

**Family and Lifestyle in the Visegrad Countries I and II.**  
**Visegrad University Studies Grant (No. 61000015)**

**RESULTS OBTAINED FROM THE STUDENTS' SATISFACTION  
 QUESTIONNAIRE**

**Academic year 2012-2013., semester 1. and 2.**

Results of the analysis of the quality control questionnaires referring to the two semesters long course called "Family and lifestyle in the Visegrad Countries" funded by the International Visegrad Fund (contract No. 61000015, date: 4<sup>th</sup> of March, 2011) delivered in semester 1. and 2. of academic year 2012-2013. are presented in the followings. Here we note, that the study content of the individual semesters of the 2 semesters course are not identical, that is why the results and the topics of the two semesters are not comparable to each other, only results obtained in the same semesters can be compared.

<b>semester</b>	<b>registered in the ETR system</b>	<b>participated at classes regularly</b>	<b>filled the questionnaire out</b>
<b>1.</b>	45 students	44 students	36 students
<b>2.</b>	44 students	41 students	34 students

When the course was first advertised in 2012 February, 27 students registered for the course and 20 of them were active participants and completed the course obtaining a grade. Success of the new course is well indicated by the number of students in academic year 2012-2013. Though these numbers are impressive for a new course, they are still too low for deeper mathematical statistical analysis, so data are indicated in terms of absolute numbers, and no further analysis by students' branch of studies or year-groups is provided.

Enrolment to the course was compulsory elective for students of Recreation Organiser and Health Promoter Minor, and optional elective for every other study branches of the University of Szeged. Distribution of students according to study branches was as follows: (indicated as number of students):

<b>Study branch</b>	<b>semester 1.</b>	<b>semester 2</b>
<b>Recreation Organiser and Health Promoter Minor</b>	1	0
<b>Physical educator-coach</b>	4	10
<b>Biology BSc</b>	0	6
<b>Remedial education</b>	31	10
<b>Education</b>	0	1
<b>English Studies</b>	0	1
<b>Visual representation</b>	0	1
<b>Andragogy</b>	0	2
<b>Economic Information Technologist</b>	0	2
<b>Total</b>	36	33

The distribution of students according to year groups was as follows:

<b>year group</b>	<b>semester 1</b>	<b>semester 2</b>
<b>1.</b>	25	19
<b>2.</b>	6	10
<b>3.</b>	5	4
<b>4</b>	0	1
<b>Total</b>	36	34

25 first year, 6 second year and 5 third year students evaluated the course in semester 1; 19 first year, 10 second year, 4 third year and 1 fourth year students evaluated the course in semester 2.

The course description indicated that participation at the course was compulsory, with a maximum number of 2 absences. The frequency of course participation was as follows:

	<b>semester 1</b>	<b>semester 2</b>
<b>I have not missed a class</b>	13	6
<b>I missed only a minimum number of classes</b>	22	27
<b>I was present at more than half of the classes</b>	1	1
<b>Total</b>	36	34

13 and 6 students respectively have never missed a class, 22 and 27 students respectively missed only a minimum number of classes and 1-1 student indicated that they were present at more than half of the classes.

If we examine class attendance, we have to examine the course delivery by the teachers also.

<b>To what extent were classes of the course delivered?</b>	<b>semester 1</b>	<b>semester 2</b>
<b>All of them</b>	21	6
<b>There were 1 or 2 classes which were not held</b>	15	28
<b>Total</b>	36	34

21 and 6 students respectively indicated that there were no missing classes, while 15 and 28 students respectively indicated that there were 1 or 2 classes missing. Both answers were right, as there were 1 or 2 classes not held because extraordinary holidays were ordered by the Rector or by the Dean of the Faculty at the university due to university/faculty programmes. This means, that each class when there were no holidays was delivered.

The course description contained a rich list of compulsory and optional references, as well as the power point presentations of the course were uploaded to the Coospace system (presentations of the guest lecturers were uploaded in Hungarian and English as well). In the light of this students gave the following answers to the question: *To what proportion of the course content are there written references or lecture notes available?*:

	<b>semester 1</b>	<b>semester 2</b>
<b>More than 80 %</b>	22	27
<b>60-79%</b>	9	5
<b>40-59%</b>	3	2
<b>20-39 %</b>	2	0
<b>Total</b>	36	34

22 and 27 students respectively indicated more than 80%, 9 and 5 students respectively indicated 60-79%, 3 and 2 students respectively indicated 40-59%, while in semester 1 two students indicated 20-39% of the course material was aided by written notes or references.

An important element of the course was to ensure interactivity among the students and the lecturers. The following two tables indicate the possibilities students could choose for communicating with the lecturers:

<b>Was it possible to pose questions to the lecturers concerning the course?</b>	<b>semester 1</b>	<b>semester 2</b>
<b>During the lecture</b>	33	31
<b>After the lecture</b>	20	24

33 and 31 students respectively indicated that it was possible to ask questions from the lecturers during the classes, so the requirement of interactivity during the course was almost 100% fulfilled. The possibility to consult after the classes was indicated by 20 and 24 students respectively.

<b>How could you contact the lecturers?</b>	<b>semester 1</b>	<b>semester 2</b>
<b>Personally</b>	33	28
<b>Through the phone</b>	1	1
<b>Through e-mail</b>	22	23
<b>ETR, Coospace</b>	27	28
<b>In no wise</b>	0	1

The numbers indicated in case of the different forms of contacting the lectures mean rather the communication channels chosen by the students and do not indicate the availability of teachers. 33 and 28 students respectively students marked the possibility of personal contact on the first place. This was followed by the ETR (Universal Study System) and the Coospace as official forums (27 and 28 students respectively) and finally the e-mail (22 and 23 students respectively). Contact through the phone was marked by 1-1 students in both semesters, and in semester 2 one student indicated that it was not possible to contact the lecturers.

In questions 2.-10. of the questionnaire we asked our students to express their opinion on a scale of 10. The mean of results is shown in the following table:

	semester 1	semester 2
<b>To what extent were the lecturers striving at demonstrating the course material with practical examples?</b>	9,08	8,85
<b>To what extent were you satisfied with the infrastructural prerequisites of the course (size of classroom, projector, computer etc.)</b>	6,14	9,00
<b>Was the pace of the course satisfactory?</b>	9,31	8,53
<b>To what extent was the course traceable?</b>	9,19	8,56
<b>To what extent did the lecturers strive at involving students to the classes?</b>	8,89	8,91
<b>To what extent were you satisfied with the work atmosphere of the course (eg. noise level)?</b>	8,83	8,12
<b>To what extent do you consider the topic of the lecture interesting?</b>	8,31	7,65
<b>To what extent do you consider the topic of the lectures useful related to your future profession?</b>	6,97	7,06
<b>To what extent did papers and mid-term evaluations, if any, contribute to the acquisition of the course material?</b>	7,69	7,32

It is visible, that in semester 1 pace of the course (9,31), its traceability (9,19) and practical nature (9,08) were leading. The mean of involving students (8,89), the work atmosphere (8,83) and interesting topics (8,31) obtained also higher means. The smallest mean was given to the infrastructural prerequisites, which was a rightful critique, as the classroom was too small for the size of the group, students sometimes had to sit in the corridor. Considering the tendency of increasing student numbers, the previous problem was 'cured' in semester 2, and students could study in a classroom of suitable size, which was reflected in the evaluation as well (9,00). In the satisfaction rank order of semester 2, student involvement (8,91), the practical nature of the course (8,85), the traceability of the course material (8,56), pace of the course (8,53) and its work atmosphere (8,12) were in a leading position. The lowest mean was given to the usefulness of the course related to students' future profession (7,06). In this regard the teachers are in a hard situation as representatives of 9 different study branches participated at the course. Considering this item we need to extend the profession specific repertoire of examples.

The last 5 questions of the questionnaire were open-ended questions, where the students could freely express their opinions. You can find representative examples of student responses as follows. On the basis of answers given to these open-ended questions we have conceptualised the 'morals' referring to the course.

<b>What was I happy about?</b>	
<b>semester 1</b>	<b>semester 2</b>
friendly atmosphere, foreign lecturers and lectures in English, interesting materials, interactivity, personal example that made the understanding of the material easier, the researchers themselves were talking about their findings, learning about the value systems of fellow students, similarities among the four countries, interesting and unique topics and facts, we could try out the research as well	practical examples and experiences, proper behaviour at class, interesting, up-to-date and colourful topics, foreign examples and lecturers, multidisciplinary nature of the course, real life examples, possibility of active participation, the topics are applicable to practice

<b>What was I surprised about?</b>	
<b>semester 1</b>	<b>semester 2</b>
facts like the extent of prejudice among young people or the living circumstances of Romany people, different answers obtained in different countries, Hungarian circumstances, the detailed information the research provided, talking about topics of everyday relevance and talking about some topics so openly, interesting correlations among the elements of lifestyle, some surprising information.	some surprising research results, foreign lectures, some difficulties in understanding the foreign lectures, differences in how people think, many data underlying the lectures, colourfulness of topics, fast pace of development, the lecturers were student centred and open, interactivity, situation of many people, how interesting statistics can be, the harmonious cooperation of lecturers from different countries

<b>What was I impassive about</b>	
<b>semester 1</b>	<b>semester 2</b>
the topic on nutrition, small classroom, foreign lectures, detailed statistical information, some topics far from some students' interest	some topics, too many statistical data, English lectures

<b>What was I annoyed by?</b>	
<b>semester 1</b>	<b>semester 2</b>
small classroom, boring statistics, high level of prejudice and racism reflected by the data, the extent of poverty among marginal groups, some questions that could not be answered	students talking instead of listening, the foreign lecturers sometimes were not understandable, impassivity of some students, too much focus on one topic, noise

<b>Other remarks, suggestions concerning the course</b>	
<b>semester 1</b>	<b>semester 2</b>
make the course more colourful by using short videos and pictures, smaller group for easier interaction,  most of the students expressed their satisfaction with the course and required no change	slower pace in showing the slides, interpretation in every case, smaller room, more group-work,  but basically students were satisfied with the course and liked it

The biggest lesson learnt from the evaluation was that the language knowledge of students is very heterogeneous, in many cases they do not dare to tell if they do not understand English and don't ask for interpretation, but later they complain about lack of understanding. So it is always necessary and useful to translate each sentence for the students.

The final results of the students (as sum of continuous classroom activity and the final paper) were as follows:

<b>grade</b>	<b>semester 1</b>	<b>semester 2</b>
Excellent (5)	44	34
Good (4)	-	2
Fair (3)	-	3

Szeged, 11. 09. 2013.

Analysis prepared by:

Klára Tarkó, PhD.  
Administrative coordinator to the project