



Student Course Experience, Personality Type and Residence Distance

Pankaj Deshwal^{#1}, Nitin Kakkar^{#2}, Apoorv Anand Srivastava^{#3}, Priyank Khattar^{#4}

¹pankajdeshwal@gmail.com

[#]Netaji Subhas Institute of Technology, Delhi, India

²nitinkakkar95@gmail.com

³apoorvanand.srivastava@yahoo.in

⁴priyankkhattar@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research paper aims to ascertain whether or how groups based on personality type differently evaluate the dimensions of student course experience in the Indian technical institutions, and to ascertain whether or how groups based on distance of residence from institution evaluate the dimensions of student course experience in the Indian technical institutions. A 23-statements instrument was adopted for gathering the data. The dimensions of the Student Course Experience were Skill Development (six items), Quality of Teaching (four items), Assessment (four items), Workload (three items), Clarity of Goals and Standards (three items), Time Devotion by Faculty (one item), Clarity and Ease in Understanding (2 items). The respondents were the students studying in the technological institution in Delhi, India. At last, authors found that usable data was of 199 respondents. ANOVA test was used in finding the result of the paper. The output revealed that how the students assess the Workload dimension and the Student Course Experience based upon both their Personality type and their Residence Distance from the college, are related. In the authors' opinion, this study is the first that aims at finding such a relation and in which quality of student course experience in India is assessed using Course Experience Questionnaire model.

Key words: Quality, Education, Student Course Experience, Personality Type, Residence Distance

1. INTRODUCTION

In the recent years, the importance of quality in education has been rising increasingly. It is also being regarded as one of the most important factors to be analyzed in the educational domain [1]. Owing to this idea of quality, education there has been a growing trend of reformation in the education system all around the globe in response to the globalization trends and to meet the expectations of the residents within nations.

The student course experience has started to become a factor of increasing importance globally and it is becoming a benchmark for assessing the quality of education being imparted in any educational institution. In the wake of these perceptions, there has been a surge in the quantity of surveys that are centered on students and student life, seeking feedback on their perception about the way of teaching in their educational institutions and how it affects their overall learning experience.

A questionnaire provides a quantitative approach to assess any qualitative variable. These help in investigating the different aspects and parameters of the student educational

experience, which can also provide empirical evidence to inform the concerned bodies pursuing quality upholding [2].

The practice of obtaining feedback from students about the teaching and courseware is neither limited to a few countries, nor is it held controversial to do so. However, the use of the result of such feedbacks maybe a subject of controversy. One example of the use of such questionnaires in today's time is the Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) is a survey that is mandatory as per the government, in which all the Australian Universities take part, in which the questionnaires are sent to the students who graduated in the previous year and, second, in the UK, the National Student Survey (NSS) which is supposed to be filled by the students who are in the final year of their education. The results of both the surveys acted as the basis in identifying problem areas and informing enhancement activities [3].

In this 21st century and the global world, the engineering sector is seeing growing challenges across various domains. On one side where the developed countries are positioning themselves as the super powers of knowledge, it is the developing countries (majorly in Asia) are striving towards becoming hubs for providing technical know-how, infrastructure and skilled manpower as produce of their educational system [4].

In around the last two decades, Indian education sector has witnessed a drastic transformation. The ever increasing population of the country and hence the demand for education the access of quality education has been a major concern for successive Indian governments [5].

Now, more than 500 million Indians are in the age group of five to twenty-five old. Roughly, 14.6 million students are currently enrolled in more than 30,000 institutions, and the country has roughly 700 universities. As India has the largest K-12 population across the globe; India shall possess the largest population pursuing higher education by the year 2030 [6]. What is speculated is that the population that is eligible to be labeled, as students will be twice by 2020. This is an indication that there exists a vast gap between demand for higher education and the supply for the same.

Through this paper, we wish to find the relation between the student course experience (SCE) in technological universities in India based upon the personality type of the students (introvert/extrovert/ambivert) and the distance that their residence is from the Institution. These two aims have been summed up as follows:

(1) To ascertain whether or how groups based on personality type differently evaluates the dimensions of student course experience in the Indian technical institutions;

(2) To ascertain whether or how groups based on distance of residence from institution evaluate the dimensions of student course experience in the Indian technical institutions.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Previous studies

The quality of education imparted to their students in educational institutions has been a rising point of concern for countries across the world. The method of obtaining feedback on the course has become popular in various countries including Australia, Greece, China, and the Chinese special administrative region of Honk Kong.

The education sector in China has witnessed a rapid growth post the 1990s. The average population of the students pursuing higher education rose from 5% in 1993 to 15% in 2002. A significant decline in quality was found during the same period [7]. This led to increasing concerns by various stakeholders regarding the higher education quality [8]. In 2003, the Ministry of Education in China initiated an Undergraduate Teaching Evaluation (UTE) program to check the quality of teaching at the higher education levels [9].

In Greece, the law has provisions that provide legal frameworks in order to assess the educational institutions of the higher level. However, the collection of the data systematically is not well established in the majority of Greek Universities [3].

In Australia, interviews regarding quality of education are being conducted for the graduating students since 1993, with results being published annually. The universities in Australia have used the Course experience questionnaires scores for improving their course structure, teaching style of the faculty, and even in deciding the allocation of funds [10, 11].

2.2 The Course Experience Questionnaire

The intention of CEQ [12] was to assess and indicate the performance of teaching and its effectiveness. This questionnaire was initially worked upon at the Lancaster University during the 1980s. The students' experiences of the instructions, curriculum, and assessments are held as the deciding factors of their commence to learning and for assessing the standard of their learning results. This concept serves as the basis of the CEQ [13, 14, 15].

This was designed to assess and determine the difference in the quality of education being imparted at institutions that were comparable, and were assessed upon the important dimensions of teaching for which students have a great amount of experience and hence can comment directly upon.

CEQ's developments and the basis of it theoretically and empirically have been outlined previously [12]. The work used for the development used pool of items that were extracted from the CPQ, a subsequent SEQ, Experiences of Studying, and HEQ, and statements taken with the help of an examination of open-ended student responses [16, 17, 18].

The foremost version of the CEQ comprised of five parameters, namely good teaching, appropriate workload, clear goals and standards, appropriate assessment and emphasis on independence. The questionnaire itself comprised of 30

questions with eight, five, five, six, and six items in the aforementioned parameters respectively.

2.3 Present status of the CEQ

The current and the most extensively used form of CEQ is a questionnaire comprising of 23 questions. This survey consists of questions in the domains of Clear Goals and Standards (4 items), Appropriate Workload (4 items), Good Teaching (6 items), and Appropriate Assessment (3 items). The Emphasis on Independence that was a part of the previous 30-question format, was eliminated from this survey questionnaire and instead a new scale, that measured the Generic Skills (6 items) was included.

This paper is part of a concurrent study for the testing and validation of the Student Course Experience in the Technological Education sector in India. Based upon the research findings, seven dimensions were found out namely: Skill Development (6 items), Quality of Teaching (4 items), Assessment (4 items), Workload (3 items), Clarity of Goals and Standards (3 items), Time Devotion by Faculty (1 item), Clarity and Ease in Understanding (2 items).

D. Hypothesis

The aims of present paper give directions how the hypotheses can be proposed. Researchers proposed following hypothesis:

- H1. Relation between the type of the personality of the customer and the Skill Development dimension of SCE.
- H2. Relation between the types of personalities of the customers and the Quality of Teaching dimension of the SCE.
- H3. Relation between the types of personalities of the customers and the Assessment dimension of the SCE.
- H4. Relation between the types of personalities of the customers and the Workload dimension of the SCE.
- H5. Relation between the types of personalities of the customers and the Clarity of Goals and Standards dimensions of the SCE.
- H6. Relation between the types of personalities of the customers and the Time Devotion by Faculty dimension of the SCE.
- H7. Relation between the types of personalities of the customers and the Clarity and Ease in Understanding dimension of the SCE.
- H8. The variation in the distance of the residences of the students, who were the respondents, from the institution will play a role in determining how the Skill Development is recognised as a part of the SCE.
- H9. The variation in the distance of the residences of the students, who were the respondents, from the institution will play a role in determining how the Quality of Teaching is recognised as a part of the SCE.
- H10. The variation in the distance of the residences of the students, who were the respondents, from the institution will play a role in determining how the Assessment is recognised as a part of the SCE.
- H11. The variation in the distance of the residences of the students, who were the respondents, from the institution will play a role in determining how the Workload is recognised as a part of the SCE.

H12. The variation in the distance of the residences of the students, who were the respondents, from the institution will play a role in determining how the Clarity of Goals and Standards is recognised as a part of the SCE.

H13. The variation in the distance of the residences of the students, who were the respondents, from the institution will play a role in determining how the Time Devotion by Faculty is as a part of the SCE.

H14. The variation in the distance of the residences of the students, who were the **respondents, from** the institution will play a role in determining how the Clarity and Ease in Understanding is recognised as a part of the SCE.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Participants

This research was conducted in a Technological Institution situated in New Delhi, India. The participants of the survey were students studying in this institution. A 23 items SCE instrument with seven dimensions was distributed to the students. At the last after eliminating all the incomplete and half-filled responses, the authors analyzed 199 responses. These responses were taken on the basis by asking the respondents to fill a printed copy of the questionnaire. The authors used convenient sampling method in order to collect the responses.

3.2 Data Collection

The responses of the survey were collected over a period of three months from August, 2016 to October, 2016. Customers gave response about their experience as students enrolled in courses in these institutions. The authors chose to follow a 5-point scale, known as the Likert scale that ran from 1-5, where 1 meant strongly in disagreement and 5 meant strongly in agreement, to get responses from the respondents. Authors examined how the personality type and the distance of the residence of the students from the institution affected the student course experience. The Analysis of Variance test, popularly known as the ANOVA test, was run. SPSS 16.0 software was used in order to run this analysis.

4. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The ANOVA test results for both: Personality type and SCE dimensions, and Residence distance and SCE factors were got on for all the seven factors used in the instrument.

4.1 Personality Type and SCE factors

The responses were thoroughly examined to find a relation between the personality of a student (introvert/extrovert/ambivert) and the SCE dimensions. One more step down the line after the analysis of the mean square, the sum of squares, F-test, and degrees of freedom was to ascertain how the Personality Type of the student casted an effect on the SCE dimensions. Table 1 shows the ANOVA results of Personality Type and SCE factors. The outputs of the ANOVA test revealed that there was found to be a relation in between the Personality Type and one of the SCE factors, which was the effect of Workload (Sig.<0.05 level). The outputs of the ANOVA test for Personality Type and SCE dimensions showed support for the dimension H4. Ahead, the outputs for H1-H3 and H5-H7 were insignificant.

Table 1: ANOVA RESULTS- PERSONALITY TYPE AND SCE DIMENSIONS

	Factor	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
F 1	Between Groups	6.791	3	2.264	2.263	.083
	Within Groups	173.069	173	1.000		
	Total	179.860	176			
F 2	Between Groups	.711	3	.237	.226	.879
	Within Groups	181.863	173	1.051		
	Total	182.575	176			
F 3	Between Groups	.875	3	.292	.274	.844
	Within Groups	184.526	173	1.067		
	Total	185.402	176			
F 4	Between Groups	8.639	3	2.880	3.020	.031
	Within Groups	164.951	173	.953		
	Total	173.589	176			
F 5	Between Groups	.193	3	.064	.061	.980
	Within Groups	182.650	173	1.056		
	Total	182.843	176			
F 6	Between Groups	5.982	3	1.994	1.948	.124
	Within Groups	177.054	173	1.023		
	Total	183.036	176			
F 7	Between Groups	3.958	3	1.319	1.369	.254
	Within Groups	166.764	173	.964		
	Total	170.721	176			

4.2 Residence distance and SCE dimensions

The answers of the respondents were examined to find a relation between the distance of the place of residence of the student from the institution (less than 5 Kilometers, 10 to 15 Kilometers, 15 to 20 Kilometers, 20 to 25 Kilometers, or more than 30 Kilometers) and the SCE. Just like as in the previous case of Personality type and SCE dimensions, similar test =s was conducted. The 'Table 2', shows the ANOVA outputs of RD and SCE factors. The outputs of the ANOVA proved that a relation was revealed in between the Residence Distance and one of the SCE dimensions, which in turn was the effect of Workload (Sig.<0.05 level). The findings of ANOVA for Residence Distance and SCE factors support H11. Ahead, the outputs for H8-H10 and H12-H14 were not revealed significant.

Table 2: ANOVA RESULTS RESIDENCE DISTANCE AND SCE DIMENSIONS

	Factor	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
F 1	Between Groups	.073	1	.073	.074	.787
	Within Groups	192.264	194	.991		
	Total	192.336	195			
F 2	Between Groups	3.523	1	3.523	3.564	.061
	Within Groups	191.789	194	.989		
	Total	195.312	195			
F 3	Between Groups	.254	1	.254	.263	.609
	Within Groups	187.467	194	.966		
	Total	187.721	195			
F 4	Between Groups	9.710	1	9.710	10.175	.002
	Within Groups	185.146	194	.954		

	Total	194.857	195			
F 5	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	.997
	Within Groups	194.814	194	1.004		
	Total	194.814	195			
F 6	Between Groups	.331	1	.331	.327	.568
	Within Groups	196.404	194	1.012		
	Total	196.735	195			
F 7	Between Groups	.195	1	.195	.194	.660
	Within Groups	195.825	194	1.009		
	Total	196.020	195			

5. CONCLUSIONS AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

The outputs have shown a weak relation between the SCE dimensions and the Personality type and the Residence distance of the students. There was however, one exception, which was found to be was that of the SCE dimension of Workload.

The conclusions reveal how the student course experience varies with the difference in Personality Type and the Residence Distance. As strong correlation was found only in the case of the Workload dimension of the SCE in both the cases of Personality type as well as the Residence distance (sig.<0.05), which is why H4 and H11 were supported and all the others were not supported.

These findings clearly show on the fact that the different categories, be it in the case of Personality Type or in the case of RD definitely obtain the amount of Workload that they have to take care of as students differently. This as the institutional bodies can apply findings to design the curriculum in such a manner that the workload is perceived uniformly, that would help in increasing the quality of education being impacted by the technological institutions in India.

6. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study can be further elucidated in order to overcome the constraints of the existing one. The research was carefully undertaken in a technological institution in Delhi. To receive further sound results, study should be conducted across India. The research if conducted at different places and at different times of the year may further bring out varied results that can help develop a greater insight into the field.

Further research in this field can be done by carrying out the survey in not only the technological institutions of India, but also across all the institutions in India in order to obtain a greater understanding of the subject.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper is a part of an ongoing project and the questionnaire for the paper has been taken from the same, where the authors have also validated the questionnaire.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Stensaker, "Quality as Fashion: Exploring the Translation of a Management Idea into Higher Education." In *Quality Assurance in Higher Education: Trends in Regulation, Translation and Transformation*, edited by D.F. Westerheijden, B. Stensaker, and M.J. Rosa, pp. 99–118, 2007. Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6012-0_4
- [2] J. Leckey and N. Neill, "Quantifying quality: the importance of student feedback", *Quality in Higher Education*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 19-32, 2001.

- <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538320120045058>
- [3] Dimitrios P. Stergiou and David Airey, "Using the Course Experience Questionnaire for evaluating undergraduate tourism management courses in Greece", *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, Vol. 11, pp. 41–49, 2012. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhlste.2012.02.002>
- [4] A. Mohanty and D. Dash, "Engineering Education in India: Preparation of Professional Engineering Educators", *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, Vol. 4, pp. 92-101, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jhrss.2016.42011>
- [5] A. Thakran, R.C.Sharma, "Meeting the challenges of higher education in India through Open Educational Resources: Policies, practices, and implications" *Education policy analysis archives*, [S.l.], v. 24, pp. 37, 2016. ISSN 1068-2341.
- [6] World Bank. (2012). "World Bank report on education in India." Retrieved from <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/india>
- [7] S. Liu, "Higher Education Quality Assessment in China: An Impact Study", *Higher Education Policy*, 2014. Online First Article. doi:10.1057/hep.2014.3.
- [8] J.C.K. Lee, Y. X. Huang, and B. Zhong, "Friend or Foe: The Impact of Undergraduate Teaching Evaluation in China." *Higher Education Review* Vol. 44No. 2,pp. 5–25, 2012.
- [9] Y. Hongbiao and W. Wenlan, "Assessing and improving the quality of undergraduate teaching in China: the Course Experience Questionnaire", *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol. 40 No.8, pp. 1032-1049, 2015. DOI: 10.1080/02602938.2014.963837
- [10] S. Barrie, P. Ginnsand M. Prosser, "Early impact and outcomes of an institutionally aligned, student focused learning perspective on teaching quality assurance", *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol. 30 No. 6, pp. 641-56, 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500260761>
- [11] A. Brewand P. Ginns, P., "The relationship between engagement in the scholarship of teaching and learning and students' course experiences", *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol. 33 No. 5, pp. 535-45, 2008. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930701698959>
- [12] P. Ramsden, "A performance indicator of teaching quality in higher education: The course experience questionnaire.", *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol.16 No.2, pp. 129–150, 1991. doi:10.1080/03075079112331382944.
- [13] F. Marton and R. Säljö, "On qualitative differences in learning: I- Outcome and process", *The British Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 46 No.1, pp. 4–11, 1976. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.1976.tb02980.x>
- [14] N.J. Entwistle and P. Ramsden, "Understanding student learning", *London and Canberra: Croom Helm*, 1983.
- [15] P. Ramsden, "Learning to Teach in Higher Education (London, Roufledge), 1992.
- [16] P. Ramsden and N.J. Entwistle, "Effects of academic departments on students' approaches to studying", *British*

Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol .51, pp. 368-383, 1981.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.1981.tb02493.x>

- [17] P. Ramsden, E. Martin and J. B. Owen, "School environment and sixth form pupils' approaches to learning", *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 59, pp. 129-142, 1989.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.1989.tb03086.x>

- [18] N.J. Entwistle and H. Tart, "Approaches to learning, evaluations of teaching and preferences for contrasting academic environments", *Higher Education*, Vol. 19, pp. 169-194, 1990.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00137106>