

Course evaluation UV 9102 A & B

Spring 2026

UV9102A& B – General course in Qualitative Research Methodology

In 2026 there were 17 PhD candidates taking part in UV 9102 A and 8 candidates participating in both part A and B. Kristinn Hegna and Elin Sæther were responsible and involved in the course for the first time, and Kirsten Sivesind and Ingvill Rasmussen contributed with lectures in part 2, as they had done previously.

The participants were asked for their feedback on the course in an anonymous Nettskjema right after the completion of the course, and six participants answered. Two of them had participated in course A, and four participated in both course sections A and B.

All respondents have given good feedback on what worked well in the course:

- All parts. Especially the dialogic parts. Nice to have lunch together. Good chats. Useful readings.
- I liked the combination of lectures and group work. It was very helpful to discuss what we learned during the lectures, and to have groups with quantitative and qualitative researchers combined.
- The lectures were clear and interesting.
- I particularly liked how the group work in part A was organised. It was two well organised days with a variation between active participation and lectures. I may have felt that you spent a bit too much time comparing quantitative and qualitative methods. It seemed in a way that you wanted to defend qualitative methods against quantitative methods. Part B has also been very good. It is exciting to be involved in the analysis work.
- Loved the readings, and must confess I was surprised by that. I was especially indebted to you for the concrete examples we were able to see from your own research throughout the course. It is one thing to draw threads together from the readings, but it is another entirely to apply them in rich, "active" data settings, where we are allowed to practice what we have learned.

When asked about suggestions for improvement, participants commented on the balance between addressing overarching theories and providing more detailed introductions to concrete methodological approaches, for instance conversation analysis.

One of the PhD students from course section A suggested that clearer priorities within the reading list would be useful.

The positive responses from those handing in Nettskjema were also mirrored in the communication during the two course parts and in emails with individual participants during and after the course.