ED 325 489   TM 015 699

AUTHOR   Meld, Andrea
TITLE   Designing Questionnaire Items: Lessons Learned from
                Faculty and Student Surveys.
PUB DATE   Apr 90
NOTE   15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of tle
                Western Psychological Association (70th, Los Angeles,
                CA, April 26-29, 1990).
PUB TYPE   Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Accreditation (Institutions); Comparative Analysis;
                Higher Education; Mail Surveys; *Program Evaluation;
                *Questionnaires; Response Style (Tests); Test
                Construction; *Test Format; Testing Problems; Test
                Interpretation; Test Items; Test Reliability; Test
                Validity
IDENTIFIERS   *Close Ended Questions; Nonrespondents; *Open Ended
                Questions

ABSTRACT
                Surveys used for program and institutional
evaluation, such as self-studies conducted for accreditation review,
are discussed. Frequently, these evaluations take the form of faculty
surveys and student surveys. This paper explores the following
general considerations associated with mail surveys and other
surveys: avoidance of response bias; reduction of non-response;
reliability and validity in survey research; and the effects of
different response models. Practical suggestions are offered, in
non-technical language, for implementing survey research methods and
developing more useful questionnaire items. The advantages and
disadvantages of open versus closed question forms are described.
Open questions allow respondents to state opinions in their own words
and may reveal important issues that the evaluator may not have
anticipated. However, the results of open questions are more
difficult to analyze than are those of closed questions, which
generally produce more reliable data that accommodate statistical
analysis and allow the responses of individuals and groups to be
quantified and compared. It is concluded that the question format not
only determines the quality of information or opinion elicited, but
also affects data analysis and interpretation. (TJH)

Designing Questionnaire Items: Lessons Learned

from Faculty and Student Surveys

Andrea Meld, Ph.D.

City University, Bellevue, WA

Presented at the 70th Annual Western Psychological Association Convention

Los Angeles, California, April 29, 1990

2

ABSTRACT

Designing Questionnaire Items: Lessons Learned
from Faculty and Student Surveys

Andrea Meld, Ph.D.
City University, Bellevue, WA

Educational decisions in higher education are most often based on some form of
evaluation, for example, the self-study conducted for accreditation review is
an extensive example. Frequently, these evaluations take the form of faculty
and student surveys. This paper explores general considerations such as: 1)
how to avoid response bias, 2) how to reduce nonresponse, 3) reliability and
validity in survey research, 4) the effects of different response modes, and
other general considerations.

The advantages and disadvantages of open vs. closed question forms a   dis-
cussed in some detail. "Open" questions allow respondents to stat-   ,inions
in their own words, and may reveal important issues which the evaluator did
not anticipate. Open questions provide respondents with the opportunity to
express their thoughts and opinions, but results are more difficult to
analyze.

On the other hand, "closed" questions generally produce more reliable data
which can be statistically analyzed. Responses of individuals and groups can
be quantified and compared. Thus, question form not only determines the
quality of information or opinion elicited, but also affects data analysis and
interpretation.

Designing Questionnaire Items: Lessons Learned from Faculty and Student Surveys

Surveys can provide a useful source of information about the quality of
higher education which may not attainable by other research methods. However,
survey research has its perils and pitfalls. This paper discusses survey
research for program and institutional evaluation such as the accreditation
review process and outcome assessment. Practical suggesting are offered, in
non-technical language, for implementing survey research methods and developing
more useful questionnaire items. For the sake of simplicity, the term "survey"
refers to a mailed questionnaire, however, similar recommendations apply as
well to phone and in-person interviews.

General Considerations

Bias in Response

Assuming that sampling techniques are not a source of bias (Blalock,
1979), bias can still be a problem in campus surveys because of certain human
or social tendencies, especially if faculty and students believe (erroneously)
that their answers can be traced back to them (e.g., "my instructor will
recognize my handwriting"). Three major sources of bias are acquiescence,
social desirability, and atypical responses (Fowler, 1988).

Acquiescence is the human tendency to agree or respond "yes" or "true" to
questions, regardless of their content; individuals appear to vary in the
extent of this tendency. One way to avoid this response bias is to write half
of the items so that indicating agreement is actually a negative evaluation:

"Students are prepared for upper-division classes." (positive)
"Faculty support from administration should be improved." (negative)

Social desirability bias occurs when individuals respond positively to items which are congruent with socially acceptable attitudes or behaviors. However, this source of bias is probably not a deliberate attempt to "fake" the survey instrument. For example, faculty members may be reluctant to admit they are experiencing any problems or that academic achievement of their students is not excellent. They may feel that such admittance reflects poorly on them as individuals and their academic department or the institution as a whole. Similarly, students may experience a reluctance to admit they are not satisfied with programs that represent a considerable investment of their time, energy, and resources or that they are not "good" students, which may create cognitive dissonance. Also, they may not wish to make an instructor or the school "look bad," for various reasons, even though negative information will be used to improve and upgrade programs.

In addition, individuals tend to underreport conditions that carry a social stigma, such as mental illness, physical or learning disabilities, alcoholism, drug abuse, or embarrassing behavior. If sensitive information is being asked in a survey, be aware that even seemingly innocent questions may embarrass someone. Consider whether such questions are really necessary.

Atypical response occur when individuals respond atypically or unusually, or make choices others are unlikely to make, regardless of item content. Faculty and students who believe that the survey is overly intrusive or even pointless may express their discomfort or annoyance this way. While there is not much point in debating whether such individuals are "abnormal" or not, one solution is to set aside atypical cases, that is, those with incongruent responses, and analyze them separately. Many of these response biases can be avoided by ensuring faculty and student respondents that their answers will be confidential or anonymous. Explain the purpose and objectives of the survey

research and how the information acquired will be used to improve instructional programs and services, rather than used in any punitive way. Trust between those conducting the research and the sample of respondents is essential.

Nonresponse

Nonresponse can refer to particular items which some individuals choose not to answer. However, when faculty and students selected for your sample refuse to respond at all there is the much greater problem of sampling bias. Common reasons for the nonresponse of faculty and students include: the questionnaire did not reach them because they were away on vacation or changed their address; they refused or failed to supply information; they were unable to supply information. Bias occurs when response rate is low because only those who are interested in the issues return the survey. These individuals differ in some systematic way from those who do not return the survey.

Ways to Reduce Nonresponse

Questionnaires apparently work best with individuals who are highly literate, interested in research, and motivated to return the form. (Fowler, 1988) Thus, the self-administered form should be well suited for faculty and students. Almost anything that makes a mailed questionnaire look professional and personalized, such as an attractive color or letterhead, will increase response rates (Fowler, 1988). The instrument should be easy to complete and not overly long; the directions should be easy and clear; the form should be attractive, easy to read, and uncluttered. Follow-Up reminders, either by postcard or phone are also important ways to reduce nonresponse.

Reliability and Validity

A reliable measure is one that produces consistent results which are not
influenced by extraneous variables. To the extent that questionnaire items are
clearly written and unambiguous, that is, individuals reading them will
interpret them the same way, a survey will be reliable. Internal consistency,
another form of reliability, refers to items on the same scale (which are
assumed to measure the same construct), being highly intercorrelated.

Validity of a questionnaire can be more difficult to achieve and
determine. People do not always give valid information on a survey for several
reasons: they do not know the information; they cannot recall it; they don't
understand the question; or they feel uncomfortable answering the question in
the survey context. Recently, the cognitive aspects of designing and testing
questionnaires, such as the validity of self-report data, have been explored in
laboratory studies (e.g., Lessler, Mitzel, Salter, & Tourangeau, 1985; Jabine,
Straf, Tanur, & Tourangeau, 1984).

Another way to assess validity is to compare questionnaire responses with
a different measure, such as records or test data, measuring a similar concept.
However, since these correlations usually tend to run low, in the neighborhood
of .35 (Fowler, 1988), the usefulness of this approach to validity is limited.

"Agree/Disagree" and "Don't Know" Responses

'Agree/Disagree" items are commonly used in surveys. They seem to be
simple, but should be used with care. Statements should have only one
dimension, and they not be double-barreled as in this example:

"Completing my MBA will improve my personal skills and advance my career."

the end of continuum, rather than middle. Does disagreement with the statement
below indicate that an individual person believes that the alumni association
is doing an excellent job or a poor one?

"The alumni association is doing a fair job."

"Don't Know" answers can have different meanings. In any case, they are
often difficult to interpret and like "missing values," can complicate data
analysis. "Don't know" is not the same as a neutral response category on a
scale and requires different coding procedures. If the number of "don't
know's" is a large percentage of item responses, items may be poorly written.

In general, if the survey topic or particular items are about feelings or
experiences, "don't know" may indicate an unwillingness to respond, not
uncommon with individuals who may find it threatening to appear critical of
themselves or an instructor. For example, "don't know" might be a frequent
response to intrusive statements such as the following:

"I find it difficult to keep up with course assignments because of my
study skills."

"Problems in my personal life have prevented me from attending class."

A better approach to item construction might be:

"I would be interested in taking a study skills workshop." or

"Time conflicts sometimes make it difficult to attend class."

On the other hand, students and faculty may simply be unfamiliar with the
topic. Certain questions can be screened by a preceding question to see
whether respondents are familiar with subject and should go any further. In
that way, those responding will at least know something about the subject. For
example:

5

8

"Do you use the library's on-line reference services?" (yes/no)

(if yes) "How would you rate the quality of this servic.?"

Open vs. Closed Questions

Open questions have certain advantages: they describe the "real" views of
faculty and staff and permit unanticipated answers. Often, people prefer to
answer questions concerning issues of importance to them in their own words.
They open-ended approach is also more appropriate if the list or possible
answers to a question is very long.

On the other hand, closed questions are more satisfactory because the task
of responding to a given item is more reliable and they constrain the number of
possible answers and eliminate rare answers or those not appropriate for the
analysis. Closed questions are also better for constructing rating scales
which yield ordinal data. Thus, data analysis and interpretation can be far
less time-consuming and easier to automate.

In our surveys of faculty and students, we found that the use of a closed
questions tended to produce generally positive mean responses, whereas faculty
and students were more likely to use the open format to express their
frustrations or grievances in negative terms. (Others did express positive
feelings or omitted the open-ended questions.) Since the use of open or a
closed questions may influence the direction of expressed attitudes, perhaps
both approaches should be used as a check to compare group trends with the more
extreme views of particular individuals.

Pretesting

Every questionnaire should be pretested, no matter how experienced the
researcher. Once questionnaires are printed ard data collection starts,
changes can be expensive and difficult. If wording is changed, already

completed questionnaires have cannot be included in the analysis. Pretest a self-administered survey by having a small group complete the instrument. The researcher should then lead a group discussion and find out if the instructions were clear, whether any questions were confusing or difficult, and if there were any format or design problems.

Ethical Issues

The essential ethical principals in survey research in the academic setting or elsewhere are the following:

1) there should be no adverse effects to respondents;

2) data must be kept confidential;

3) data analysis and utilization should be appropriate.

Student and faculty respondents should be informed of the department or organization conducting the research; the investigators' names; the purpose of the survey research project; and how confidentiality will be protected. Student and faculty should be told that their cooperation is voluntary and that refusal to participate will not have any adverse effect or them, and that they can skip any questions they choose not to answer.

Constructing Items for Accreditation Review

City University, a private school serving adult students, is located in Bellevue, WA. In July, 1989, the author constructed a set of surveys based on questions in the <u>Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges Accreditation Handbook, (1988 Edition)</u>, as xt of the re-accreditation process. In the case of faculty rating proposed means of improving faculty effectiveness, written comments from earlier surveys which formed the basis of response categories.

The actual survey items were written using wording similar to the Handbook
questions, and were reviewed by faculty other than the researcher. The surveys
were sent to a random sample of 700 students, 475 faculty, and 700 alumni and
former students. Response rates for the three samples were ranged from .30 to
.40.

The items on the following pages are actual examples to illustrate how
broad topics can be converted into objective (closed) response items. Included
are faculty ratings of ways to improve faculty effectiveness; ratings of the
physical plant, classrooms, and study or lounge areas; and alumni ratings of
programs in terms of professional advancement. These items are meant to
suggest ways gathering objective data on topics of broad concern. Clearly,
each institution m... ,t construct items that are suitable to its philosophy and
unique characteristics.

Handbook Question:

"Comment on changes which might be made in departmental policies and procedures to improve faculty effectiveness."

Survey Item (for Faculty):

What do you think is the relative importance of these items for improving faculty effectiveness? (1=high, 11=low)

RESULTS:

1   Ensuring that entering students meet minimum competencies in English and math; prerequisites for advanced classes.

2   An increase in faculty salary.

3   A faculty library of teaching and instructional materials, such as slides, overhead displays, other visual aids.

4   An ongoing review of courses, goals, and objectives with full faculty participation.

5   Funding for professional faculty development, such as training, membership dues, conference attendance and presentation.

6   Better communication between administration and faculty on short- and long-range goals for City University.

7   Guest speakers at faculty meetings addressing teaching methods and academic subjects for faculty development.

8   Increased clerical and secretarial support for faculty.

9   Peer evaluation of faculty effectiveness, as well as the SIR forms.

10 Fostering "team spirit" among faculty members to reduce turnover rate by organizing various group projects and events for faculty.

11 Greater emphasis on computer applications for classes.   (n-112)

12

<u>Handbook Questions</u>:

"Evaluate how well the physical plant serves the needs of students and staff."
"Carefully review maintenance and housekeeping standards and attractiveness of the grounds. What improvements are needed, if any?"

<u>Survey Item (Faculty, Students, Alumni and Former Students)</u>:

C-2. How do you feel about the classrooms in which you teach, in terms of lighting, spaciousness, and comfort for both instructor and student?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
29.5%	45.4%	8.1%	13.8%	3.1%

(n=491)

C-3. How well do the study, lounge, an⁣ ⁣t areas in the facility where you teach meet the needs of faculty and students?

Very Adequately	Somewhat Adequately	Not Applicable	Somewhat Inadequately	Very Inadequately
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
15.5%	37.6%	13.3%	22.0%	11.6%

(n=490)

C-4. How would you rate the housekeeping, maintenance, and attractiveness of the facility where you teach?

Very Well-Kept	Somewhat Well-Kept	Neither Well-Kept nor Poorly Kept	Somewhat Poorly Kept	Very Poorly Kept
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
28.6%	36.9%	18.1%	12.4%	4.1%

Handbook Question:

"What has been learned about the educational effectiveness of the various instructional programs from former students who left before completing their programs of study?"

Survey Item (For Alumni and Former Students):

E-4. How would you rate the instructional programs at City University in preparing you for professional work and career advancement?

Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Neither Effective nor Ineffective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
35.5%	59.1%	4.5%	.9%	0.0%

(n=110)

Final Pointers and Reminders

1. Avoid asking for information that is redundant with other data sources which are accurate and easy to access.

2. Make sure that student, faculty, and alumni respondents are sufficiently motivated to respond to questionnaire items.

3. Avoid wording which encourages favorable responses, thus biasing results.

4. Also avoid wording which is ambiguous, cryptic, or loaded with jargon.

5. Pre-test all questions. Don't include those which respondents will find ridiculous or trivial.

6. The form should not be too long or too complicated to complete.

7. Completing the form should be an enjoyable or educational experience for the respondent.

8. Results should be announced and utilized to provide feedback to respondents, and provide a sense of closure, that is, their participation made a difference. When students, faculty, and others see actual results from surveys, they are more likely to respond to them in the future.

References

Blalock, H. M. (1979). Social statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fowler, F. J. (1988). Survey research methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Jabine, T. B., Straf, M. L., Tanur, J. M., & Tourangeau, R. (1984). Cognitive aspects of survey methodology: Building a bridge between disciplines. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Lessler, J.T., Mitzel, H., Salter, W., Tourangeau, R. (1985). Cognitive aspects of questionnaire design: Part A report. Contract No. 282-84--2123. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics.

END

U.S. Dept. of Education

Office of Education
Research and
Improvement (OERI)

ERIC

Date Filmed

March 29, 1991