Course Evaluation Report

PSY9165 - Quantitative Methods, Fall 2026

1 Course Information

Course title: PSY9165 - Quantitative Methods

Semester and year: Fall 2026

Level and credits: PhD course, 5 credits

Course coordinators: Kristin Gustavson and Øystein Sørensen

Evaluation basis: Anonymous course evaluation downloaded 29 September 2026, with 4 student responses.

2 Assessment of the Course

PSY9165 is a 5-credit PhD-level course taught in English. The course gives an introduction to central quantitative methods for psychological research, including regression models, factor analysis, causal inference, power analysis, experimental design, data visualization in R, and selected advanced methods. In fall 2026 the teaching combined lectures with guided practical work and assignments in R.

The evaluation indicates that the course largely achieved its learning outcomes, although with only four respondents the results should be interpreted with caution. Students reported high academic benefit (mean 5.75 on a 1–7 scale) and high attainment of the stated learning objectives (mean 6.0). Attendance was high, with three of four students attending all teaching. Three of four found the workload in line with the number of credits, and three of four found the amount of teaching about right. Comments highlighted the hands-on demonstrations of advanced concepts combined with practical considerations essential to any analysis, and one student appreciated that ethical considerations were also covered.

As in spring 2026, the main pedagogical challenge is the heterogeneous background of the participants. One student with prior methods training experienced some repetition of introductory material and described the schedule as tightly packed, while recognizing that the introductory parts help ensure that everyone is on the same page. Another student would have liked more time devoted to practising writing R code.

3 Student Feedback

The strongest positive feedback concerned the quality of teaching, which all four respondents gave the highest possible rating (7 of 7). Students described the lecturers as extremely knowledgeable, well prepared, and open to questions and discussion, including of niche topics, while maintaining the focus of the group. Blackboard illustrations and good use of breaks were highlighted as useful. Most students indicated that only minor changes are needed, and one student wrote that they would recommend the course to others.

Suggested improvements included a recommended list of sources for the more advanced methods, for later use in articles and the thesis summary (kappe), more exercises in writing R code, and possibly trimming some of the introductory material. One student suggested preparatory reading as an alternative to covering introductory material in class, but noted the risk that not everyone would read it.

The clearest negative feedback again concerned the physical learning environment (mean 4.25 of 7). Three of four students commented on poor ventilation and bad air in the teaching room. No other technical or practical issues were reported.

4 Overall Assessment and Further Development

Overall, the course appears to be of high quality and should be continued with its current core structure. Ventilation problems have now been reported in two consecutive semesters, so the most important immediate measure remains to secure a teaching room with adequate ventilation.

For further development, the course coordinators could provide a curated list of recommended readings for the advanced methods, add more exercises where students write R code themselves, and send out an optional “preparation package” on introductory material so that less class time needs to be spent on the basics.