students and the course may not be entirely aligned, and this misalignment might detract from both the course and these students' experiences at UiB. In short, they were undergraduate psychology majors and likely anticipated a more traditional psychology methodology course³, they had up to three other courses running at the same time as ours⁴, they were undergraduate students. This last point meant that they also were unfamiliar with academic norms expected of Masters students – citation, writing an academic essay, etc. The students themselves were lovely, did the work in a comparable way to the GLODE students, but the above mentioned misalignments were clear. Future versions of the course would benefit from more thoughtful consideration about who is included. Moreover we would prevent these misalignments by: making sure that our course descriptions include references to global development theory and practice, adjusting the title to include development more clearly, setting some prerequisites for the course, or asking the students to write a paragraph about why they are interested in **this** particular course*

Student evaluation

At the end of the course, students participated in multiple methods of evaluation – 1) a brief individual survey, and 2) a student-led, focus group style discussion. Overall, students said that the course met all learning objectives, said the assignments helped them work towards those objectives, and that they were pleased with the lecturer: **10/15 respondents (two did not attend the session) rated the course content as excellent**, and 5/15 rated it as good. **13/15 rated the teaching as excellent**, and 2/15 rated it as good. **14/15 rated the lecturer responsiveness as excellent**, and 1/15 rated it as good. Students indicated that the expectations were clear and the structure and implementation were effective.

The primary critique of the course was that it had a large amount of material and may benefit from more sessions/credits. Moreover, 2 people noted that the lecturer occasionally used complicated language that could be simplified and additional knowledge checks could be implemented (beyond at least one instance in lecture and the assignments), however, other students wrote that they found that the lecturer made a complicated topic accessible. The students almost all seminar activities, but had mixed feelings about the debate and the fling exercises.

Most students felt that a strength of the course was the teaching and the multiple modalities of learning. They particularly liked the practical exercises. The majority found the podcasts useful (this was a pilot of such an approach of the lecturer). Students also highlighted the individualised support from the lecturer to be something that they felt was a strength of the course.

Staff evaluation

Overall, the course went well. Students developed knowledge and skills from assignment to assignment, and a majority of them performed well (As/Bs) on a challenging exam.

³ The Lecturer emphasised the topic and approach of the course on the first day.

⁴ Our *Masters* students only have this course at this time, and the workload reflects this fact.

The assignments were appropriate, the lectures and seminars went well, and the students were engaged. Some specific revisions to the reading list could be made, but I can discuss this with GLODE colleagues should they want to know more.

My primary critiques for the course are structural. I agree with the students that the **schedule for this course is too full, and greater efficiency could be achieved**. One way to do this would be to restructure the course to have only the first lecture focus on knowledge paradigms and writing research questions, and infusing the additional paradigms material into the Qual/Quant lectures/seminars. With an additional lecture freed up, we could take more time on both mixed methods and quality, both of which were rushed this year, and both of which are topics that could help students synthesise the core focus of the course (research designs need to be coherent on ontological, epistemological, methodological, and methods levels).

In my opinion, the course could **benefit from additional practical engagement with methods**. Students regularly were interested in getting into detail about methods for data collection and analysis, but, due to the design of the course, we give them only a little of what they are looking for and tell them that they will more learning next semester. Additional practical engagement with methods at this stage would benefit students for several reasons: students are invigorated when they get to try methods, they can solidify their understanding of the primarily theoretical messages of the course by experiencing what they mean in practice, and they would then achieve a minimum level of competence on all aspects of writing a research design. In the exam, students struggled with writing the data collection and analysis portions of research designs, which was understandable given the amount of time devoted to these topics.

In the long term, I believe this indicates that a more **integrated approach to this methodology course and the methods courses is necessary**. For instance, by running the methodology and methods courses in direct succession might help. Or, by thinking about the two courses in a holistic way could benefit students. For instance, GLODE could move the mixed methods and participatory action research session into the spring semester, and hold them as joint sessions of the qual and quant methods courses. Students would be better prepared with the complicated nature of these discussions because they know enough about methods *and* theory to have nuanced discussions about them. This would additionally free up more space in 302 for practical experience with both qual and quant methods. Several students have indicated that they would like to study both qual and quant while at UiB, and giving them additional opportunities to work within both approaches in 302 might suit their interests *and* help to more effectively meet learning objectives.

Student evaluation GLODE 302

1. Content:

Students agree that we covered many topics, however, argue that the course time is too short.

Some of the exchange students said that other courses they took were on the same time as lectures in this course.

2. Teaching and learning methods used:

Most students expressed positive opinions about the teaching and learning methods. Students liked how we covered a lot of topics

Some said they did not like the use of Flinga, especially since the lecturer himself had technical difficulties using it.

The PowerPoints are good – maybe a bit too long as we did not have time to cover all slides every lecture? Helpful that lecturer uploaded the slides beforehand.

Mixed feeling about the debate. Maybe more people would enjoy it if we had better time to prepare? (maybe also say who is pro-con beforehand).

Everyone liked how we got written feedback on the assignments, especially the informal grading.

Should be mindful that some of the quant articles were hard to understand.

Neuman (2011) article is great.

3. The outcome

At the time of evaluation people said they felt prepared for the exam, however, during the exam, people expressed frustration on how different methods were not covered or explained. Would enjoy more focus on compare/contrast.

4. Strongest features of this course

People enjoyed how there was much variation in the literature. Good that it was not only books and chapters of books. Articles were engaging and nice to read with examples. The articles and the lectures gave much insight.

Good balance of discussions and lecturers: some wanted more discussion.

The assignments really helped the learning outcome of the students. Especially the paradigms which are difficult to grasp.

Learning by doing is a great way of acquiring knowledge.

5. Specific suggestions for improvement of the course

Students want more time between assignment 2 and the debate. They feel that all the assignments were squeezed into one period of time: overwhelming.

Some students suggested to have a compare/ contrast essay for assignment 2 (we see now that this might not be changed as that was the exam question).

If we do not have time to talk about the literature we are supposed to read, better to put that one in the recommended list (not the obligatory).

Share link of flinga

More discussion of readings.

Mixed feelings on more focus on ethics.

Some argued they wanted fewer topics, not all agreed on this.

Some said they wanted more focus on quantitative methods?

6. Strongest features of the lecturer's approach

Everyone are satisfied with the lecturer. His approach of teaching is engaging (even in a 'dry' methods-course). He gave much of himself, always helping and answering questions when needed.

People liked how he talked about his own studies, it was helpful with specific examples.

Lecturer always quick responding to emails.

After every lecture he told what material to read, in addition sent out announcements about it. Very good.

Lecturer gave many examples, often highlighted why things are important: linking it to thesis.

Students say they liked how the lecturer 'expected' them to read the articles. A motivation to actually do it. Good that he always said which ones to read and highlighted the most important ones.

Grateful for the individual support by the lecturer: sending us personally additional information. Interested in students' backgrounds and interests.

7. How lecturer can improve is teaching

Everyone were satisfied with the lecturer. Some students said that he should not be afraid to call out students to speak, some did not agree on that. Maybe there would have been more discussion that way.

Less rushing through the lectures. Fewer slides and more time for comments?

8. How was the pace of the course?

9. Design of the course

For an introduction course, good job of introducing many topics.

Some students wished for more depth on fewer topics.

10. Supplemental comments

Some students discussed how it would be nice to have an evaluation after the home exam as well. Lecturer could make a 5-10 question questionnaire and share on MittUiB, students who feel they want to contribute can do so.

Some students said they would like a mid-way evaluation.

People are very grateful for cookies and bananas.

MittUiB always said three different seminar rooms. Annoying.

11. Comments to faculty

Faculty need to be better in responding to emails. Some students sent emails months ago, still no response. All of a sudden people are on sick-leave.

Students want the option of doing both methods and specialisations for next semester.

Better communication in between faculty

GLODE302 Evaluation

Total Questions: 16

Most Correct Answers: #0

Least Correct Answers: #0

1. Did the course help you understand some concepts and theories within quantitative and qualitative methodologies?
- 15/15 A Yes
- 0/15 B No
2. Did the course help you become better at formulating research questions, and potential research designs based on those questions?
- 15/15 A Yes
- 0/15 B No
3. Did the course acquaint you with key concepts and give you skills for assessing the quality in quantitative and qualitative research?
- 15/15 A Yes
- 0/15 B No
4. Was Assignment 1 (ontology/epistemology or RQ/design) valuable to you in pursuing the goals of the course (mentioned in the first three questions)?
- 15/15 A Yes
- 0/15 B No
5. Was Assignment 2 (Design proposal) valuable to you in pursuing the goals of the course (mentioned in the first three questions)?
- 15/15 A Yes
- 0/15 B No
6. Overall, how would you rate this course?
- 10/15 A Excellent
- 5/15 B Good
- 0/15 C Poor
- 0/15 D Very poor

7. Overall, how would you rate the lecturer of this course (Paul)?

13/15 A Excellent

2/15 B Good

0/15 C Poor

0/15 D Very poor

8. How would you rate the lecturer's responsiveness to your feedback during the course?

14/15 A Excellent

1/15 B Good

0/15 C Poor

0/15 D Very poor

9. What were the strongest elements of the course in your opinion?

Anon anon026a04914a274031

The lectures, podcasts and seminars tailored it well.

Anon anon06bb2815453d4866

easy to follow

Anon anon3386e8a0ddbb40cf

Very clear descriptions of what was expected of us, and what was happening in each class and seminar. This made it easy to come prepared. Learning through other methods than just reading theory, like dedoose.

Anon anon4dc1141efa054d47

Paul followed us in every step of the process of learning, from lecture and also with the assignments. He gave us specific comments for each one and he was very available for doubts.

Anon anon58091784f1e74833

It helps you to stay focused every week on the content of this course despite I attend other courses. In fact, I think that this is the most effective way to learn a new topic.

Anon anon7d76287eff194415

The continuous feedback from lectures gave by professor

Anon anon9052150acb1f4502

the podcast and the debate

Anon anonb449f066864645cd

I struggle with all things related to science so for me a large barrier was the perceived disconnect I imagined having in this course. Paul made this course incredible accessible. I did not always understand the content but when I asked questions, Paul tried his best to formulate information in several different ways to help me understand the content. While I feel, I struggled in the course (based on my own standards and expectations) Paul was always a helpful and willing resource and the effort was genuine. I appreciate that.

Anon anonb87562faf81a43ce

Maurice's visit was very insightful, the assignment structure really helped better my understanding of some key concepts, practicing writing research questions were good seminar activities

Anon anonbb90725baab0434a

Good introduction course for methods.
Participatory course.
Engaged teacher.
Forcing us to start thinking about thesis.
Good practice for writing/ talking about research.

Anon anonc6d69f5baf3a4ff7

The structure of the course and the seminar sessions

Anon anonc7bcd6a32e8a4826

The professor! He was willing and able to teach and lead us.

Anon anon321c6e18f3f4c8b

The enthusiasm of Paul!
Also the focus on methodology. I never had that in a methods course before, and it made a lot of sense to include it. Also likes that we could use the course to start thinking about our thesis. That was helpful.

Anon anonf15fa4267c994e89

The course was really helpful in understanding the very basic as well as to the very broad.

I think Paul did a great job as a lecturer, he was very approachable for individual feedbacks about course and also regarding questions outside of the course

Anon anonf81fb18ef3e34a3f

Understand the link between the philosophical concept and the precise choice of methodology and collected data.

10. What specific suggestions do you have for changes that would improve the course?

Anon anon026a04914a274031

No known suggestions. It was just perfect.

Anon anon06bb2815453d4866

differences in levels for experienced vs non-experienced students

Anon anon3386e8a0ddbb40cf

I found the course to be exactly what I needed, but if I had to say one thing: I thought the assignments were good, so maybe more than two obligatory hand ins would have been good, they wouldn't have to be long.

Anon anon4dc1141efa054d47

Each lecture was very full of contents, so I suggest to add more lectures to have more time to understand more.

Anon anon58091784f1e74833

Reduce just a bit the total amount of studies that we have to read and concentrate more on the key concepts in order to make sure that we have understood them. In fact, I struggled a bit on compulsory in course readings since Erasmus students have to focus also on other courses.

Anon anonb449f066864645cd

I would ask for more time to explore both of qualitative and quantitative methods. I feel as though half of a semester is a very short time to learn, digest, and decide which of the methods you want to commit to for the next 1.5 years OR extend the duration of the program to include both courses because I feel as though this decision continues to maintain the divide between qual and quant research.

Anon anonb87562faf81a43ce

Some more time between assignment 2 and the debate would have been helpful so we would have had more time to prepare, which could have made for a more interesting debate

Anon anonbb90725baab0434a

More lectures on ethics.
More lectures in general
Make book an e-book.

Anon anonc6d69f5baf3a4ff7

the course can include details of quantitative and qualitative analysis techniques/software

Anon anonc7bcd6a32e8a4826

I would like this course to be longer. I feel like it was compacted and material was given to us rapidly, especially for the undergrad exchange students this would be difficult.

Anon anon d321c6e18f3f4c8b

I did enjoy the key readings from GLODE301 and the discussions in class. Maybe one could do something similar here?
Also, I would have appreciated more group work.

Anon anonf15fa4267c994e89

i would have loved to spend more time in each topic, for example more time on data analysis and ethics.
maybe a longer time period for the course would be helpful in that

Anon anonf81fb18ef3e34a3f

Honestly, I have no suggestions. This course was very interactive, as all courses should be. Despite my difficulties with English, through observation and good listening, I could improve a lot because of a good interaction between student and teacher.

11. What are the strongest features of the lecturer's approach to the material? In what ways was the lecturer most effective in helping you learn?

Anon anon026a04914a274031

Explicit explanations and use of different perspectives for better understandings. It was really great!

Anon anon06bb2815453d4866

very diverse and active lectures

Anon anon3386e8a0ddbb40cf

By not talking about theory only, but by how we can apply it, has been really effective.

Anon anon4dc1141efa054d47

Lectures summarized the contents

Anon anon58091784f1e74833

Good propriety of language but great clarity as well. Slides and podcasts showed in advance or immediately after lectures.

Anon anon7d76287eff194415

By giving us questions about articles and papers before lectures, it has been useful on focusing on the main aspects of papers

Anon anon9052150acb1f4502

through the feedback on required reading

Anon anonb449f066864645cd

The strongest feature lecturer's approach to the material is his ability to emphasize points in real life contexts as well as encouraging a hands on approach to the work. I felt more comfortable writing research questions as home after having practiced writing research questions in class.

Paul was incredibly helpful and genuine. Its easy to seek help from people you believe truly want to help you.

Anon anonb87562faf81a43ce

Calm and collected, answers questions well, gives good and helpful feedback, has an enthusiasm for the course and the students which creates a great atmosphere and inspires

Anon anonbb90725baab0434a

Excelent lecturer.

Good at responding to questions.

Very approachable and available.

Quick responses to email

If some classmates were explaining something, the lecturer would repeat what the student said, and explain it again (often in a more simple way)

Anon anonc6d69f5baf3a4ff7

detail and exemplary explanation of lecture materials and a short podcast of the review of lectures

Anon anonc7bcd6a32e8a4826

I enjoyed podcasts and discussions. I appreciate when lecturers are able to relate material with reality and Paul a find job of this.

Anon anon321c6e18f3f4c8b

I appreciated that the lectures took the time to explain concepts when we asked, at understood that some of these concepts were difficult to grasp at first.

Anon anonf15fa4267c994e89

Paul answered all of our questions (all kinds) very well.
His emails about class and flexibility regarding the literature readings also helped me manage the course well.
the podcasts and videos were a great tool of learning.

Anon anonf81fb18ef3e34a3f

In using many concrete examples, in giving us the opportunity to think for ourselves and share our reasoning with other students. By letting the student be active.

12. What specific suggestions do you have to help the lecturer improve his teaching?

Anon anon026a04914a274031

No known suggestions as it was OK with me.

Anon anon3386e8a0ddbb40cf

I think the lecturer has been beyond great.

Anon anon4dc1141efa054d47

More written parts on the slides

Anon anon9052150acb1f4502

keep up the podcast approach

Anon anonb449f066864645cd

I remember early in this course Paul saying that a good teacher can teach anything simply (layman's terms) and I would honestly say that in the beginning of this course i was hoping for more digestible content. This is just my preference but i think most students come into methods courses already believing they wont do well or have a good time so making the information easier to understand would be helpful. This is not Paul's fault but moreso inherited consequences of the scientists before him.

Anon anonb87562faf81a43ce

I was very happy and don't have any specific suggestions

Anon anonbb90725baab0434a

Cannot think of any at this moment.

Anon anonc6d69f5baf3a4ff7

non in my opinion

Anon anonc7bcd6a32e8a4826

I would like to know more of his experiences and stories! I know this is hard because of the amount of content we had but sometimes it helps engagement of students when professors are able to share more.

Anon anon321c6e18f3f4c8b

Stop to make sure everyone understands everything regularly. Also when the ones that don't raise their hand as much. Maybe make sure through discussions?

Anon anonf15fa4267c994e89

Maybe Paul could explain things in a plainer English. Sometimes, i really have to think about what he is saying to understand it. However, it did not hinder me from learning whatsoever, it was just a little bit difficult at times.

Anon anonf81fb18ef3e34a3f

Like question 10, I do not really have any suggestions. By not putting any pressure, I could appreciate this course and learn with pleasure much more than other courses

13. Should this course be revised to spend more time on quantitative and qualitative methodologies and methods? Specifically, should the first two lectures on paradigms be integrated into the additional lectures on methodological traditions?

5/15 A Yes

10/15 B No

14. Were the review podcasts produced by the lecturer useful?

14/15 A Yes

1/15 B No

15. If you listened to the lecturer-produced podcasts, how did you access them?

6/15 A Soundcloud

3/15 B download

5/15 C both

1/15 D I didnt listen to any of the review podcasts

16. Do you have any other comments about the content, teaching methods, or the outcome of the course?

Anon anon026a04914a274031

No comments! It was just OK with me!

Anon anon06bb2815453d4866

forme most was known already. i would prefer a course that includes the extra qual and quant course (for example 15 ECPT for one course covering all, instead of having rwo courses on methodology and methods)

Anon anon3386e8a0ddbb40cf

Great course.

Anon anon4dc1141efa054d47

I think it is very useful to have lecturs and then seminars about the contents explained before.

Anon anon58091784f1e74833

I found this course very useful not only from the theoretical skills that it gave to me but mostly from the practical point of view: elaborating research questions, problem statements, etc.

Anon anon7d76287eff194415

it has been really useful to have the possibility of put in practice all the knowledge we learnt through assignment and seminars

Anon anonb449f066864645cd

The only thing I would recommend, is to not be scared to call on us in class. Don't be afraid to put us on the spot because even when we know the answers we do not raise our hands and even if we do not know our "wrong" answers may be shared and provide the whole class an opportunity to learn something. YOU ARE AWESOME PAUL!

Anon anonb87562faf81a43ce

The Neuman article was key in my understanding of the philosophical approaches so that was very helpful. I have struggled a bit to stay motivated because I don't find methods as interesting, especially when it isn't specialised to what I am using. The assignments were a really good way of getting into the different concepts in practice which I think will be good for the exam. I am really grateful for your enthusiasm in this course! You are a great lecturer and I am sad to see you go. Also I really enjoyed learning more about your own studies, and I appreciate how you connected so much of our learning to real-life examples, that made it easier to comprehend. I apologise for not always showing up, it is in no way a reflection of you as a lecturer. Thank you so much! And best of luck with your dissertation and everything to come.

Anon anonbb90725baab0434a

No.

Anon anonc6d69f5baf3a4ff7

course content, teaching methods and outcomes were adequate enough in my personal opinion

Anon anonc7bcd6a32e8a4826

Thank you for a great class!

Anon anond321c6e18f3f4c8b

Thank you for an excellent course!

Anon anonf15fa4267c994e89

it was a great course. i learnt a lot from it.

Anon anonf81fb18ef3e34a3f

I only have positive comments: the podcasts were really useful, especially for me struggling with my English. This course has given me the pleasure of reading articles with a deep understanding of how they think. I want to thank you for sharing so much positive energy by sharing your knowledge.