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ABSTRACT

This project describes the theoretical background and the empirical development of the Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ), which is an instrument designed to measure students' perceptions of tertiary courses.

Two areas of research provide the background for the development of the CEQ. Student ratings research (Marsh, 1987), has provided evidence of the reliability and validity of student evaluations at the tertiary level and has revealed consistent dimensions of teaching effectiveness. The second area is research which has focused on a relational view of learning (Marton, Hounsell & Entwistle, 1984). This has demonstrated the influence of students' perceptions of educational contexts on their approaches to learning and the quality of learning outcomes.

Although students' perceptions have been recognized as important in evaluating tertiary teaching at an individual level, no suitable instrument has so far been included in packages of performance indicators which are concerned with evaluation at the aggregate level of departments. The CEQ has been designed as such an instrument.

The development of the CEQ from the initial pilot stage to the administration to a range of tertiary course groups is described. Possible further developments and refinements of the instrument are discussed together with reference to limitations and considerations in its future use as a performance indicator.
INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Students are an integral part of the teaching/learning process in higher education. It has been argued that their perceptions of the teaching process affect the ways they go about learning and the quality of outcomes achieved (Marton, Hounsell & Entwistle, 1984). Student evaluations have been used in the past to assess the performance of individual staff members but little attention has been given in Australia to the use of students' perceptions to evaluate courses and programs at aggregate level. The questionnaire which has been developed through this project, the Course Experience Questionnaire, is designed to fill that need. It has been developed in such a way that it is relevant for use in all Australian Tertiary Institutions.

Through the extensive research which has been carried out in the area of student ratings (Marsh, 1987; Feldman, 1976), dimensions of teaching effectiveness have been identified which are appropriate to consider in the evaluation of courses through student perceptions. The relevant aspects of this research and its contribution to the development of the Course Experience Questionnaire are outlined in Chapter 1.

Evaluation in higher education is receiving increasing attention in Australia. The recent emphasis in government policies on effective resource utilization in universities and colleges and
the related push towards a unified national system has been an important influence. The emphasis on measurement of outcomes in relation to resource utilization has created a need for the development of reliable and valid performance indicators which take account of both teaching and research functions of tertiary institutions (Bourke, 1986). Most packages of performance indicators used to compare courses at aggregate level do not include a measure of students' perceptions of courses although writers in the area acknowledge the relevance of such a measure (Elton, 1988; Ball & Halwachi, 1987). This is probably due to the lack of suitably validated instruments having a sound theoretical basis. It is anticipated that the Course Experience Questionnaire will fulfil these requirements and thus fill a significant gap in the area of performance indicators. Issues relating to evaluation and the definition, development and usage of performance indicators are discussed Chapter 2.

Another significant body of research has focused on learning in higher education and demonstrated the importance of the learners' perception of the context in the teaching/learning process (Marton, Hounsell & Entwistle, 1984). This research points to the significance of the interaction between the learner and the context in the determination of the approach taken by the learner and the quality of the learning outcome which is achieved. This research along with that from the student ratings area (Marsh, 1987) and research on classroom environments (Fraser, 1986) has reinforced the view that it is the student's perception, rather
than an objective view from outside observers or the perception of the teaching staff, which is the critical determinant of learning processes and outcomes. This work reinforces the need to consider the learner's perspective in any evaluation project which examines the quality of the teaching process. An overview of this research and its relationship to the present project is included in Chapter 3.

Much of the previous research which has utilized the views of students has focused either on the macro level of whole institutions (Pace, 1967; Stern, 1970) or on the micro level of individual classes (Fraser, 1986; Marsh, 1987). Few other studies have focused, as the present one does, at course level. One major exception, a study conducted by Ramsden (1979) which resulted in the development of the Course Perception Questionnaire in Britain, forms the starting point for the development of the Course Experience Questionnaire. This background work is reviewed in Chapter 4 together with reference to other relevant questionnaire and survey material.

The methodological approach used is outlined in Chapter 5. A description of the initial pilot testing of Version 1 of the instrument is also presented in chapter 5. The results of the major development and testing phase of Version 2 are presented in Chapter 6. This chapter includes the results for a range of tertiary course groups to whom the CEQ was administered.
The results are discussed in Chapter 7. The results obtained for course groups are discussed in relation to other issues such as discipline based differences, course size and specific departmental practices such as selection procedures. The relationships between scales of the CEQ and possible future developments are discussed.

The final chapter also includes an overview of issues and limitations involved in the further development and use of the Course Experience Questionnaire as a performance indicator.
CHAPTER 1.

STUDENT RATINGS RESEARCH AND TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

1.1 Overview of the Usage of Student Ratings.

With increasing interest in student learning in higher education there has been increasing interest in examining teacher effectiveness and other aspects of academic environments which may impact on learning. Student ratings have been the primary method used over the past 60 years to measure teaching effectiveness in higher education. The voluminous research in this area has highlighted the substantial agreement between lecturers and students about what constitutes effective teaching (Feldman, 1976; Marsh, 1987). In this chapter the dimensions of effective teaching that have emerged through these studies will be reviewed.

Student evaluations have been used extensively in the United States of America since the 1920s and most extensively during the 1970s and 80s as a measure of teaching effectiveness in higher education. They have been used by teaching staff as a form of feedback, by students for course selection and by administrators for personnel decisions (Marsh, 1989). More recently they have been introduced throughout one Australian university to fulfil similar functions (Moses, 1989). Although they have been extensively criticised, student evaluations of teaching
effectiveness are the most thoroughly studied of all forms of evaluation and, as some researchers (McKeachie, 1979; Marsh, 1989) suggest, one of the best in terms of being supported by empirical research. A recent definitive review of the area carried out by Marsh (1987) has indicated that student ratings are reasonably reliable and valid and relatively uncontaminated by many variables often seen as sources of potential bias when used to measure areas about which students can form accurate judgments (Marsh, 1987, p. 369).

1.2 Student Ratings and Teaching Effectiveness.

Perhaps the most consistent view indicated by the research is that teaching effectiveness is multifaceted and that measures should reflect this multidimensionality. Feldman (1976) in a review of studies of the characteristics of good teaching as perceived by students identified the following 19 categories:

1) Teacher's stimulation of interest in the course and subject matter.
2) Teacher's enthusiasm for the subject and for teaching.
3) Teacher's knowledge of the subject.
4) Teacher's intellectual expansiveness and breadth of coverage.
5) Teacher's preparation and organization of the course.
6) Clarity and understandableness of presentations and explanations.

7) Teacher's elocutionary skills.

8) Teacher's sensitivity to, and concern with, class level progress.

9) Clarity of course objectives and requirements.

10) Nature and value of the course material (usefulness and relevance)

11) Nature and usefulness of supplementary materials and teaching aids.

12) Difficulty and workload of the course.

13) Teacher's fairness and impartiality of evaluation of students.

14) Classroom management.

15) Nature, quality and frequency of feedback to students.

16) Teacher's encouragement of questions and discussion and openness to opinions of others.

17) Intellectual challenge and encouragement of independent thought.

18) Teacher's concern and respect for students; friendliness.

19) Teacher's availability and helpfulness.

(Feldman, 1976, p. 272)

The obvious assumption here is that the teacher or lecturer has control over aspects of subject content, assessment and course goals. Although this may be the case with regard to
the American higher education system it is not generally the case in Australia. Therefore some of the aspects mentioned would be more appropriately placed in the broader context of course or departmental evaluation. In support of the idea of overall course evaluation together with individual staff evaluation, Marsh (1987) indicates that there are a range of contextual factors which are not under the control of individual lecturers which should be evaluated on a departmental basis so as not to bias the evaluation of individuals. This view is also supported by the work of Entwistle and Tait (in press) who have demonstrated the complex interaction of teaching with contexts.

Several researchers using factor analytic methods have identified two or three higher order factors under which other dimensions may be subsumed. Smalzried and Remmers (1943) identified 10 traits subsumed under two higher order factors which they termed Empathy and Professional Maturity. Similarly, Frey (1978) identified Skill and Empathy as two higher order factors and Feldman (1976) identified three higher order clusters related to instructor roles of: presenter, facilitator and manager.

Reviewing a number of factor analytic studies of student ratings, Marsh (1987) has maintained that teaching effectiveness is multifaceted and that the simplification of ratings into one or two composite scores provides little
information in terms of feedback and poor discrimination between individual styles. He examined the components which students consistently identified and used these to develop a student rating instrument called the Student’s Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ). Using factor analysis he has identified the ways in which items clump together to form dimensions which describe good teaching. By this process he has identified nine dimensions which summarize the responses of both the self ratings of lecturers and ratings by students on the same scale. These can be summarized as follows:

1) Learning value of the course.
2) Enthusiasm of the teacher for the subject.
3) Organization and clarity of goals.
4) Group interaction: encouragement of discussion, valuing of student ideas.
5) Individual Rapport: friendly, accessible, giving help and advice.
6) Breadth of coverage of topics.
7) Examination and evaluation methods and feedback.
8) Assignments: value of and contribution to understanding.
9) Workload/difficulty.

These dimensions are similar to those identified more recently by Entwistle and Tait (in press) in a study of student perceptions and approaches conducted in
institutions of higher education in England. The dimensions they identified included workload and level of difficulty, assignments and degree of choice, quality of explanations, enthusiasm, empathy with student's needs, level of material and pace at which it is presented and clarity of goals.

1.3 Comparison of Staff and Student Ratings.

Further support for the criteria of effective teaching identified comes from research comparing staff self ratings with student ratings. Focusing on the validity and reliability of student ratings of teacher effectiveness, Centra (1979) reviewed research which compared staff ratings with staff self ratings and concluded that the patterns of ratings were similar, but the staff self ratings tended generally to be higher than the student ratings of staff. Marsh's (1987) findings support this view and the substantial agreement between staff and students lends support to the criteria of effective teaching as identified in the studies reviewed.

1.4 Student Ratings and Performance.

A meta-analysis of research on overall student ratings and student performance has been performed by Cohen (1981). His research indicated substantial correlations between student
ratings and student performance. However, these results must be viewed in relation to the "grading satisfaction hypothesis" discussed by Marsh (1987). According to this hypothesis, students are likely to rate a lecturer more highly if they are doing well in the subject. Cohen's results do, however, lend support for the validity of the criteria of teaching effectiveness identified through student ratings research.

The implicit theory underlying student ratings assumes a direct relationship between the quality of teaching in higher education and the quality of learning or at least a simple relationship between teaching and learning. This relationship proves to be more complex than initially might be suspected.
CHAPTER 2.

EVALUATION AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

2.1 Evaluation in Higher Education

Performance indicators are a form of evaluation, and evaluation in higher education may have a range of functions depending on how it is carried out, by whom and on what. It may have diagnostic value, (indicating specific areas in which change may be appropriate); it may be used for appraisal purposes (in this case, management may use evaluation to determine whether a staff member is meeting his or her goals); or it may be used as a performance assessment either at an individual staff member level or at the level of a course or institution (Ramsden & Dodds, 1989). The questionnaire developed in this case is intended to have the following two functions: firstly, as a diagnostic tool for the team of teaching staff involved in a course and for those undertaking internal course reviews and, secondly, as a performance indicator which can be used together with a variety of other instruments to compare courses on an aggregate level in different institutions. It is not designed for the evaluation of the performance of individual staff members.

2.2 Definition of Performance Indicators.

Performance indicators have been defined in a variety of ways. In a broad sense they may be, "numerical values derived in a
variety of ways... (which)... provide a measurement for assessing the quantitative or qualitative performance of a system," (Cave et al., 1988, p. 17). In other words, a performance indicator may be a measure of quantitative features such as, the ratio of graduates to enrolling students, or a qualitative measure which examines aspects of the process in higher education such as the quality of teaching. Other writers have differentiated between simple indicators and performance indicators:

performance indicators differ from simple indicators in that they imply a point of reference, for instance a standard or an objective, an assessment or a comparator and are therefore relative rather than absolute in value. (Cuenin, 1986, p. 22).

A performance indicator may thus be comparative in that it provides the opportunity to rank or compare academic organizational units. The Jarratt report (1985) separates performance indicators into three categories: internal, external and operating. External indicators are those which measure performance in the market place, for example with employers, operating indicators measure productivity ratios, such as unit costs; and internal indicators measure teaching quality, attractiveness of the course and research funding. Cave et al. (1988) have also suggested that performance indicators may be provided through subjective procedures such as peer or student evaluations.
2.3 Limitations on the use of student evaluations.

It is acknowledged that there are important limitations in the utilization of the perceptions and evaluations of students who are in the process of studying a particular course. They cannot generally comment on the applicability of the course content with regard to vocational relevance or the larger view of the course which encompasses a range of material, approaches and skills developed over the 3 to 4 years of a course (Moses, 1989). However, their perceptions of the management and presentation of course materials and staff interactions with them are valid and relevant for evaluation purposes especially when combined with a range of other measures to give a total picture of course effectiveness (Cave et al., 1988; Moses, 1989).

In accordance with these acknowledged limitations and definitions the Course Experience Questionnaire has been developed as an internal indicator of the qualitative performance of a particular course. It is intended to be relative rather than absolute in measurement and therefore appropriate for use in making comparisons between courses. It is subjective in nature, utilizing the perceptions of students studying the course. The ways in which student perceptions relate to learning outcomes and quality issues will be covered in the following chapters.
CHAPTER 3.

THE CONTEXT OF LEARNING: A RELATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Over the past 15 years in Sweden, Britain and Australia a group of researchers have developed what they call a "relational" view of student learning. Learning is seen as a function of the individual student's engagement with the learning context. This view has developed from initial work by Marton and Saljo (1976a) which focused on the learner's experience of learning. The relevant aspects of this research will be reviewed in this chapter with particular emphasis on the ways in which students interact with and are influenced by the context in which their learning takes place.

3.1 Early Studies of Institutions of Higher Education.

Two early studies of institutions of higher education by Snyder (1971) and Becker, Geer and Hughes (1968) focused on the experience of students. Snyder (1971) found that there were significant differences between the formal curriculum as defined by staff and the "hidden curriculum", the message received implicitly but strongly by students about what was required of them. The teaching and assessment methods used by staff to fulfil curriculum goals for particular types of learning gave messages to students which were different from those initially intended by staff. These "hidden messages" frequently led to less desirable modes of learning such as rote memorization,
question spotting and cue seeking. The findings of Becker and colleagues (1968) also supported the view that what students perceived and responded to in their educational context was different from what was intended by their teachers.

The idea of a "hidden curriculum" suggested that there was a complex relationship between the educational context, the ways in which students experienced it and went about their learning as a result of their experience. Other researchers, who have focused on the students' perspective, have confirmed the complexity of the relationships and the relational nature of these. Concerning himself with the way in which students experience learning tasks in context, Marton (Marton & Säljö, 1976a) carried out an experiment in which he had students read a passage with the prior knowledge that they would be asked questions upon completion. After reading the passage the students were also asked to describe how they went about reading the passage, difficulties they may have encountered, and whether there were particular aspects which struck them as important during their reading. The interviews showed that students tended to process the passage in one of two particular ways. Some focused on memorizing facts whilst others focused on the author's intention and the conclusions to be drawn. Students read the passage with particular intentions in mind and the ways in which they approached it depended upon their intentions.
3.2 Approaches to Learning.

The distinctive approaches demonstrated through this experiment have been termed "deep" and "surface" approaches according to the way in which the student interacts with the text. The approach taken by the students seemed to depend upon their interpretation of the particular context and the requirements of it. As a consequence of this, the two groups achieved very different learning outcomes in terms of level of understanding of the particular text. This experiment demonstrated that the way in which students experience or perceive learning contexts will affect their intentions in terms of learning, thus the approach they use and as a consequence the quality of the outcome.

3.3 Contexts of Learning.

Since Marton (Marton & Säljö, 1976) first identified the different approaches there has been a wealth of other research which has confirmed and extended his findings (Marton, Hounsell & Entwistle, 1984). The major concern here is with a particular aspect of that research which has focused on the context of learning and how that impacts on the way in which students go about learning. The research has indicated that it is not what the context is as observed by an outsider or defined by teaching staff that is important, but rather the way in which students perceive and experience that context. More recent work by Fraser (1986) and Fraser, Treagust and Dennis (1984) examining
students' perceptions of higher education classroom environments has demonstrated clearly that students have very different and usually less positive perceptions of the learning environment than the teaching staff who teach them.

In tertiary education students can experience a wide range of learning contexts. These might range from a highly structured lecture-based course on molecular structures of amino acids assessed completely by multiple choice examinations to a loosely structured discussion-oriented course on gender roles and policy determination in which group work is emphasised and assessment options and methods are flexible. The different learning contexts invite students to adapt and respond to them in a variety of different ways. The ways in which students may respond or adapt will depend on the students' previous experience of similar and different learning situations and their interpretations and perceptions of the present context which will also be tempered by previous experience.

The different contexts clearly will invite students to utilize different strategies to approach their learning tasks. It is likely that students will endeavour to respond to the perceived demands of the situation in such a way as to maximize the desired outcomes for themselves given the perceived opportunities in the situation. The ways in which students adapt or respond to contexts may thus be seen as relational in that they represent a relationship between the learner and the context. Learners bring prior experience as well as some habitual responses to situations
perceived to be similar. However, research in this area has demonstrated that a major determinant of the approach taken is the context as it is perceived by the student (Ramsden, 1984).

3.4 Three Domains of the Context.

It is possible to divide the context of learning in higher education into three domains. These are: teaching (the way in which what is learnt is transmitted), assessment (the methods used to evaluate what is learnt) and the curriculum (the structure and content of what is learnt) (Ramsden, 1988b, p. 160). Both direct and indirect influences from the context on learning can be seen. The indirect influence can be seen in the students' perception of the three domains of teaching, assessment and curriculum. The three contextual domains can also exert direct influence by placing constraints on the strategies which students can employ. Material may be presented in such a way that it lacks any meaningful structure which can be grasped and therefore can only be approached in a rote learning mode. This may be affected in some contexts by the students' past experience. If students do not have the prior knowledge or experience necessary in a particular area then they may find it difficult to deal with complex material in a meaningful way. Thus the students' past experience in terms of topic areas as well as their past experience of other learning contexts may impact the way in which they perceive the context with which they are presently confronted. Figure 1. is taken from Ramsden's (1988b, p. 161)
work and illustrates this process.

Figure 1. A model of learning in context
(Ramsden, 1988b, p. 161)

3.5 Referential and Relational Components of Approaches.

The approaches referred to in the diagram have both referential and relational components. The referential component is concerned with students' intentions; that is, whether they are focusing on the meaning of the learning material or parts or components of it without reference to the overall meaning. The relational component refers to the process whereby a student either manipulates a task in a "holistic" manner maintaining the essential structure or in an "atomistic" way in which the components or structure are distorted (Ramsden, 1988a). Ideally one would want students to utilize a "deep" or "holistic" approach more often and one of the reasons for examining context
involves the desire to identify ways in which this may be facilitated.

3.6 Facilitating Different Approaches to Learning.

Unlike many of the other factors which may impact on student learning, the context is largely under the control of teachers and is amenable to alteration in order to facilitate the achievement of teaching goals. Research in this area has demonstrated that it is easier to encourage the utilization of surface approaches by students than it is to encourage deep approaches. The reading experiment conducted by Marton and Säljö (1976a) in which two groups of students were given different types of questions to answer demonstrated this. All of the first group who were given highly factual questions adopted a surface approach. The second group were given questions which focused on the relations between conclusions and evidence, but not all students in this group adopted a deep approach. It would appear that these students interpreted the learning context in a variety of ways.

Other factors have been associated with the utilization of different approaches by students. Although intertwined, they can be discussed in relation to the three domains of context, teaching, assessment and curriculum. Some general aspects of 'good teaching' have been identified through the student ratings research as discussed in Chapter 1. Studies of departmental
environments in higher education (Gaff, Crombag & Chang, 1976; Entwistle & Ramsden, 1983) have identified the following factors as significant: student centredness, respect for students, individual guidance, skill in lecturing and choice of content and method in the promotion of an environment which is likely to facilitate deep level learning. Fransson (1977) has also demonstrated that absence of threat or anxiety as perceived by students and intrinsic motivation were more often associated with a deep approach. These factors could be seen to be related to an ability on the part of teaching staff to empathise with students, and also to methods of assessment and feedback methods used.

3.7 Assessment and Approaches to Learning.

Assessment methods and approaches may be seen as having perhaps the most powerful impact on students approaches. As already indicated in the reading experiment conducted by Marton and Säljö (1976a), assessment which has a high factual component may induce surface approaches. As Snyder (1971) also showed it is possible that teaching staff structure assessments in a particular way anticipating the encouragement of understanding whilst students perceive and interpret them in other ways and respond by rote memorization. It is clear that the assessment process gives messages to students about the kind of learning they are expected to carry out and they respond in ways that they perceive will maximize their chances of success.
Factors relating to the curriculum which may influence students' modes of learning cannot be entirely separated from the teaching and assessment aspects. For instance, an excessive workload as perceived by students or a curriculum which endeavours to cover too much material may induce surface approaches (Entwistle and Ramsden, 1983). If students have difficulty perceiving the relevance of the material being taught then similar effects may occur (Fransson, 1977). On the other hand, freedom of choice within the curriculum, choice of study methods and of assessment have been associated with the promotion of deep approaches (Ramsden and Entwistle, 1981). Such freedom may mean that students can self select study methods which may suit them and thus facilitate their learning. It is also logical that the freedom of choice over topic material for assignments will facilitate intrinsic motivation as students will be more interested in the task if it is personally chosen rather than imposed by the lecturer. Restricted choice over assessment is likely to have the opposite effects, with students being forced to limit their focus and perhaps to centre on passing the requirements rather than becoming involved with the study material.

It is evident from this review of research on student learning that students' perceptions of their learning tasks and broader contexts influence the ways in which they approach learning and thus the quality of outcomes achieved.
CHAPTER 4.

PREVIOUS STUDIES OF STUDENTS’ PERCEPTIONS OF COURSES

In the previous chapter it was demonstrated that it is vital to consider students’ perceptions of learning tasks and the contexts of learning. Most of the research referred to related to specific learning tasks or situations. Similarly, the student ratings research refers to specific subjects and lecturers, and the learning environment research refers to specific classroom situations. Considerably less research has dealt with students’ perceptions of courses at aggregate level. The work which has been done is, however, significant in its contribution to our understanding of the way in which students approach learning and how learning outcomes may be influenced by their perceptions of contexts. This research will be reviewed in this chapter with particular reference to the instruments used to measure students’ perceptions of their learning contexts.

4.1 Early Studies of Students’ Perceptions of Departments

One of the earliest studies of students’ perceptions of departmental environments in European universities was carried out by Gaff, Crombag and Chang (1976). They used the Study Environments Scale to investigate the ‘cultures’ of four academic departments in a Dutch university. A cluster analysis revealed that the students in different departments had significantly different perceptions of their departments over a
range of areas. These included the following: understanding of students, personal attention to students, freedom and degree of choice in subject matter covered, workload and time required of students, respect for students, and relevance of the material covered. The scales relating to teaching and student interaction were highly correlated and they found that if a department was high in one they were likely to be rated highly in the others. This they termed, "student centeredness" (Gaff et al., 1976, p. 294). Ramsden (1979) identified similar criteria in a later British study.

4.2 The Course Perceptions Questionnaire.

Ramsden (1979) used a questionnaire constructed on the basis of extensive student interviews to investigate students' perceptions of the courses in a range of British tertiary institutions. Second year undergraduate students in six tertiary departments in England were surveyed. These included a social science, an applied science, a natural science and two arts departments. A factor analysis revealed eight scales with similar characteristics to those identified by Gaff et al. (1976). The dimensions of the learning environments identified were: relationships with students, commitment to teaching, workload, formal teaching methods, vocational relevance, social climate, clear goals and standards and freedom in learning. Ramsden (1979) noted that some of the distinctions seemed to relate to the primary subject discipline of the departments. The science
departments tended to be perceived by students to have more formal teaching methods and less personalized relationships, whilst the opposite was true in the arts departments. This finding relates to the evidence provided by Biglan (1973) of differences between subject disciplines in organization and approaches to students. In interviews, students constantly related contextual variables (such as the quality of relationships with teachers and assessment pressure) to their approaches to learning.

The Course Perceptions Questionnaire was shown to discriminate effectively between departments and was utilized by Ramsden and Entwistle (1981) as one of the instruments in a more extensive study of students’ perceptions of courses and their approaches to learning. Ramsden and Entwistle’s study is significant in terms of its size and, more importantly, the breadth of the study and its contribution to our understanding of the ways in which students’ perceptions of their departments and courses impact the ways they go about learning. In the study, 2,208 second year undergraduate students from 66 departments in a range of academic institutions in England were given two questionnaires, the first of which related to perceptions of their course, and the second to the ways in which they approached their learning. The analysis confirmed the existence of the eight dimensions as previously identified and two major approaches to study consistent with Martons’ (Marton & Saljö, 1976b) earlier findings were found.
4.3 Students’ Approaches and Perceptions of Departments.

Student approaches to learning were classified as either a meaning orientation (deep/holistic) or a reproducing orientation (surface/atomistic). Significantly, Ramsden and Entwistle (1981) found that the departments which had the highest scores in terms of students showing a preference for meaning orientation could be predicted by reference to the good teaching and freedom in learning scales. In other words, departments which had good teaching and freedom in learning as perceived by students were more likely to have students who favoured the meaning orientation. On the other hand, departments having students with the highest scores on the reproducing orientation were more likely to be perceived by students to have a heavy workload, vocational relevance, and a lack of freedom in learning.

Two other more recent studies, one conducted in Australian high schools (Ramsden, Martin and Bowden, 1989) and the other conducted in tertiary institutions in Britain (Entwistle and Tait, in press) have supported the findings of Ramsden and Entwistle (1981). The School Experiences Questionnaire was used by Ramsden et al. (1989) and a combined approaches and student perceptions of courses questionnaire called the Experiences of Study and Higher Education Questionnaire was developed and used by Entwistle and Tait (in press).

The results of these studies suggest that there is a relationship between students’ perceptions of courses at aggregate level,
and the approaches to learning which students adopt. The present study aims to develop a questionnaire which can be utilized in the Australian tertiary system to examine students' perceptions of courses. Items from the three questionnaires; the Course Perceptions Questionnaire, the School Experiences Questionnaire and the Experiences of Study and Higher Education Questionnaire, have been used in the present study, together with items developed from interviews and other sources.
CHAPTER 5.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE COURSE EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE: VERSION 1.

5.1 Guiding Criteria.

In this chapter the development and trialing of the Course Experience Questionnaire: Version 1 will be outlined. The initial development of the Course Experience Questionnaire was guided by the following six criteria:

1. Coverage of all significant categories on which students can legitimately comment with regard to teaching effectiveness and which are supported or suggested by previous research and theory.

2. Applicability to all courses in universities, colleges and institutes of higher education across Australia. This meant that items needed to be more general than specific and response categories needed to have a range of options including a "not sure" or "doesn't apply" category.

3. Economy. In order to encourage broad usage the questionnaire needed to be short, with a small number of reliable scales and easy to process in terms of collation of results from large class groups. The aim was to develop a questionnaire which could be completed by a group of students in approximately fifteen minutes.

4. Relevance to tertiary teachers and students. Students and staff at the tertiary level must be able to relate to, and identify with the ideas and concepts presented in the
questionnaire.

5. Utilization of previously tested items and scales. Where possible, items which had been tested and found successful in other settings should be used.

6. Ability to differentiate between the perceptions of students in different course groups. In other words, students in the same course should perceive the course in relatively similar ways overall and the mean in course perceptions may vary between course groups.

5.2 Scale Identification

Guided by previous research and associated theory as previously outlined and experience from extensive interviews with students in higher education, nine hypothesized scales were proposed and items were identified and placed in the scales according to the intuitive-theoretical model of scale construction described by Hase and Goldberg (1967).

5.3 Item Pool and Hypothesized Scale Construction

Items for the Course Experience Questionnaire were derived from interviews with tertiary students in a range of different courses and also from the following questionnaires:

1) Course Perceptions Questionnaire (CPQ) (Ramsden, 1983).

2) School Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ) (Ramsden, Martin & Bowden, 1989).

3) Experiences of Studying and Higher Education
Twenty five items from the CPQ (Ramsden, 1981), five items from the SEQ and six items from the ESHE scales were selected for trial in the CEQ. Where possible, items were used in an identical form or with minor modifications which would not affect overall meaning. Other items were derived from interviews with students in a wide variety of courses at the tertiary level.

5.4 Pretesting of Items.

The pool of items collected as described was then given to lecturers and students in the target population as a pretest process as described by Coverse and Presser (1986). The aim was eventually to produce a questionnaire which would take a maximum of fifteen minutes for the average tertiary student to complete. This time allowance takes into consideration the uses for which the questionnaire is intended. In the pretest stage, time trials using the pool of items indicated that the maximum length should be 60 items with an optimum of 50 or less. The initial trial version could be much longer to allow for discarding of items and scales if necessary. In the pretest stage, items were checked particularly for appropriate wording and language as well as flow and consistency. Also, persons experienced in the construction of questionnaires checked the items for ambiguities, for dual issue items and double negatives or other aspects that would create confusion.
5.5 Course Experience Questionnaire: Version 1.

As a result of the pretest process, the Course Experience Questionnaire: Version 1 contained 80 items grouped into the following nine hypothesized scales which varied in length from 6 to 13 items: (Sample items are shown in brackets.)

1. GOOD TEACHING: EXPLANATION, ENTHUSIASM AND INTEREST (GTE)
High scores would indicate that students perceive teaching staff in the department to be good at explaining and linking concepts and demonstrate enthusiasm and interest in their subjects through their approach to teaching. (10 items)

(Lecturers on this course seem to be good at pitching their teaching at the right level for us.)

2. GOOD TEACHING: AVAILABILITY AND STUDY SUPPORT (GTAS)
High scores would indicate that students perceive the teaching staff to be accessible to students and supportive to students in their studies. (10 items)

(Teaching staff always seem ready to give help and advice on approaches to study.)

3. GOOD TEACHING: AMOUNT AND QUALITY OF FEEDBACK ON STUDENTS' WORK (GTF)
High scores would indicate that students receive constructive feedback on their work. (7 items)

(The staff provide a great deal of constructive criticism of our work.)
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4. CLEAR GOALS, STANDARDS AND STRUCTURE. (CG&S)

High scores would indicate that the standards of assessment and the goals of the course are perceived by students to be clear.

(13 items)

(The staff here make it clear right from the start what they expect from students.)

5. WORKLOAD. (WKL)

High scores would indicate that students feel themselves to be under excessive pressure from the demands of the course and the assessment methods.

(8 items)

(The sheer volume of work to be got through on this course means you can’t comprehend it thoroughly.)

6. COMMITMENT TO ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

(inspiration /motivation to do best work) (ACH)

High scores would indicate that students feel that they are expected to produce a high standard of work and are inspired to do so by teaching staff.

(6 items)

(Lecturers here inspire you to do your best work.)

7. ASSESSMENT (ASS)

High scores would indicate that the assessment for the course encourages students to understand curriculum material rather than rote learn it.

(9 items)

(To do well on this course all you need is a good memory.(-))
8. EMPHASIS ON STUDENT INDEPENDENCE AND CHOICE. (INDEP)

High scores would indicate that students feel that they have a high degree of choice over the ways in which they go about learning and assessment processes and that they are encouraged to develop their interests and strengths. (10 items)

(The course seems to encourage us to develop our own academic interests as far as possible.)

9. COOPERATION/COMPETITIVENESS. (C/C)

High scores would indicate that students are encouraged to work cooperatively with other students. (7 items)

(Students on this course frequently discuss their work with each other.)

(The scales with items in full and the source of the items are shown in Appendix A.)

5.6 Other Features of Version 1.

The questionnaire included 24 items (30%) which were reverse scored and these were distributed through the hypothesized scales. Items from each of the hypothesized scales were distributed on a cyclical basis through the questionnaire. The ordering of items was checked through a similar process to the pretest described above.

A five point Likert scale was used for responses with the
following range;

1. means that you definitely agree
2. means that you agree but with reservations
3. means that you are not sure or that it doesn’t apply
4. means that you tend to disagree
5. means that you definitely disagree

It may have been possible to use a forced choice format (Converse & Presser, 1986) which excluded the possibility of a "doesn’t apply" category, however initial informal trials of the questionnaire with tertiary students indicated that the option was important in two ways;

a) there were small numbers of items which may not apply specifically to some courses and it was important that respondents had the option of "doesn’t apply".

b) students indicated that they would be negative toward a questionnaire which did not provide an option for a "doesn’t apply" response and thus the lack of this option may impact on their responses to other aspects of the questionnaire or lead to refusals to respond.

Separating the "not sure" from the "no response" category would also have been a possible alternative thus providing a 6 point scale. It was decided that in analysis that these two areas would be likely to be combined and that for simplicity in response that the five point scale would be most appropriate.

The questionnaire response sheet allowed the student to be totally anonymous, the only other information required being "course" in which the student is enrolled.

(A copy of the complete Version 1. of the Course Experience
5.7 *Trialing the Course Experience Questionnaire: Version 1.*

Version 1 of the CEQ was administered to 98 undergraduate students at a metropolitan institution of higher education. They were distributed by course as shown in table 1.

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% OF CLASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Biology</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biotechnology</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Science</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Medical Lab. Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Communication Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*these 2 students were undertaking optional subjects in other course areas.)

The CEQ was given in normal lecture time and completion of the questionnaire was optional. All students were 2nd or later year students. This trial was conducted in March and within 4 weeks of the beginning of the first semester. It was therefore considered important to use later year students who would have a minimum of one year of experience in their courses.

The response rate in Applied Biology, Biotechnology and
Information Science was 100% of those present at that lecture time. In Architecture, the CEQ was given in a combined class group of 2nd and 1st years and 80% of the 2nd year students present completed it.

5.8 Validation of the CEQ: Version 1.

Frequencies of response ranges for each item were calculated in order to identify items with skewed responses (for example, any item on which all or most students responded in the same or similar way). These items were unlikely to discriminate effectively between course groups and therefore needed to be excluded. (Frequencies for each item in Version 1. are shown in Appendix C.) Four items were removed on this basis, they were: questions 2, 13, 17 and 51.

The data was also subjected to item analysis in order to identify items whose removal would enhance each scale’s internal consistency. The internal consistency of the scales was improved by removing items with low item-scale correlations. Estimates of the internal consistency of each scale were calculated using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. This information is presented in Table 2. (The questionnaire items are paraphrased for presentation in Table 2.)
### Table 2.

**Results of internal consistency analysis:**

**Course Experience Questionnaire: Version 1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale: Good Teaching (quality of feedback)</th>
<th>GTF</th>
<th>Correlation with Scale Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Alpha = 0.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Staff put a lot of effort into commenting on work</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Staff make too many negative comments on work (-)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I get valuable comments from staff on written work</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Staff give helpful feedback on how you are going</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Staff seem more ready to see student mistakes(-)</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Staff provide a great deal of constructive criticism</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Staff never seem to have time to discuss s.progress(-)</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale: Good Teaching (availability and study support) GTAS</th>
<th>Correlation with Scale Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Alpha = 0.79)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. L. make a real effort to understand student difficulties</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If L. can't help will suggest others who can</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Most staff try really hard to get to know students</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. L. give the impression they have nothing to learn(-)</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Staff give help and advice on approaches to study</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Often difficult to make contact with staff (-)</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Staff receptive to suggestions from students</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Staff seem genuinely interested in what students say</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. So many students doing course, staff don't have time(-)</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Staff talk about subjects outside class time</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. (cont.)

Scale: Good Teaching (explanation and interest)  
(Alpha = 0.75)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation with Scale Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Few opportunities to relate theory to practice (−)</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Staff show us how to understand by asking questions</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Staff are really enthusiastic about their subjects</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Lecturers wander of the point so we can’t follow (−)</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Lecturers help us to make links between topics</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. L. are good at pitching their teaching at right level</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Staff work hard to make subjects interesting</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. L. are extremely good at explaining things to us</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. L. try to relate theory to real life situations</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Staff seem to prepare their teaching thoroughly</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: Commitment to Academic Achievement  
(Alpha = 0.75)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation with Scale Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Staff set a high standard in what they expect</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Staff motivate students to do best work</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Course tries to get the best out of all its students</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. You are encouraged to develop skills and abilities</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. L. inspire you to do best work</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. This course is very challenging academically</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 (cont.)

**Scale: Workload**

(Alpha=0.73)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation with Scale Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Many projects or assignments are due at one time</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The workload here is too heavy.</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The syllabus tries to cover too many topics</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. We are given enough time to understand things (-)</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Volume of work to be got through means can’t comprehend</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Assignment work means hard to follow up lectures</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. There’s a lot of pressure on you as a student here</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Course structure encourages you to spread effort (-)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scale: Assessment**

(Alpha =0.67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation with Scale Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Ass. encourages you to think carefully about learning</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Course requires you to link themes and concepts</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Staff interested in memorization not understanding(-)</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. To do well all you need is a good memory (-)</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Possible to get through just by working hard at exams (-)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Criteria used for marking assignments, clearly specified</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Too many staff ask us questions just about facts (-)</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. You have to understand subjects to do well</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Feedback is only provided as marks or grades (-)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>C/C Correlation with Scale Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students frequently discuss their work with each other</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Course prepares students for competition in work (-)</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. A lot of students on this course are friends of mine</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Course fosters a friendly climate.</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Course seems to operate on &quot;survival of the fittest&quot; (-)</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. To do well you have to work cooperatively with others</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. You are always under pressure to do better than others (-)</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scale; Emphasis on Student Independence and Choice INDEP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>C/C Correlation with Scale Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Students are given a lot of choice in the work they do</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. There's a real opportunity to choose the areas to study</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. You are encouraged to study more and more independently</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Students have choice over how they are going to learn</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Course encourages the development of our own interests</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Every student has to study the same things in same way (-)</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. There's a lot of choice in the ways you are assessed</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. You have a chance to use methods of study which suit you</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. We discuss how we are going to learn with lecturers</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Students ideas and suggestions are used during class</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (cont.)

Scale: Clear Goals , Standards and Structures   CGS

\[ \text{(Alpha=0.77)} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation with Scale Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Students given a clear idea of aims &amp; objectives</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Seems lecturers do not communicate very much (-)</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Lot of guidance from staff on planning workload</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Goals of course have never been made clear to me (-)</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Often hard to discover what's expected of you (-)</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Usually have a clear of where you are going</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. It's easy to know the standard of work expected</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Only way to judge how you are going is to compare (-)</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Written info. is provided on how to do assignments</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Staff make it clear from start what they expect</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. It's hard to know how well you are doing (-)</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. All the staff here have similar expectations</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Staff and students work together as a team</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.9 Selection of Items for Version 2.

As a result of this analysis it was decided that the items comprising the cooperation/competitiveness scale would be removed as there were low correlations between the items and it was obvious that these items did not form a coherent scale. The assumption behind this scale was that cooperation and competition would form the two ends of a continuum of interactions between
students which may be fostered in a department (Slavin, 1983). The results suggest that this is not the case and it may have been more appropriate to form separate scales for each dimension. The aim for a questionnaire that could be administered in approximately ten minutes and consisting of 50-60 items would not allow for such an extension, hence the items were removed.

All other scales had satisfactory alpha values ranging from .67 to .79 which could be strengthened with the removal of weaker items identified through the correlation analysis. Items with low correlations with the scale were in some cases tried in other scales to determine if it was appropriate to retain them for trial with a larger sample. Items with a correlation with the designated scale of .30 or less were deleted. As a result of the frequency analysis and correlation of items within scales twenty three items were deleted leaving a total of fifty seven items in eight scales.
CHAPTER 6.

DEVELOPMENT AND TRIALING OF THE

COURSE EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE: VERSION 2.

Version 2 of the Course Experience Questionnaire was developed as a result of the analysis of the results of the trialing of Version 1. The eight scales which comprise Version 2 are listed with item numbers in Table 3.

Table 3.

Scales which formed the CEQ: Version 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>No of ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Teaching (explanation...)</td>
<td>GTE</td>
<td>9 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Teaching (availability &amp; study support)</td>
<td>GTA&amp;S</td>
<td>8 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Teaching (feedback)</td>
<td>GTF</td>
<td>6 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Goals, Standards &amp; Structure</td>
<td>CG&amp;S</td>
<td>8 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>WKL</td>
<td>6 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Academic Achievement</td>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>5 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>ASS</td>
<td>8 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on Student Independence &amp; Choice</td>
<td>INDEP</td>
<td>7 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of items = 57.

A complete listing of items in scales is presented in Appendix D. The items selected were then reordered in the questionnaire where necessary and renumbered accordingly for the presentation of
Version 2. (A copy of Version 2 is included in Appendix E.)


The aims of this trial were to further test the hypothesized scales for internal consistency and also to test whether the questionnaire could effectively discriminate between courses. A variety of courses was selected for trial. These included seven courses at a large metropolitan institution of higher education and another three courses from another training institution. The courses will be identified by codes in order to maintain the confidentiality of the information. The number of students in each course group who responded to the questionnaire is shown in Table 4 together with information about the faculties represented in the sample. The aim was not only to sample different courses but to spread these across faculties to gain a more diverse sample. Course groups will be referred to by ID (that is A to N) as shown in Table 4 from this point on in descriptions of results and in the discussion which follows.

Courses A to K represent a range of courses spread over five faculty groups. In the case of these courses the questionnaire was administered in normal lecture time with the cooperation of the lecturers involved. Courses L, M and N, are located in another institution and direct access to students could not be obtained during class time. For these courses the students were given the questionnaire at the end of a class and asked to return it to a designated office after completion. The mode of administration in this case explains the lower participation
rates for these groups.

Table 4.

Course samples used for the trial of the CBO: Version 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Full/Part</th>
<th>No.of</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>Enrol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F.T.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F.T.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F.T.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F.T.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F.T.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F.T.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F.T.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P.T.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F.T.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F.T.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F.T.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Humanities &amp;</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>F.T.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P.T.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P.T.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P.T.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participation was optional and the average participation rate for courses in which the CEQ was given during lecture times was 98%. (This represents the percentage of students present at the lecture who completed the questionnaire.) Students responded positively to the questionnaire and comments generally indicated that they were happy to have an opportunity to comment on their course. (Other comments will be referred to in the discussion section which will refer to particular course groups.)

Administration time with a short verbal introduction was approximately 15-20 minutes depending on the size of the group. This indicated that the final version of the questionnaire would need to be considerably shorter if it were to be completed in 15 minutes as planned.

6.2 Analysis of the results for the CEQ: Version 2.

Frequencies of responses for all items for the total group of respondents were calculated in order to identify any items with a skewed distribution and thus indicating poor discriminative ability. (Frequencies for all items in Version 2 are shown in Appendix F.)

A confirmatory factor analysis was completed. Using the criterion of extracting factors with eigenvalues larger than one, a 14 factor solution was indicated. A scree test, however, suggested a 6 factor solution and given the number of items and the hypothesized scales it was decided to complete the analysis
on that basis. Direct oblimin rotation with alpha extraction of factors was used. The results of the factor analysis are shown in table 5.

Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>GTE</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>GTE</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>GTE</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>GTE</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>GTE</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>GTE</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>GTE</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>GTE</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>GTE</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>GTAS</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>GTAS</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>GTAS</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>GTAS</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>GTAS</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>GTAS</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>GTAS</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>GTAS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>Factor 5</td>
<td>Factor 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>WKL</td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>WKL</td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>WKL</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>WKL</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>WKL</td>
<td></td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>WKL</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>CGS</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>CGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>CGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>CGS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>CGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>CGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>CGS</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>CGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>GTF</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>GTF</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>GTF</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>GTF</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>GTF</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>GTF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>Factor 5</td>
<td>Factor 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>INDEP</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>INDEP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>INDEP</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>INDEP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>INDEP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>INDEP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>INDEP</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>ASS</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>ASS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>ASS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>ASS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>ASS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>ASS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Variance

|         | 18.1% | 6.1% | 4.7% | 3.7% | 3.3% | 3.2% |

The results presented in Table 5 indicate that there is one major factor and five other factors accounting for smaller proportions of the variance. Items from the three scales, Good Teaching (Explanation), Good Teaching (Availability and Support) and Commitment to Academic Achievement load on factor 1, whilst there is a single factor which corresponds to each of the other scales as shown in table 6.
Table 6.

Relationship between the scales and factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Scales loading on the factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Good Teaching (Explanation...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good Teaching (Availability and Support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to Academic Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Clear Goals and Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Emphasis on Student Independence &amp; Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Good Teaching (Feedback)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis provides clear support for six scales. The loadings on factor 1 suggested a possible combination of the scales: good teaching (explanation), good teaching (availability and study support) and commitment to academic achievement. It was decided however to proceed with the correlational analysis of scales using the conceptual framework on which the scales were based to determine if separate scales were appropriate and if the maintenance of the separation of scales would provide extra discriminative information for the differences between courses. For a future development of a much shortened scale, this analysis suggests that the three scales could be combined and the number of items reduced accordingly. For the present analysis it was desirable to proceed with the three scales separated in order to develop an instrument with as much discriminative ability as
possible, especially as one of the anticipated uses of the questionnaire is as a diagnostic instrument.

Examining the loadings for individual items, it was evident that some items loaded on more than one factor and some items appeared to fit better with other scales. Item 46, which was originally placed in the Assessment scale, loaded on both the Good Teaching (Feedback) scales and Assessment scales. It was decided to continue the analysis with this item in the original scale with the possibility of possible deletion or movement between scales depending on the internal consistency analysis. Item 18 similarly loaded on two scales, Good Teaching (Feedback) and Assessment and it was decided to proceed with this item in the initial scale with the possibility of later deletion.

Other items (2, 9, 11, 31, 5, 56, 44, 47 and 54) were identified due to their loadings as items to be closely examined for the possibility of deletion at the next stage.

The results of the internal consistency analysis for Version 2 of the Course Experience Questionnaire are shown in Table 7. For each scale except Good Teaching (Explanation), two sets of the results are presented. The first shows the analysis with the inclusion of all items, the second included only those items with an item-scale correlation with the scale total of .30 or above.
Table 7.

**Results of the internal consistency analysis**

**CEO: Version 2.**

**Scale:**

**Clear goals, standards and structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It’s always easy here to know the standard of work expected of you.</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Students are given a clear idea of the aims and objectives of the course.</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. You usually have a clear idea of where you are going and what’s expected of you in this course.</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The goals of this course have never been made clear to me. (–)</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. It’s often hard to discover what’s expected of in this course.</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. The staff here make it clear right from the start what they expect from students.</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. On the whole, staff and students work together as a team to make this a good course.</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. It’s hard to know how well you are doing in the course. (–).</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{ALPHA} = 0.76 \quad 0.78
\]
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Table 7 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale:</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good teaching (feedback) (GTF)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teaching staff put a lot of time into commenting on students' work.</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I get valuable comments from staff on my written work.</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Teaching staff here normally give helpful feedback on how you are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going.</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. The staff provide a great deal of constructive criticism of our work.</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Teaching staff here never seem to have time to discuss students'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progress with them.</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The staff here seem more ready to students' mistakes than what they</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have done well(-).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALPHA** = .68    .73
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Table 7 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale:</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload (WKL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The workload here is too heavy (−)</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It seems to me that the syllabus tries</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to cover too many topics. (−)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. We are generally given enough time to</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understand the things we have to learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The sheer volume of work to be got</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through in this course means you can't</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehend it all thoroughly. (−)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. There's a lot of pressure on you as a</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The amount of assignment work means</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that it's hard to get down to following</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up material from lectures. (−)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{ALPHA = .73} \quad .75
\]
Table 7 (cont.)

Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis on student independence and choice</th>
<th>(INDEP.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. There is a real opportunity to choose the particular areas you want to study.  
   14. Students here seem to be given a lot of choice in the work they have to do.  
   17. Students have a great deal of choice over how they are going to learn on this course.  
   22. The course seems to encourage us to develop our own academic interests as far as possible.  
   39. There's a lot of choice in this course in the ways you are assessed.  
   53. We often discuss how we are going to learn things with our lecturers or tutors  
   56. Student's ideas and suggestions are used during class discussions.  

\[
\text{ALPHA} = \begin{array}{cc}
0.69 & 0.68 \\
\end{array}
\]
Table 7. (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale:</th>
<th>Assessment (ASS.)</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Staff here seem more interested in testing what we have memorised than what we have understood. (-)</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>To do well on this course all you really need is a good memory (-)</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>It would be possible to get through this course just by working hard around exam times. (-)</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Too many staff ask us questions just about facts. (-)</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Feedback on student work is usually provided ONLY in the form of marks and grades. (-)</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The assessment for this course encourages you to think carefully about what you have been learning.</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>This course requires you to show that you can link different themes and concepts together.</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>The criteria used by staff for marking (.18) assignments are always clearly specified.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALPHA: .63 .63
Table 7. (cont.)

Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Good teaching (explanation) (GTE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Most of the staff here show us how to understand the subject by asking the right questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>The staff are really enthusiastic about their subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Our lecturers go out of their way to help us make links between different topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Lecturers on this course seem to be good at pitching their teaching at the right level for us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Teaching staff work hard to make their subjects interesting to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Our lecturers are extremely good at explaining things to us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Most of the staff here seem to prepare their teaching very thoroughly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Lecturers here try to relate theoretical ideas to real life situations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALPHA = .79
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to academic achievement</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>The teaching staff of this course motivate students to do their best work.</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>This course really tries to get the best out of all its students.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>You are encouraged to develop your own particular skills and abilities to their full potential through this course.</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Lecturers here inspire you to do your best work.</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>This course is very challenging academically.</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALPHA=** .71 .73
Table 7.(cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale; Good teaching (availability and support)</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Staff here make a real effort to understand difficulties students may be having with their work.</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. If a lecturer in this course can’t help a student, he or she will suggest others who may be able to assist.</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Teaching staff always seem ready to give help and advice on approaches to study.</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Most of the staff try really hard to get to know students.</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. The staff seem genuinely interested in what students have to say.</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Most of the staff are receptive to suggestions from students for changes to their teaching methods.</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Lecturers here frequently give the impression that they haven’t anything to learn from students(—)</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. There are so many students doing this course that staff don’t have time to help everyone properly.</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{ALPHA} = .71 \quad .70
\]
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As a result of the factor analysis and the internal consistency analysis, 11 items were removed as previously indicated.

6.3 CEQ: Version 3

The removal of 11 items from Version 2 as indicated left 46 items. This shortened version of the questionnaire has been called the CEQ: Version 3. The analysis of the results for the course groups has been conducted using only the items which comprise the CEQ: Version 3. The scales and the number of items in each are shown in table 8.

Table 8.
CEQ: Version 3: Scales and item totals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>NO. OF ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Good Teaching (amount and quality of feedback)</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Workload</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Assessment</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Good Teaching (explanation, enthusiasm and interest)</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Commitment to Academic Achievement</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Good Teaching (availability &amp; study support)</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of items 46.

A copy of Version 3 of the Course Experience Questionnaire in a form ready for further trialling and use is included in Appendix 6.
6.4 Comparison of Course Group Means on the CEQ: Version 3.

Table 9 shows the between course differences in students' perceptions (mean and standard deviations) for the CEQ: Version 3. F-values (showing the size of differences between means) and values of $\eta^2$ (showing the proportion of variability accounted for by the different courses) are also provided. The results indicate that the CEQ: Version 3 can clearly discriminate between different courses.
Table 9.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>SCALE: ASSESSMENT</th>
<th></th>
<th>SCALE: WORKLOAD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>17.90</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>15.07</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>14.05</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>17.20</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>17.21</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 3.79, p < .0001, \eta^2 = 0.13 \]
\[ F = 8.68, p < .0001, \eta^2 = 0.25 \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>CASES</th>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>CASES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>16.09</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>14.59</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>18.30</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>17.22</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>17.44</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>17.96</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>15.14</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>19.62</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>16.47</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14.45</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15.07</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( F = 6.60, p < .0001, \eta^2 = 0.20 \)  \( F = 3.78, p < .0001, \eta^2 = 0.13 \)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>CASES</th>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>CASES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>23.96</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>23.44</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>24.63</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>23.22</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>26.82</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>24.06</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>21.85</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22.89</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>22.73</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>27.86</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>24.77</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>26.21</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 5.00, p < .0001, $\eta^2 = 0.16$

F = 5.36, p < .0001, $\eta^2 = 0.17$
Table 9. (cont.)

SCALE: GOOD TEACHING (EXPLANATION, ENTHUSIASM AND INTEREST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>CASES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>28.34</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>27.97</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>26.84</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>27.49</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>31.65</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>26.58</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>27.74</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>25.57</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>26.71</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>32.35</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>32.05</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>27.32</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>31.08</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>30.20</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>26.36</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCALE: CLEAR GOALS, STANDARDS AND STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>CASES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>20.76</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>21.89</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>22.46</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>21.65</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>18.27</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>20.63</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>17.68</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>22.30</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>19.37</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>22.85</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>22.75</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>21.29</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 4.92, P < .0001, \eta^2 = 0.16 \]

\[ F = 4.96, P < .0001, \eta^2 = 0.16 \]

Figures 2, 3, 4 and 5 provide graphical representations of the results presented in table 9. Comparisons of the results of
course groups on selected scales are presented. In each case the means have been recoded to the same scale on the Y-axis to permit direct comparison. Figure 2 shows the means for all course groups compared graphically on the three scales; Good Teaching (amount and quality of feedback), Good Teaching (availability and study support) and Good Teaching (explanation, enthusiasm and interest). The courses are ordered by increasing mean values on the good teaching (explanation, enthusiasm and interest) scale.

![Graph showing mean scale scores for different course groups](image)

**Figure 2.**

Comparison of the means for each of the course groups on the three good teaching scales. (T = mean for the total group)
Figure 3 provides a graphical comparison of the course means on the workload and assessment scales. The courses are ordered by increasing mean values on the assessment scale.

Figure 3.
Comparison of the means for each course group on the workload and assessment scales. (T = mean for the total group.)

Figure 4 is a graphical presentation of the course means on the commitment to academic achievement (inspiration/motivation to do best work) and the clear goals, standards and structure scales. The courses are ordered on the basis of increasing means on the academic achievement scale.
Figure 4.

Comparison of the course group means on the academic achievement and clear goals, standards and structure scales.

(T = the mean for the total group).

Figure 5 provides a graphical comparison of the course groups I, J and H. The means are compared on each of the eight (8) scales of the CEQ.
6.5 Relationships between scales.

Pearson's R correlation coefficient was used to examine the relationships between the scales. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 10.
### Table 10.

**Correlations between scales. (N= 386)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>WKL</th>
<th>GTF</th>
<th>ASS</th>
<th>GTE</th>
<th>CGS</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>INDEP</th>
<th>GTAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WKL</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Workload (WKL) scale correlated negatively with each of the other seven scales and the strongest correlations were between the three Good Teaching scales (GTF, GTE, GTAS) and the Commitment to Academic Achievement scale (AC). As the three Good Teaching scales are measuring similar concepts, the high correlations were anticipated. These results will be discussed in more depth in relation to further developments of the questionnaire.
CHAPTER 7.

DISCUSSION AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

This discussion will focus on the results obtained for individual course groups and comparison of these with information known from other sources about the courses. The relationships between the scales will also be discussed together with possible further developments of the scales. The evidence of concurrent validity will be provided by discussing the results for course groups in relation to information, gained from interviews with students and teaching staff and written information provided by each course for prospective students. Possible further developments of the questionnaire and associated research which would facilitate and enhance its usefulness as an evaluation instrument are also discussed. Other factors which may have influenced the results and may be significant considerations in the future utilization of the Course Experience Questionnaire as a performance indicator are also discussed.

7.1 Comparison of Different Course Groups.

When examining the results for the various course groups it is evident that there is a small group of courses that stand out in that they have results which fall at the extremities of the scales, whilst the majority of courses fall within the mid-range for most of the scales. It is impractical to discuss in detail every course included in this study, so a decision has been made
to focus on those courses for which the results are clearly
distinctive and to discuss more generally the middle range of
courses in relation to other information known about the courses.

7.1.1 Courses I and J

On most scales, the mean scores for courses I and J are
distinctively different from those of other courses. This is
particularly evident in figures 2, 3, 4 and 5. On five of the
eight scales these courses had the highest mean scores. These
were: good teaching (explanation, enthusiasm and interest), good
teaching (availability and study support), emphasis on student
independence and choice, assessment, and commitment to academic
achievement. For two scales, clear goals, standards and
structures and good teaching (feedback), the course groups I and
J had mean scores in the highest four course groups and they had
the lowest mean scores for the workload scale. Taken together,
these results suggest that the students in these courses
experience relatively good teaching, feel that they have a
relatively high degree of freedom of choice in learning and
assessment methods, perceive that the assessment methods used
encourage integration and understanding of material rather than
rote learning, experience academic staff as encouraging
excellence and generally providing clear goals and standards,
and perceive their workload to be low in comparison to the
other course groups.
Discussions with teaching staff and students and reference to written information about these courses confirmed that they are distinctive in their operation in a number of key aspects. Of particular interest are the approaches taken to selection and assessment. Both courses operate within an Architecture Faculty and both are relatively new, being less than 10 years since inception. Both courses have relatively small intakes of students, around 35 per year, and their selection methods include interviews. Students applying for these courses are given an outline of the course goals during the interview. The interview is regarded as a partial self selection process with students being encouraged to consider the course goals, the ways in which the courses are conducted and whether they are suited, before proceeding with their application. In the case of course I, later year students are included on the interview panel for selection of first year students.

7.1.2 Assessment and Workload in Courses I and J.

The primary mode of assessment for the courses I and J, is continuous and students are expected from the beginning of the courses to work on longer term projects extending over one or two semesters. Group work forms a major part of the assessment particularly in course J, where 50% of the assessment requires group reports and group participation. There are no formal examinations in either case and students are able to negotiate with lecturers with regard to assessment topics and approaches.
Lecturers in course I see themselves as a relatively cohesive team having similar philosophies with regard to the goals of the course. However, staff members are free to conduct their particular subjects in their own ways and to assess them in whatever ways they choose. There is little coordination of workload between lecturers, but students are able to negotiate with lecturers over deadlines and thus achieve more control over their workloads. This may be facilitated by the small numbers in each course and the consequent individual knowledge of each student by the lecturing staff. The students' perception of the workload as lower than that perceived by students in other courses may result from the greater possibility of negotiating with lecturers over deadlines or it may be related to the fact that there is choice in assessment. Therefore, students undertake assignments of their choice and as such may not regard these as onerously as they may were the assignments imposed with no choice.

Both courses I and J have active staff-student consultative committees, which are designed to give students at every year level of the course an opportunity at regular intervals (monthly) to raise with staff any concerns and issues with regard to the course on which the head of the department is expected to act.

7.1.3 Course H.

In contrast with courses I and J, students in course H experienced it as having a heavy workload, and perceive that they have little choice in assessment and methods of learning (see
figure 5). Students in course H experience less appropriate feedback, availability and study support from teaching staff, and judged the level of explanation, enthusiasm and interest shown by staff members to be less also. The results suggested too that they experience comparatively low commitment by academic staff to academic excellence. Prior to the students completing the CEQ, the staff member coordinating the student group indicated that this was a 'particularly unhappy group of students' who were very discontented with the course. This observation certainly seems borne out by the students' responses.

Course H operates within an Engineering Faculty and is a traditional engineering discipline. In line with this, it has a high number of contact hours (24-27 per week) and students sit a minimum of 6-8 examinations per semester and more that 50% of the assessment is based on examinations. In some cases the examinations form 90% of the assessment. The intake could be regarded as medium sized (approximately 70 per year). Students complete weekly laboratory reports and assignments and feel that they have little time for ongoing consolidation of their learning due to the demand to hand in assignments regularly, these being often time consuming and not always regarded as relating to the learning in lectures. Students also had three new lecturers in the course whom they felt were difficult to understand in class and less approachable than their coordinator and other members of staff.

7.1.4 Courses L, N and N.
7.1.4 Courses L, N and N.

In examining the results for other courses it is interesting to note the variation between the perceptions of students of the three courses L, M and N that are each different stages of the same course conducted in a medical institution. The variability in the results may be partly due to the low participation rates for these groups and the consequent possibility of an unrepresentative sample. The responses may represent only students who held strong feelings about their courses and were thus motivated to respond and may not form a representative sample. This raises a relevant point in the use of an instrument such as this for evaluation purposes. Samples of students from any course group should be representative and where possible form a large percentage of the total enrolment at the time of administration. This means that direct administration in lecture groups may provide the best opportunity for obtaining a representative sample and mail outs may be less appropriate due to the relatively low and often selective nature of returns.

7.2 Discipline based difference between courses.

It is apparent from these results that there may be differences between courses which may be related to the major discipline of study, as suggested by previous research (Biglan, 1973; Neumann & Neumann, 1985; Roe, 1953; Gaff & Wilson, 1971). The nature of this study precludes direct comparison with previous findings. However, it is possible to discuss the results generally with
reference to discipline based differences. Biglan (1973) in his study of different disciplines discriminated between the categories of definition of paradigm structure (hard/soft), orientation toward application (applied/pure) and orientation to living organisms (living/non-living). According to these criteria, courses I and J would be classified as soft, applied, and being concerned with living as opposed to non-living material. Course H, in content would be classified as hard, applied, and dealing with non-living material. Previous research by Marsh (1987) has suggested that the teaching quality of a course would be more negatively rated in 'hard' disciplines than 'soft' disciplines. Other research in this area (Feldman, 1976) has suggested that courses and teaching in the areas of humanities and arts would be more positively rated than those in the maths, engineering and business areas. This discipline difference may account for part of the wide variation between courses I, J and H as described but does not explain the variation in results for other courses.

Course C, for instance, is an applied science course and may be regarded as being in a discipline area which is hard, pure, and non-living. This course, however, is perceived by its students to be relatively high on all three of the good teaching scales and also to have a comparatively high emphasis on student independence and choice. In discussions, staff of this course indicated that they have been concerned in past years with a high drop-out rate amongst first year students and are making an
effort to integrate students more by teaching mainly in small
tutorial groups and practical classes rather than in large
lecture groups. This suggests that it is the style of teaching
rather than the discipline being taught that may be significant
in this case.

Examination of the results for the group of other courses
operating under the Applied Science Faculty provides another
opportunity to examine the discipline related hypothesis. The
results for these six courses vary widely on each scale except
for the assessment scale. Courses A, A1 and B are perceived to
require more rote type learning and courses D, E and C are
perceived to require more understanding through their assessment
methods. This is interesting as courses A, A1 and B according to
Biglan's (1973) criteria would be classified as applied, soft,
and living in orientation whilst courses C, D and E would be
classified as pure, hard, and non-living. The apparent
complexity of the relationships between discipline related
factors and course evaluations reinforces the need to use a
diverse range of performance indicators in the comparison of
courses and the establishment of norms for different discipline
groups.

The area of discipline based differences in courses and their
perceptions by students is an area requiring further research.
There is a need to collect large amounts of data in each
discipline in order to establish norms for each group. The extent
of discipline based differences as opposed to individual course
differences could then be determined. Ideally, courses should be
compared with similar courses in other institutions, but the
establishment of discipline based norms would make other
comparisons between courses possible.

7.3 Other factors Affecting Course Experience and Perceptions

It is possible that other factors, such as size of the student
intake and staff-student ratios may affect students' perceptions
of other aspects of courses, such as availability of teaching
staff. Previous research in this area has produced a variety of
results. Gaff et al. (1976) found no relationship between
students' perceptions of courses and staff-student ratios or the
sizes of the classes. Marsh (1987) reviewed differences in staff
ratings in relation to class sizes and found that students in
small (less than 25 students) or very large classes (more than
100 students) were more likely to have more positive perceptions
of lecturing. In more recent research, Wulff, Abbott and
Nyquist (1989) found exactly the opposite result in an examination
of students' experience of particular courses and class size.
Reference to Table 4 (p. 42) shows that all courses included in
this sample have enrolments of between 14 and 58 students and
thus all fall within the mid range as described by Marsh (1987),
and ordering them according to size of the groups does not
provide any significant pattern of results.

Course size, staff-student ratios, the orientation of departments
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to teaching or research and a range of other factors, as explored by Harnett and Centra (1977) in relation to departmental effectiveness, could be investigated through the collection of a more representative and larger sample using the Course Experience Questionnaire. However, the results may indicate, as Harnett and Centra (1977) found, that department size, staff-student ratio, and faculty interest in teaching do not correlate with effectiveness measured in terms of student performance. If so, the only obvious suggestion could be that student perceptions may be more important in explaining effectiveness than any of the other factors, and that these perceptions are independent of the other factors.

7.4 Relationships between scales.

The correlations between scales as shown in table 10 indicate that the Workload scale is negatively correlated with the other seven scales. High scores on this scale indicate a relatively high workload as perceived by students and a negative correlation with the other scales would be anticipated. The three good teaching scales and the Commitment to Academic Achievement scale are all strongly positively correlated. This is in line with the results of the factor analysis in which three of these scales loaded principally on the first factor and the fourth had secondary loadings on the same factor. Although these correlations are positive and relatively strong they do reaffirm that the three good teaching scales are measuring highly related
but different concepts and thus this reinforces the decision to maintain the eight separate scales for Version 3 of the questionnaire.

High positive correlations also exist between the Good Teaching (explanation) scale, the Clear Goals, Standards and Structure scale and the Emphasis on Student Independence and Choice scales. This suggests that courses which students experience as having good teaching in terms of explanation are more likely to have clear and articulated goals and standards and are more likely to foster student independence and choice.

7.5 Further Research Required.

In addition to the areas already mentioned, further trialing of the questionnaire would also involve examination of the retest reliability for individual course groups and trials that would check for the effects of administration at different stages during the academic year. Marsh (1987) has thoroughly documented the possible effects of administration of student questionnaires immediately after assessment and these effects would require careful checking. Longitudinal studies of courses examining the responses of different cohorts of students may also be relevant although difficult in terms of the control of variables given the changes in staffing and courses which one may anticipate from year to year.
7.6 Utilizing the CEQ as a Performance Indicator.

There are several issues and limitations which must be taken into account in the future use of the Course Experience Questionnaire as a performance indicator.

7.6.1 Further Development

If the Course Experience Questionnaire is to be used as part of a package of performance indicators, a further reduction in the number of items in order to reduce administration and scoring time may be required. A shortened version could be developed by further testing of Version 3 on a broader tertiary population in order to establish the defining items on each scale and isolate weaker items that may be deleted. Although some reduction in the number of scales through the combination of scales would be possible and would allow a further reduction in length, there is a risk that this may reduce the usefulness and overall meaningfulness of the results obtained. As indicated in the discussion of the general development of the questionnaire for further use, there is a need for further extensive validation on large numbers of course groups and the establishment of norms for the major discipline groupings of courses to enable appropriate comparison of courses. The effects of other variables already mentioned such as course enrolment size, staff-student ratios and the timing and manner of administration will also require further research.
7.6.2 Level of Aggregation.

In general, performance indicators in Australia are intended by the Commonwealth Government to be applied to Academic Organizational Units (A.O.U.s) as the aggregate level for comparison rather than individual courses. In any institution a number of courses may be offered under one A.O.U. and this does not pose a major problem in the utilization of the Course Experience Questionnaire along with other performance indicators. There is, however, a problem when courses fall under two or more A.O.U.s. This may be the case when a course has a large number of service subjects offered by other A.O.U.s not under the direct control of the home department. Some of the course groups utilized in this study had one or two service subjects provided through other departments, with the majority of subjects usually (six to eight) provided through the home department. Only one course, course K, had more than 30% of subjects provided by service departments. When completing the questionnaire, students in this group commented particularly on the difficulties that they experienced in responding to items which comprised the three good teaching scales.

7.6.3 Application of the Results of Performance Indicators.

The information obtained from performance indicators can be utilized in a number of ways. Crude resource allocation, whereby courses which have the highest scores get the most resources as a reward or those with the lowest scores get extra resources to
enable them to overcome weaknesses, is one such application. In practice this would involve minimal discrimination of what the results actually mean in terms of the operation of courses. If this were the case, it would be possible over time that course leaders could choose to orientate courses to achieve scores on performance indicators in order to obtain more resources regardless of the actual changes to the learning context. If a measure such as the CEQ has a number of separate scales and each represents a specific feature of the learning context which can be identified and improved then this process of aiming to improve specific areas would be appropriate. However utilizing a single score from such a measure provides no real guidance on appropriate areas for attention.

In his review of student evaluations in higher education, Marsh (1987) noted that the instruments used were usually quite sound and provided a range of useful information which unfortunately was distorted in the hands of administrators and political bodies seeking a single score. He reported that subscores were often combined to provide an often meaningless aggregate score for purposes of expediency. There is obviously the risk that this process could be applied to the Course Experience Questionnaire, the results of which, if simplified into a single score, would be relatively meaningless. A more appropriate utilization of the results would involve examination of scale scores to determine areas of specific weakness and strength and the provision of appropriate feedback and advice to the unit concerned.
7.7 Conclusion

The Course Experience Questionnaire provides a means of describing certain important and consistent differences in the ways in which students perceive courses at the tertiary level. The questionnaire has been developed to a stage where it can be utilized for further research, particularly in the area of discipline based differences in students' perceptions of courses. Before this instrument can be used as a performance indicator there is a need for further extensive testing on a number of the same courses offered in different institutions. This would allow further testing of the rigor of the eight scales and also the establishment of normative data which would provide a basis for future comparisons of courses.

In the present form the instrument could be utilized by departments during internal reviews for diagnostic purposes. In this case, the questionnaire results might be combined with other data to give the department feedback on how its students are experiencing the course. Departments may choose to examine the responses to some individual items as well as the overall scales.

Further research using the Course Experience Questionnaire could involve the comparison of student perception of courses with student approaches to learning and also student outcomes in terms of performance, as has been carried out by Ramsden (1979) and more recently by Entwistle and Tait (in press) in England. This would
involve the concurrent administration of a student approaches to learning questionnaire together with the CEQ and the possible correlation with student assessment results. With further trialing and modification, the Course Experience Questionnaire can become a well validated and reliable instrument which may play a significant role in the establishment of clear and useful information about the operation of courses from the students' perspective.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

Source and Scale Identification of Items for the CEQ: Version 1.
**CEQ SCALES**  
Pilot Study, March 1989  
Version 1

**List of scales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Description</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good teaching (explanation and interest)</td>
<td>GTE 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good teaching (availability and study support)</td>
<td>GTAS 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good teaching (quality of feedback)</td>
<td>GTF 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation/competitiveness</td>
<td>CC 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear goals, standards and structure</td>
<td>CGS 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate workload</td>
<td>WKL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to academic achievement</td>
<td>AC 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate assessment</td>
<td>ASS 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on student independence + choice</td>
<td>INDEP 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Origin of Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Origin of Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPQ</td>
<td>Course Perception Questionnaire (RAMSDEN, 1981)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ</td>
<td>School Experiences Questionnaire (RAMSDEN, MARTIN + BOWDEN, 1981)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESHE</td>
<td>Experiences of studying and higher education (ENTWISTLE + TAIT, 1989)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Student on this course frequently discuss their work with each other  

26. One of the main aims of this course is to prepare students for intense competition in future work areas (−)  

28. A lot of students on this course are friends of mine  

33. This course seems to foster a friendly climate that helps students get to know one another  

46. This course seems to operate on the principle of 'survival of the fittest' (−)  

48. To do well in this course, students have to work cooperatively with each other  

75. You are always under pressure to do better than other students on this course (−)  

7 items
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Origin of Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The teaching staff set a high standard in what they expect from us</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The teaching staff here motivate students to do their best work</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>This course really tries to get the best out of all its students</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>You are encouraged to develop your own particular skills and abilities to their full potential through this course</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Lecturers here inspire you to do your very best work</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>This course is very challenging academically</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6 items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The course has many assignments or projects all due at the one time</td>
<td>WKL</td>
<td>CPQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The workload here is too heavy</td>
<td>WKL</td>
<td>CPQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>It seems to me that the syllabus tries to cover too many topics</td>
<td>WKL</td>
<td>CPQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>We are generally given enough time to understand the things we have to learn (-)</td>
<td>WKL</td>
<td>ESHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>The sheer volume of work to be got through in this course means you can't comprehend it all thoroughly</td>
<td>WKL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>The amount of assignment work means that it's hard to get down to following up material from lectures</td>
<td>WKL</td>
<td>CPQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>There's a lot of pressure on you as a student here</td>
<td>WKL</td>
<td>CPQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>The course structure encourages you to spread your academic efforts throughout the year (-)</td>
<td>WKL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8 items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. The assessment for this course encourages you to think carefully about what you have been learning

11. This course requires you to show that you can link different themes and concepts together

18. Staff here seem more interested in testing what we have memorized than what we have understood (-)

34. To do well on this course all you really need is a good memory (-)

39. It would be possible to get through this course just by working hard around exam times (-)

45. The criteria used by staff for marking assignments are always clearly specified

47. Too many staff ask us questions just about facts (-)

52. You have to really understand the subject matter if you want to do well in this course

61. Feedback on student work is usually provided ONLY in the form of marks and grades (-)

9 items

10. Students here seem to be given a lot of choice in the work they have to do

14. There is a real opportunity to choose the particular areas you want to study

17. As the course progresses, you are gradually encouraged to study more and more independently

19. Student have a great deal of choice over how they are going to learn in this course
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>The course seems to encourage us to develop our own academic interests as far as possible</td>
<td>INDEP</td>
<td>CPQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Every student in this course has to study the same things in the same way (-)</td>
<td>INDEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>There's a lot of choice in this course in the ways you are assessed</td>
<td>INDEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>This course gives you a chance to use methods of study which suit your own way of learning</td>
<td>INDEP</td>
<td>CPQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>We often discuss how we are going to learn things with our lecturers or tutors</td>
<td>INDEP</td>
<td>SEQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Students' ideas and suggestions are used during class discussions</td>
<td>INDEP</td>
<td>SEQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Teaching staff put a lot of effort into commenting on students' work</td>
<td>GTF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Teaching staff here make too many negative comments on students' work (-)</td>
<td>GTF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I get valuable comments from staff on my written work</td>
<td>GTF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Teaching staff here normally give helpful feedback on how you are going</td>
<td>GTF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>The staff here seem more ready to see students' mistakes than what they have done well (-)</td>
<td>GTF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>The staff provide a great deal of constructive criticism of our work</td>
<td>GTF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Teaching staff here never seem to have time to discuss students' progress with them (-)</td>
<td>GTF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Staff here make a real effort to understand difficulties students may be having with their work
5. If a lecturer in this course can't help a student, he or she will suggest others who may be able to assist
9. More of the staff try really hard to get to know students
24. Lecturers here frequently give the impression that they haven't anything to learn from students (-)
27. Teaching staff always seem ready to give help and advice on approaches to studying
29. It is often difficult to make contact with staff of this course outside class time (-)
57. Most of the staff are receptive to suggestions from students for changes to their teaching methods
60. Course staff seem genuinely interested in what students have to say
62. There are so many students doing this course that staff don't have time to help everyone properly(-)
72. The staff talk to you about their subjects out of class time

10 items

16. There are few opportunities in this course to relate theory to practice(-)
23. Most of the staff here show us how to understand the subject by asking the right questions
31. The staff are really enthusiastic about their subjects
32. Too many lecturers here wander off the point so we can't follow them(-)
35. Our lecturers go out of their way to help us make links between different topics

43. Lecturers on this course seem to be good at pitching their teaching at the right level for us

49. Teaching staff here work hard to make their subjects interesting to students

66. Our lecturers are extremely good at explaining things to us

67. Lecturers here try to relate theoretical ideas to real life situations

77. Most of the staff here seem to prepare their teaching very thoroughly

10 items

15. Students are given a clear idea of the aims and objectives of this course

22. It often seems that lecturers from different parts of this course don't communicate very much(-)

38. There is a lot of guidance from staff on how to plan your workload

42. The goals of this course have never been made clear to me(-)

50. It's often hard to discover what's expected of you in this course(-)

53. You usually have a clear idea of where you're going and what's expected of you in this course

58. It's always easy here to know the standard of work expected of you

63. The only way to judge how you are going on this course is to compare your marks with other students(-)

64. Useful written information is provide on
how to go about study and assignment work

69. The staff here make it clear right from the start what they expect from students

71. It's hard to know how well you're doing in the course(-)

74. All the staff here have similar expectations of students

80. On the whole, staff and students work together as a team to make this a good course

13 items
APPENDIX B

COURSE EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect students' opinions of teaching and assessment in particular courses and subjects.

You are asked to refer your answers to the following specific course or subject:

Please keep this course or subject in mind throughout. It is most important that you answer as honestly as you can. The items in the questionnaire have been specially chosen to reflect aspects of teaching and courses that are generally important across a wide range of subjects. Try to give a definite answer to every question.

Your responses are strictly confidential and will not be seen by members of staff.

HOW TO ANSWER

Simply circle the number beside each statement that most accurately reflects your view.

- 1 means Strongly agree
- 2 means Agree with reservations
- 3 means Not sure (only use this category if the item doesn’t apply to your course)
- 4 means Disagree with reservations
- 5 means Strongly disagree

Remember to relate your answers to this particular course or subject and no other. Now please answer all the following questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Students on this course frequently discuss their work with each other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The teaching staff set a high standard in what they expect from us</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Staff here make a real effort to understand difficulties students may be having with their work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The course has many assignments or projects all due at the one time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>If a lecturer in this course can’t help a student, he or she will suggest others who may be able to assist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The workload here is too heavy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teaching staff put a lot of time into commenting on students' work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The assessment for this course encourages you to think carefully about what you have been learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Most of the staff try really hard to get to know students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Students here seem to be given a lot of choice in the work they have to do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. This course requires you to show that you can link different themes and concepts together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It seems to me that the syllabus tries to cover too many topics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Teaching staff here make too many negative comments on students' work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. There is a real opportunity to choose the particular areas you want to study</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Students are given a clear idea of the aims and objectives of this course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. There are few opportunities in this course to relate theory to practice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. As the course progresses, you are gradually encouraged to study more and more independently</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Staff here seem more interested in testing what we have memorised that what we have understood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Students have a great deal of choice over how they are going to learn in this course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The teaching staff here motivate students to do their best work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. We are generally given enough time to understand the things we have to learn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It often seems that lecturers from different parts of this course don’t communicate very much</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Most of the staff here show us how to understand their subjects by asking the right questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Lecturers here frequently give the impression that they haven’t anything to learn from students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The course seems to encourage us to develop our own academic interests as far as possible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. One of the main aims of this course is to prepare students for intense competition in future work areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Teaching staff always seem ready to give help and advice on approaches to studying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. A lot of students on this course are friends of mine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. It is often difficult to make contact with staff of this course outside class time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The sheer volume of work to be got through in this course means you can’t comprehend it all thoroughly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The staff are really enthusiastic about their subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Too many lecturers here wander off the point so we can’t follow them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. This course seems to foster a friendly climate that helps students get to know one another</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. To do well on this course all you really need is a good memory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Our lecturers go out of their way to help us make links between different topics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I get valuable comments from staff on my written work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Every student in this course has to study the same things in the same way</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. There is a lot of guidance from staff on how to plan your workload</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. It would be possible to get through this course just by working hard around exam times</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. The amount of assignment work means that it’s hard to get down to following up material from lectures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Teaching staff here normally give helpful feedback on how you are going</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. The goals of this course have never been made clear to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Lecturers on this course seem to be good at pitching their teaching at the right level for us</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. There’s a lot of pressure on you as a student here</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. The criteria used by staff for marking assignments are always clearly specified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. This course seems to operate on the principle of 'survival of the fittest'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Too many staff ask us questions just about facts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. To do well in this course, students have to work cooperatively with each other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Teaching staff here work hard to make their subjects interesting to students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. It’s often hard to discover what’s expected of you in this course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. The course structure encourages you to spread your academic efforts throughout the year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. You have to really understand the subject matter if you want to do well in this course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>You usually have a clear idea of where you’re going and what’s expected of you in this course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>The staff here seem more ready to see students’ mistakes than what they have done well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>There’s a lot of choice in this course in the ways you are assessed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>The staff provide a great deal of constructive criticism of our work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Most of the staff are receptive to suggestions from students for changes to their teaching methods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>It’s always easy here to know the standard of work expected of you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>This course really tries to get the best out of all its students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Course staff seem genuinely interested in what students have to say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Feedback on student work is usually provided ONLY in the form of marks and grades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>There are so many students doing this course that staff don’t have time to help everyone properly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>The only way to judge how your are going on this course is to compare your marks with other students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Useful written information is provided on how to go about study and assignment work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>This course gives you a chance to use methods of study which suit your own way of learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Our lecturers are extremely good at explaining things to us</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Lecturers here try to relate theoretical ideas to real life situations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. You are encouraged to develop your own particular skills and abilities to their full potential through this course</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. The staff here make it clear right from the start what they expect from students</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Lecturers here inspire you to do your very best work</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. It's hard to know how well you're doing in the course</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. The staff talk to you about their subjects out of class time</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. This course is very challenging academically</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. All the staff here have similar expectations of students</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. You are always under pressure to do better than other students on this course</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. We often discuss how we are going to learn things with our lecturers or tutors</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Most of the staff here seem to prepare their teaching very thoroughly</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Students' ideas and suggestions are used during class discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Teaching staff here never seem to have time to discuss students' progress with them</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. On the whole, staff and students work together as a team to make this a good course</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX C

Frequencies for all items in the CEQ: Version 1.
COURSE EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect students' opinions of teaching and assessment in particular courses and subjects.

You are asked to refer your answers to the following specific course or subject:

Please keep this course or subject in mind throughout. It is most important that you answer as honestly as you can. The items in the questionnaire have been specially chosen to reflect aspects of teaching and courses that are generally important across a wide range of subjects. Try to give a definite answer to every question.

Your responses are strictly confidential and will not be seen by members of staff.

HOW TO ANSWER

Simply circle the number beside each statement that most accurately reflects your view.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>means</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>means</td>
<td>Agree with reservations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>means</td>
<td>Not sure (only use this category if the item doesn't apply to your course)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>means</td>
<td>Disagree with reservations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>means</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remember to relate your answers to this particular course or subject and no other.

Now please answer all the following questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students on this course frequently discuss their work with each other</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The teaching staff set a high standard in what they expect from us</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staff here make a real effort to understand difficulties students may be having with their work</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The course has many assignments or projects all due at the one time</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If a lecturer in this course can't help a student, he or she will suggest others who may be able to assist</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. We are generally given enough time to understand the things we have to learn</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It often seems that lecturers from different parts of this course don't communicate very much</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Most of the staff here show us how to understand their subjects by asking the right questions</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Lecturers here frequently give the impression that they haven't anything to learn from students</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The course seems to encourage us to develop our own academic interests as far as possible</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. One of the main aims of this course is to prepare students for intense competition in future work areas</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Teaching staff always seem ready to give help and advice on approaches to studying</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. A lot of students on this course are friends of mine</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. It is often difficult to make contact with staff of this course outside class time</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The sheer volume of work to be got through in this course means you can't comprehend it all thoroughly</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The staff are really enthusiastic about their subjects</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Too many lecturers here wander off the point so we can't follow them</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. This course seems to foster a friendly climate that helps students get to know one another</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. To do well on this course all you really need is a good memory</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Our lecturers go out of their way to help us make links between different topics</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I get valuable comments from staff on my written work</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Every student in this course has to study the same things in the same way</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. There is a lot of guidance from staff on how to plan your workload</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. It would be possible to get through this course just by working hard around exam times</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. The amount of assignment work means that it’s hard to get down to following up material from lectures</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Teaching staff here normally give helpful feedback on how you are going</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. The goals of this course have never been made clear to me</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Lecturers on this course seem to be good at pitching their teaching at the right level for us</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. There’s a lot of pressure on you as a student here</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. The criteria used by staff for marking assignments are always clearly specified</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. This course seems to operate on the principle of ‘survival of the fittest’</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Too many staff ask us questions just about facts</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. To do well in this course, students have to work cooperatively with each other</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Teaching staff here work hard to make their subjects interesting to students</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. It’s often hard to discover what’s expected of you in this course</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. The course structure encourages you to spread your academic efforts throughout the year</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. You have to really understand the subject matter if you want to do well in this course</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
53. You usually have a clear idea of where you’re going and what’s expected of you in this course

54. The staff here seem more ready to see students’ mistakes than what they have done well

55. There’s a lot of choice in this course in the ways you are assessed

56. The staff provide a great deal of constructive criticism of our work

57. Most of the staff are receptive to suggestions from students for changes to their teaching methods

58. It’s always easy here to know the standard of work expected of you

59. This course really tries to get the best out of all its students

60. Course staff seem genuinely interested in what students have to say

61. Feedback on student work is usually provided ONLY in the form of marks and grades

62. There are so many students doing this course that staff don’t have time to help everyone properly

63. The only way to judge how your are going on this course is to compare your marks with other students

64. Useful written information is provided on how to go about study and assignment work

65. This course gives you a chance to use methods of study which suit your own way of learning

66. Our lecturers are extremely good at explaining things to us

67. Lecturers here try to relate theoretical ideas to real life situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68. You are encouraged to develop your own particular skills and abilities to their full potential through this course</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. The staff here make it clear right from the start what they expect from students</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Lecturers here inspire you to do your very best work</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. It’s hard to know how well you’re doing in the course</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. The staff talk to you about their subjects out of class time</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. This course is very challenging academically</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. All the staff here have similar expectations of students</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. You are always under pressure to do better than other students on this course</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. We often discuss how we are going to learn things with our lecturers or tutors</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Most of the staff here seem to prepare their teaching very thoroughly</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Students’ ideas and suggestions are used during class discussions</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Teaching staff here never seem to have time to discuss students’ progress with them</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. On the whole, staff and students work together as a team to make this a good course</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX D

CEQ SCALES
Pilot Study, June 1989
Version 2

List of Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good teaching (explanation, enthusiasm and interest)</td>
<td>GTE 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good teaching (availability and study support)</td>
<td>GTAS 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good teaching (amount and quality of feedback on students' work)</td>
<td>GTF 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear goals, standards and structure</td>
<td>CGS 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate workload</td>
<td>WKL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to academic achievement (inspiration/motivation to best work)</td>
<td>AC 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate assessment</td>
<td>ASS 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on student independence + choice</td>
<td>INDEP 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Origin of Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPQ</td>
<td>Course Perception Questionnaire</td>
<td>(RAMSDEN, 1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ</td>
<td>School Experiences Questionnaire</td>
<td>(RAMSDEN, MARTIN + BOWDEN, 1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESHE</td>
<td>Experiences of studying and higher education</td>
<td>(ENTWISTLE + TAIT, 1989)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. The teaching staff here motivate students to do their best work          AC
43. This course really tries to get the best out of all its students          AC
50. You are encouraged to develop your own particular skills and abilities to their full potential through this course AC
52. Lecturers here inspire you to do your very best work                      AC
9. This course is very challenging academically                                AC

5 items
4. The workload here is too heavy

12. It seems to me that the syllabus tries to cover too many topics

20. We are generally given enough time to understand the things we have to learn (-)

24. The sheer volume of work to be got through in this course means you can't comprehend it all thoroughly

31. The amount of assignment work means that it's hard to get down to following up material from lectures

35. There's a lot of pressure on you as a student here

6 items

5. The assessment for this course encourages you to think carefully about what you have been learning

11. This course requires you to show that you can link different themes and concepts together

18. Staff here seem more interested in testing what we have memorized that what we have understood (-)

27. To do well on this course all you really need is a good memory (-)

30. It would be possible to get through this course just by working hard around exam times (-)

44. The criteria used by staff for marking assignments are always clearly specified

36. Too many staff ask us questions just about facts (-)

46. Feedback on student work is usually provided ONLY in the form of marks and grades(-)
8 items

14. Students here seem to be given a lot of choice in the work they have to do
17. Student have a great deal of choice over how they are going to learn in this course
7. There is a real opportunity to choose the particular areas you want to study
22. The course seems to encourage us to develop our own academic interests as far as possible
39. There's a lot of choice in this course in the ways you are assessed
53. We often discuss how we are going to learn things with our lecturers or tutors
56. Students' ideas and suggestions are used during class discussions

7 items

10. Teaching staff put a lot of time into commenting on students' work
29. I get valuable comments from staff on my written work
32. Teaching staff here normally give helpful feedback on how you are going
38. The staff here seem more ready to see students' mistakes than what they have done well (-)
40. The staff provide a great deal of constructive criticism of our work
57. Teaching staff here never seem to have time to discuss students' progress with them (-)

6 items
6. Staff here make a real effort to understand difficulties students may be having with their work

8. If a lecturer in this course can't help a student, he or she will suggest others who may be able to assist

3. More of the staff try really hard to get to know students

18. Lecturers here frequently give the impression that they haven't anything to learn from students (-)

23. Teaching staff always seem ready to give help and advice on approaches to studying

41. Most of the staff are receptive to suggestions from students for changes to their teaching methods

45. The staff seem genuinely interested in what students have to say

47. There are so many students doing this course that staff don't have time to help everyone properly(-)

8 items

21. Most of the staff here show us how to understand the subject by asking the right questions

25. The staff are really enthusiastic about their subjects

28. Our lecturers go out of their way to help us make links between different topics

34. Lecturers on this course seem to be good at pitching their teaching at the right level for us

37. Teaching staff here work hard to make their subjects interesting to students

48. Our lecturers are extremely good at
explaining things to us

49. Lecturers here try to relate theoretical ideas to real life situations

55. Most of the staff here seem to prepare their teaching very thoroughly

15. Lecturers often seem to go too fast

9 items

16. Students are given a clear idea of the aims and objectives of this course

33. The goals of this course have never been made clear to me(-)

42. It's often hard to discover what's expected of you in this course(-)

26. You usually have a clear idea of where you're going and what's expected of you in this course

1. It's always easy here to know the standard of work expected of you

51. The staff here make it clear right from the start what they expect from students

54. It's hard to know how well you're doing in the course(-)

2. On the whole, staff and students work together as a team to make this a good course

8 items
APPENDIX E

COURSE EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect students' opinions of teaching and assessment in particular courses and subjects.

You are asked to refer your answers to the following specific course or subject:

..........................................................

Please keep this course or subject in mind throughout. It is most important that you answer as honestly as you can. The items in the questionnaire have been specially chosen to reflect aspects of teaching and courses that are generally important across a wide range of subjects. Try to give a definite answer to every question.

Your responses are strictly confidential and will not be seen by members of staff.

HOW TO ANSWER

Simply circle the number beside each statement that most accurately reflects your view.

1 means that you definitely agree (√√)
2 means that you agree, but with reservations (√)
3 means that you are not sure or that it doesn’t apply (?)
4 means that you tend to disagree (×)
5 means that you definitely disagree (XX)

Remember to relate your answers to this particular course or subject and no other.

Now please answer all the following questions.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>√√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. It's always easy here to know the standard of work expected of you

   1 2 3 4 5

2. On the whole, staff and students work together as a team to make this a good course

   1 2 3 4 5

3. Most of the staff try really hard to get to know students

   1 2 3 4 5

4. The workload here is too heavy

   1 2 3 4 5

5. The assessment for this course encourages you to think carefully about what you have been learning

   1 2 3 4 5

6. Staff here make a real effort to understand difficulties students may be having with their work

   1 2 3 4 5
7. There is a real opportunity to choose the particular areas you want to study

8. If a lecturer in this course can't help a student, he or she will suggest others who may be able to assist

9. This course is very challenging academically

10. Teaching staff put a lot of time into commenting on students' work

11. This course requires you to show that you can link different themes and concepts together

12. It seems to me that the syllabus tries to cover too many topics

13. Staff here seem more interested in testing what we have memorised than what we have understood

14. Students here seem to be given a lot of choice in the work they have to do

15. Lecturers often seem to go too fast

16. Students are given a clear idea of the aims and objectives of this course

17. Students have a great deal of choice over how they are going to learn in this course

18. Lecturers here frequently give the impression that they haven't anything to learn from students

19. The teaching staff of this course motivate students to do their best work

20. We are generally given enough time to understand the things we have to learn

21. Most of the staff here show us how to understand their subjects by asking the right questions

22. The course seems to encourage us to develop our own academic interests as far as possible

23. Teaching staff always seem ready to give help and advice on approaches to studying
24. The sheer volume of work to be got through in this course means you can’t comprehend it all thoroughly

25. The staff are really enthusiastic about their subjects

26. You usually have a clear idea of where you’re going and what’s expected of you in this course

27. To do well on this course all you really need is a good memory

28. Our lecturers go out of their way to help us make links between different topics

29. I get valuable comments from staff on my written work

30. It would be possible to get through this course just by working hard around exam times

31. The amount of assignment work means that it’s hard to get down to following up material from lectures

32. Teaching staff here normally give helpful feedback on how you are going

33. The goals of this course have never been made clear to me

34. Lecturers on this course seem to be good at pitching their teaching at the right level for us

35. There’s a lot of pressure on you as a student here

36. Too many staff ask us questions just about facts

37. Teaching staff here work hard to make their subjects interesting to students

38. The staff here seem more ready to see students’ mistakes than what they have done well

39. There’s a lot of choice in this course in the ways you are assessed

40. The staff provide a great deal of constructive criticism of our work

1  2  3  4  5

1  2  3  4  5

1  2  3  4  5

1  2  3  4  5

1  2  3  4  5

1  2  3  4  5

1  2  3  4  5

1  2  3  4  5

1  2  3  4  5

1  2  3  4  5
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. Most of the staff are receptive to suggestions from students for changes to their teaching methods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. It's often hard to discover what's expected of you in this course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. This course really tries to get the best out of all its students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. The criteria used by staff for marking assignments are always clearly specified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. The staff seem genuinely interested in what students have to say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Feedback on student work is usually provided ONLY in the form of marks and grades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. There are so many students doing this course that staff don't have time to help everyone properly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Our lecturers are extremely good at explaining things to us</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Lecturers here try to relate theoretical ideas to real life situations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. You are encouraged to develop your own particular skills and abilities to their full potential through this course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. The staff here make it clear right from the start what they expect from students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Lecturers here inspire you to do your very best work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. We often discuss how we are going to learn things with our lecturers or tutors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. It's hard to know how well you're doing in the course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Most of the staff here seem to prepare their teaching very thoroughly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Students' ideas and suggestions are used during class discussions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Teaching staff here never seem to have time to discuss students' progress with them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP**
APPENDIX F

Frequencies for all Items on the CEQ: Version 2.
COURSE EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect students' opinions of teaching and assessment in particular courses and subjects.

You are asked to refer your answers to the following specific course or subject:

Please keep this course or subject in mind throughout. It is most important that you answer as honestly as you can. The items in the questionnaire have been specially chosen to reflect aspects of teaching and courses that are generally important across a wide range of subjects. Try to give a definite answer to every question.

Your responses are strictly confidential and will not be seen by members of staff.

HOW TO ANSWER

Simply circle the number beside each statement that most accurately reflects your view.

1  means that you definitely agree (✓✓)
2  means that you agree, but with reservations (✓)
3  means that you are not sure or that it doesn’t apply (?)
4  means that you tend to disagree (X)
5  means that you definitely disagree (XX)

Remember to relate your answers to this particular course or subject and no other. Now please answer all the following questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>✓✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>XX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It's always easy here to know the standard of work expected of you</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. On the whole, staff and students work together as a team to make this a good course</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Most of the staff try really hard to get to know students</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The workload here is too heavy</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The assessment for this course encourages you to think carefully about what you have been learning</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Staff here make a real effort to understand difficulties students may be having with their work</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. There is a real opportunity to choose the particular areas you want to study

8. If a lecturer in this course can't help a student, he or she will suggest others who may be able to assist

9. This course is very challenging academically

10. Teaching staff put a lot of time into commenting on students' work

11. This course requires you to show that you can link different themes and concepts together

12. It seems to me that the syllabus tries to cover too many topics

13. Staff here seem more interested in testing what we have memorised than what we have understood

14. Students here seem to be given a lot of choice in the work they have to do

15. Lecturers often seem to go too fast

16. Students are given a clear idea of the aims and objectives of this course

17. Students have a great deal of choice over how they are going to learn in this course

18. Lecturers here frequently give the impression that they haven't anything to learn from students

19. The teaching staff of this course motivate students to do their best work

20. We are generally given enough time to understand the things we have to learn

21. Most of the staff here show us how to understand their subjects by asking the right questions

22. The course seems to encourage us to develop our own academic interests as far as possible

23. Teaching staff always seem ready to give help and advice on approaches to studying
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>xx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. The sheer volume of work to be got through in this course means you can’t comprehend it all thoroughly</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The staff are really enthusiastic about their subjects</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. You usually have a clear idea of where you’re going and what’s expected of you in this course</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. To do well on this course all you really need is a good memory</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Our lecturers go out of their way to help us make links between different topics</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I get valuable comments from staff on my written work</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. It would be possible to get through this course just by working hard around exam times</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The amount of assignment work means that it’s hard to get down to following up material from lectures</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Teaching staff here normally give helpful feedback on how you are going</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The goals of this course have never been made clear to me</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Lecturers on this course seem to be good at pitching their teaching at the right level for us</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. There’s a lot of pressure on you as a student here</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Too many staff ask us questions just about facts</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Teaching staff here work hard to make their subjects interesting to students</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The staff here seem more ready to see students’ mistakes than what they have done well</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. There’s a lot of choice in this course in the ways you are assessed</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. The staff provide a great deal of constructive criticism of our work</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 121 -
41. Most of the staff are receptive to suggestions from students for changes to their teaching methods

42. It's often hard to discover what's expected of you in this course

43. This course really tries to get the best out of all its students

44. The criteria used by staff for marking assignments are always clearly specified

45. The staff seem genuinely interested in what students have to say

46. Feedback on student work is usually provided ONLY in the form of marks and grades

47. There are so many students doing this course that staff don't have time to help everyone properly

48. Our lecturers are extremely good at explaining things to us

49. Lecturers here try to relate theoretical ideas to real life situations

50. You are encouraged to develop your own particular skills and abilities to their full potential through this course

51. The staff here make it clear right from the start what they expect from students

52. Lecturers here inspire you to do your very best work

53. We often discuss how we are going to learn things with our lecturers or tutors

54. It's hard to know how well you're doing in the course

55. Most of the staff here seem to prepare their teaching very thoroughly

56. Students' ideas and suggestions are used during class discussions

57. Teaching staff here never seem to have time to discuss students' progress with them

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP
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APPENDIX G

CEQ: Version 3.
COURSE EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect students' opinions of teaching and assessment in particular courses and subjects.

You are asked to refer your answers to the following specific course or subject:

Please keep this course or subject in mind throughout. It is most important that you answer as honestly as you can. The items in the questionnaire have been specially chosen to reflect aspects of teaching and courses that are generally important across a wide range of subjects. Try to give a definite answer to every question.

Your responses are strictly confidential and will not be seen by members of staff.

HOW TO ANSWER

Simply circle the number beside each statement that most accurately reflects your view.

1 means that you definitely agree (√√)
2 means that you agree, but with reservations (√)
3 means that you are not sure or that it doesn’t apply (Ø)
4 means that you tend to disagree (×)
5 means that you definitely disagree (XX)

Remember to relate your answers to this particular course or subject and no other.
Now please answer all the following questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It's always easy here to know the standard of work expected of you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Most of the staff try really hard to get to know students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The workload here is too heavy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Staff here make a real effort to understand difficulties students may be having with their work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There is a real opportunity to choose the particular areas you want to study</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If a lecturer in this course can't help a student, he or she will suggest others who may be able to assist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Teaching staff put a lot of time into commenting on students’ work

8. It seems to me that the syllabus tries to cover too many topics

9. Staff here seem more interested in testing what we have memorised than what we have understood

10. Students here seem to be given a lot of choice in the work they have to do

11. Students are given a clear idea of the aims and objectives of this course

12. Students have a great deal of choice over how they are going to learn in this course

13. Lecturers here frequently give the impression that they haven’t anything to learn from students

14. The teaching staff of this course motivate students to do their best work

15. We are generally given enough time to understand the things we have to learn

16. Most of the staff here show us how to understand their subjects by asking the right questions

17. The course seems to encourage us to develop our own academic interests as far as possible

18. Teaching staff always seem ready to give help and advice on approaches to studying

19. The sheer volume of work to be got through in this course means you can’t comprehend it all thoroughly

20. The staff are really enthusiastic about their subjects

21. You usually have a clear idea of where you’re going and what’s expected of you in this course

22. To do well on this course all you really need is a good memory
23. Our lecturers go out of their way to help us make links between different topics

24. I get valuable comments from staff on my written work

25. It would be possible to get through this course just by working hard around exam times

26. Teaching staff here normally give helpful feedback on how you are going

27. The goals of this course have never been made clear to me

28. Lecturers on this course seem to be good at pitching their teaching at the right level for us

29. There’s a lot of pressure on you as a student here

30. Too many staff ask us questions just about facts

31. Teaching staff here work hard to make their subjects interesting to students

32. There’s a lot of choice in this course in the ways you are assessed

33. The staff provide a great deal of constructive criticism of our work

34. Most of the staff are receptive to suggestions from students for changes to their teaching methods

35. It’s often hard to discover what’s expected of you in this course

36. This course really tries to get the best out of all its students

37. The staff seem genuinely interested in what students have to say

38. Feedback on student work is usually provided ONLY in the form of marks and grades

39. Our lecturers are extremely good at explaining things to us

40. Lecturers here try to relate theoretical ideas to real life situations
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