

P:\PublicationComponents\logos\NCVER LOGOS\WMF - word\ncver left tab_mono.wmf

Measuring student satisfaction from the Student Outcomes Survey

Peter Fieger

National Centre for Vocational Education Research

### ­

### NATIONAL CENTRE FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RESEARCH

### **TECHNICAL PAPER**

The views and opinions expressed in this document are those of the author/project   
team and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Australian Government or   
state and territory governments.

About the research

**© Commonwealth of Australia, 2012**

G:\pub_prod\PublicationComponents\logos\Creativecommons\CC BY logo.eps

With the exception of the Commonwealth Coat of Arms, the Department’s logo, any material protected by a trade mark and where otherwise noted all material presented in this document is provided under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Australia <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/au> licence.

The details of the relevant licence conditions are available on the Creative Commons website (accessible using the links provided) as is the full legal code for the CC BY 3.0 AU licence <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/legalcode>.

The Creative Commons licence conditions do not apply to all logos, graphic design, artwork and photographs. Requests and enquiries concerning other reproduction and rights should be directed to the National Centre for Vocational Education Research (NCVER).

This document should be attributed as Fieger, P 2012, *Measuring student satisfaction from the Student Outcomes Survey,* NCVER, Adelaide.

This work has been produced by NCVER on behalf of the Australian Government, and state and territory governments, with funding provided through the Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education.

The views and opinions expressed in this document are those of NCVER and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Australian Government or state and territory governments.

ISBN 978 1 922056 06 1  
TD/TNC 108.04

Published by NCVER  
ABN 87 007 967 311

Level 11, 33 King William Street, Adelaide, SA 5000  
PO Box 8288 Station Arcade, Adelaide SA 5000, Australia

ph +61 8 8230 8400 fax +61 8 8212 3436  
email ncver@ncver.edu.au  
<http://www.ncver.edu.au>  
[http://www.ncver.edu.au/publications/**MERLIN ID**.html](http://www.ncver.edu.au/publications/MERLIN%20ID.html)

### *Measuring student satisfaction from the Student Outcomes Survey*

### Peter Fieger, National Centre for Vocational Education Research

The Student Outcomes Survey is an annual national survey of vocational education and training (VET) students. Since 1995, participants have been asked to rate their satisfaction with different aspects of their training, grouped under three main themes: teaching, assessment, and generic skills and learning experiences. While the composition of the bank of satisfaction questions has remained fairly constant over time and the suitability of the three overarching satisfaction categories has been validated statistically on several occasions, little progress has been made on creating summary measures that encapsulate the three main themes of student satisfaction. Such summary measures would be much more useful to researchers than responses to the bank of 19 satisfaction questions, which are very detailed. This paper compares three methods of creating a composite score and evaluates their statistical veracity.

Key messages

* The grouping of satisfaction questions into themes of teaching, assessment, and generic skills and learning experiences remains statistically valid in the current Student Outcomes Survey.
* A composite score for questions under these three main themes is needed to facilitate post-survey analytical studies.
* We review and compare three different methods of creating summary measures in respect of their utility. These methods are Rasch analysis, weighted means and simple means.
* We find that all three methods yield similar results and so recommend using the simple means method to create the summary measures.

Tom Karmel  
Managing Director, NCVER

Contents

Tables and figures 6

Introduction 7

Satisfaction themes 9

Comparison of composite measures 12

Rasch analysis 12

Simple averages 13

Weighted averages 13

Evaluation/best fit 13

Conclusion 16

References 17

# Tables and figures

## Tables

1 Eigenvalues of the correlation matrix (abridged) 9

2 Factor loadings after transformation using varimax rotation 11

3 Descriptive statistics and coefficients of reliability 12

4 Descriptive statistics of composite scores 14

5 Comparison teaching composite scores 14

6 Comparison assessment composite scores 14

7 Comparison generic skills and learning composite scores 14

## Figures

1 Student satisfaction items in the Student Outcomes Survey 8

2 Eigenvalues based on parallel analysis 10

# Introduction

The Student Outcomes Survey is an annual national survey of vocational education and training (VET) students. The survey aims to gather information on students, including their employment situation, their reasons for undertaking the training, the relevance of their training to their employment, any further study aspirations, reasons for not undertaking further training and satisfaction with their training experience. The survey is aimed at students who have completed a qualification (graduates) or who successfully completed part of a course and then leave the VET system (module completers).

The assessment of student satisfaction with their training consists of 19 individual questions and one summary question (see figure 1). The teaching and learning questions are based on questions asked in the Higher Education Course Experience Survey, and the generic skills and learning experience questions are based on questions developed by Western Australia as part of the VET student survey (Bontempo & Morgan 2001). These questions occupy a significant portion of the questionnaire (20 out of 56 questions). To date the focus has been on reporting only the overall satisfaction item. Use of the individual satisfaction questions has been limited, mainly due to their specificity, narrow scope and number of measures.

The individual satisfaction questions are grouped under three themes: teaching, assessment, and generic skills and learning experiences. While there has been some initial statistical validation of these three groupings, no significant recent analysis has been undertaken, and no summary measure of the constituent questions has been devised.

It is the purpose of this paper to validate statistically the grouping of the satisfaction questions in the context of current surveys and to develop a summary measure for each of the three themes to make the data more accessible. We use principal component analysis to identify the underlying dimensions of the 19 satisfaction items and group the questions accordingly. Cronbach’s alpha scores are calculated to assess the internal consistency of the resulting groups.

We then use three different approaches to derive composite scores to represent the groups created: Rasch analysis, weighted composite averages and straight averages.[[1]](#footnote-1) Finally, we determine the extent to which the newly established composite scores differ and which ones would be most useful in future research and reporting.

Figure 1 Student satisfaction items in the Student Outcomes Survey

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Agree | Strongly agree | Not applicable |
| **Teaching** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | My instructors had a thorough knowledge of the subject content | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 2 | My instructors provided opportunities to ask questions | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 3 | My instructors treated me with respect | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 4 | My instructors understood my learning needs | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 5 | My instructors communicated the subject content effectively | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 6 | My instructors made the subject as interesting as possible | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| **Assessment** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | I knew how I was going to be assessed | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 8 | The way I was assessed was a fair test of my skills | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 9 | I was assessed at appropriate intervals | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 10 | I received useful feedback on my assessment | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 11 | The assessment was a good test of what I was taught | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| **Generic skills and learning experiences** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | My training developed my problem-solving skills | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 13 | My training helped me develop my ability to work as a team member | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 14 | My training improved my skills in written communication | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 15 | My training helped me to develop the ability to plan my own work | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 16 | As a result of my training, I feel more confident about tackling unfamiliar problems | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 17 | My training has made me more confident about my ability to learn | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 18 | As a result of my training, I am more positive about achieving my goals | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 19 | My training has helped me think about new opportunities in life | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| **Overall satisfaction with the training** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How would you rate, on average, your satisfaction  with the overall quality of the training? | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Overall, I was satisfied with the quality of this training | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |

Source: NCVER Student Outcomes Survey 2010 questionnaire.

# Satisfaction themes

The bank of satisfaction questions in the Student Outcomes Survey was based on questions developed for use in the Higher Education Course Experience Survey and the Western Australian State Student Survey. The initial statistical validation of the satisfaction questions in the TAFE setting was undertaken by the Western Australian Department of Education and Training. (For more information on the history of the satisfaction questions see Bontempo & Morgan [2001] and Sevastos [2001].) Western Australia used this bank of questions in 2003 and a modified version became a constituent part of the current national Student Outcomes Survey in 2004.

While there have been several evaluations of the categorisation of the satisfaction questions into the three main themes, and these have provided a statistical basis for question groupings over the history of the survey (Morgan & Bontempo 2003), there has been scant progress towards creating summary measures beyond the initial categorisation into the three current themes.

Our investigations are based on the results of the 2009 survey. This represents the most recent large sample year (the Student Outcomes Survey is run with an augmented sample in alternating years). Our analysis was then duplicated for validation purposes with 2007 and 2008 data, yielding similar results.

Data were prepared by combining module completers and graduates. While the individual satisfaction means of these two groups differed significantly, in respect of this analysis, we find that module completers and graduates display similar response patterns.


Using principal component analysis, we can identify the underlying dimensions of the 19 satisfaction items and group the questions accordingly. The Eigenvalues of the correlation matrix of the initial weighted principal component analysis are shown in table 1.

Table 1 Eigenvalues of the correlation matrix (abridged)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Eigenvalue | Difference | Proportion | Cumulative |
| *1* | 9.8397 | 7.4394 | 0.5179 | 0.5179 |
| *2* | 2.4004 | 1.2989 | 0.1263 | 0.6442 |
| *3* | 1.1014 | 0.4719 | 0.058 | 0.7022 |
| *4* | 0.6295 | 0.0816 | 0.0331 | 0.7353 |
| *5* | 0.5478 | 0.0841 | 0.0288 | 0.7641 |
| *...* |  |  |  |  |
| *18* | 0.2337 | 0.0456 | 0.0123 | 0.9901 |
| *19* | 0.1881 |  | 0.0099 | 1 |

Note: Rows 6—17 are omitted but can be supplied upon request.

While there are various ways of assessing the number of factors that ideally should be retained, we applied Horns parallel analysis that uses a Monte Carlo-based simulation to compare the observed Eigenvalues with those obtained from uncorrelated normal variables. The visual inspection of the resulting graph (figure 2) indicates that three components should be retained. These three extracted components account for about 70% of the variance in the 19 satisfaction items.

Figure 2 Eigenvalues based on parallel analysis

The factor pattern resulting from the three retained factors was then transformed via varimax rotation (table 2). It is very apparent that each single question unambiguously correlates with one particular factor (shaded in table) and that the resulting three groups correspond to the three thematic question groups from the survey. For example, those questions (numbered 1 to 6) that correlate with factor 2 correspond to the teaching block, those (numbered 7 to 11) correlating with factor 3, correspond to the assessment block, and those (numbered 12 to 19) correlating with factor 1, correspond to the generic skills and learning experience block of questions.

We further tested the reliability of the three question groups by means of Cronbach’s coefficient of reliability (table 3). All three groups represent excellent internal consistency as evidenced by a very high Cronbach’s alpha statistic. None of the ‘alpha if deleted’ values exceeds the overall alpha score, which further documents the high reliability of the selected satisfaction groupings.

Based on the results of the principal component analysis and the review of the Cronbach’s alpha scores, we conclude that the grouping of the satisfaction items into the themes of teaching, assessment, and generic skills and learning experiences in the Student Outcomes Survey is statistically justified.

Table 2 Factor loadings after transformation using varimax rotation

| Question | | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 3 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | My instructors had a thorough knowledge of the subject content | 0.1898 | 0.7597 | 0.2226 |
| 2 | My instructors provided opportunities to ask questions | 0.1699 | 0.7929 | 0.2434 |
| 3 | My instructors treated me with respect | 0.1790 | 0.7829 | 0.2373 |
| 4 | My instructors understood my learning needs | 0.2794 | 0.7378 | 0.3180 |
| 5 | My instructors communicated the subject content effectively | 0.2442 | 0.7817 | 0.2980 |
| 6 | My instructors made the subject as interesting as possible | 0.2838 | 0.7181 | 0.2836 |
| 7 | I knew how I was going to be assessed | 0.1673 | 0.2132 | 0.7560 |
| 8 | The way I was assessed was a fair test of my skills | 0.2557 | 0.3426 | 0.7650 |
| 9 | I was assessed at appropriate intervals | 0.2437 | 0.3295 | 0.7623 |
| 10 | I received useful feedback on my assessment | 0.3012 | 0.3626 | 0.6523 |
| 11 | The assessment was a good test of what I was taught | 0.3296 | 0.3905 | 0.6843 |
| 12 | My training developed my problem-solving skills | 0.7314 | 0.2280 | 0.2539 |
| 13 | My training helped me develop my ability to work as a team member | 0.7583 | 0.2128 | 0.1924 |
| 14 | My training improved my skills in written communication | 0.7716 | 0.1170 | 0.1916 |
| 15 | My training helped me to develop the ability to plan my own work | 0.8085 | 0.1551 | 0.1943 |
| 16 | As a result of my training, I feel more confident about tackling unfamiliar problems | 0.8111 | 0.2257 | 0.1851 |
| 17 | My training has made me more confident about my ability to learn | 0.8235 | 0.2243 | 0.1866 |
| 18 | As a result of my training, I am more positive about achieving my own goals | 0.8174 | 0.2317 | 0.1865 |
| 19 | My training has helped me think about new opportunities in life | 0.7496 | 0.1995 | 0.1591 |

Note: Shading indicates the question highly correlates with one particular factor.

Table 3 Descriptive statistics and coefficients of reliability

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question | N | Mean | Std dev. | Alpha if deleted | Alpha score |
| 1 | 103 997 | 4.461 | 0.750 | 0.9074 | 0.9151 |
| 2 | 103 939 | 4.487 | 0.731 | 0.9018 |
| 3 | 103 744 | 4.504 | 0.748 | 0.9030 |
| 4 | 103 293 | 4.257 | 0.869 | 0.8997 |
| 5 | 103 607 | 4.272 | 0.856 | 0.8950 |
| 6 | 103 040 | 4.165 | 0.930 | 0.9035 |
| 7 | 102 602 | 4.197 | 0.838 | 0.8909 | 0.8916 |
| 8 | 102 491 | 4.248 | 0.810 | 0.8587 |
| 9 | 101 224 | 4.218 | 0.813 | 0.8623 |
| 10 | 101 634 | 4.068 | 0.974 | 0.8775 |
| 11 | 101 995 | 4.194 | 0.850 | 0.8631 |
| 12 | 100 029 | 3.886 | 0.896 | 0.9304 | 0.9363 |
| 13 | 98 254 | 3.879 | 0.948 | 0.9301 |
| 14 | 96 099 | 3.653 | 1.013 | 0.9313 |
| 15 | 98 356 | 3.859 | 0.941 | 0.9274 |
| 16 | 100 749 | 3.962 | 0.914 | 0.9257 |
| 17 | 101 472 | 4.009 | 0.912 | 0.9249 |
| 18 | 101 193 | 4.000 | 0.920 | 0.9251 |
| 19 | 100 372 | 4.037 | 0.937 | 0.9319 |

## Comparison of composite measures

It seems reasonable to speculate that the narrow scope of the individual satisfaction questions, along with the number of questions, has discouraged their use in research. It is therefore desirable to have a composite score or summary measure for each of the three themes that encapsulates the data collected. This should be done by capturing the core information contained in the individual questions, while retaining as much information as possible. The result should be three individual scores representing teaching, assessment, and generic skills and learning experiences.

## Rasch analysis

Rasch analysis is a variant of item response theory and is used chiefly to analyse test scores or attitudes that are represented by Likert-type scales. The Rasch measurement model is used to evaluate the fit of items to their intended scales and to generate individual scores and estimate the precision of those scores on an interval scale. The method also provides diagnostic information about the items and responses to them. Under item response theory, a set of items is assumed to reflect an underlying trait (such as satisfaction, teaching, assessment and learning) and responses to items are taken to indicate how strong individuals are on that trait and how easy or difficult it is to agree with an item reflecting that trait.

In this paper, we are using the Rasch scores created by Curtis (2010). This work also contains a more detailed description of the method used to derive them.

## Simple averages

As a second measure, we created a composite score for each of the three themes by calculating straightforward averages for each individual. These mean scores were created even when individual responses to satisfaction questions were missing; for example, if the response to a question is missing the measure is calculated on the average of the remaining questions. This method thus maximises the use of the available data while, at the same time, using the fewest administrative and computational resources.

## Weighted averages

When using the above simple average scores, it can be argued that not all individual items contribute to the composite score to the same extent. It is useful to create a measure that accounts for the varying contributions of individual responses to the overall score. To create such a measure, we estimate factor scores for the three identified dimensions. The scores have a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one, and represent the three themes of teaching, assessment, and generic skills and learning experiences. We then regress the constituent satisfaction scores onto the factor scores, with the aim of determining the strength of association of individual questions to the composite score. The resulting beta standardised regression coefficient provides a measure of the strength of the contribution to the composite score. The composite scores are calculated as:

Teaching*weighted* = *Q1\*Wq1 + Q2\*Wq2 + Q3\*Wq3 + Q4\*Wq4 + Q5\*Wq5 + Q6\*Wq6*

with weights derived by:

The result represents the weighted average score for teaching satisfaction that has the same metric as the simple average score. The composite scores for assessment satisfaction and generic skills and learning experiences are created using analogous procedures. One disadvantage of this method is that when a response for an individual satisfaction question is missing, a meaningful weighted composite score cannot be calculated unless the missing response is imputed. Since response data for individual questions are only rarely missing (if satisfaction responses are missing they are usually missing for the entire respondent record), this issue is considered to be a negligible problem.

## Evaluation/best fit

As a result of the application of the above methodologies, we now have available three different sets of composite scores for the three themes. The basic descriptive statistics of the three summary measures can be found in table 4.

Table 4 Descriptive statistics of composite scores

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Method | N | Mean | Std dev. | Sum. | Min. | Max. |
| Teaching | Rasch scores | 90 111 | 3.432 | 2.377 | 309 229 | -4.85 | 6.27 |
| Means | 90 486 | 4.354 | 0.687 | 393 946 | 1 | 5 |
| Weighted means | 87 605 | 4.402 | 0.664 | 385 597 | 1 | 5 |
| Assessment | Rasch scores | 88 728 | 2.742 | 2.285 | 243 327 | -4.77 | 5.93 |
| Means | 89 556 | 4.184 | 0.717 | 374 745 | 1 | 5 |
| Weighted means | 86 095 | 4.203 | 0.704 | 361 870 | 1 | 5 |
| Generic skills and learning experiences | Rasch scores | 87 443 | 2.326 | 2.460 | 203 431 | -6.09 | 6.89 |
| Means | 89 910 | 3.915 | 0.773 | 352 017 | 1 | 5 |
| Weighted means | 79 268 | 3.889 | 0.785 | 308 293 | 1 | 5 |

While the means and weighted means scores appear fairly similar, the mean and variation of Rasch scores are different. We therefore calculate correlations and Cronbach’s alpha to determine commonalities between the different methods and their reliability (tables 5 to 7).

Table 5 Comparison teaching composite scores

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Calculation method | Rasch scores | Means | Weighted means |
| Rasch scores | 1 | 0.9571 | 0.9442 |
| Means | 0.9571 | 1 | 0.9928 |
| Weighted means | 0.9442 | 0.9928 | 1 |
| Cronbach's alpha | Raw | 0.7744 |  |
| Standardised | 0.9879 |  |

Table 6 Comparison assessment composite scores

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Calculation method | Rasch scores | Means | Weighted means |
| Rasch scores | 1 | 0.9633 | 0.9473 |
| Means | 0.9633 | 1 | 0.9809 |
| Weighted means | 0.9473 | 0.9809 | 1 |
| Cronbach's alpha | Raw | 0.8029 |  |
| Standardised | 0.9876 |  |

Table 7 Comparison generic skills and learning composite scores

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Calculation method | Rasch scores | Means | Weighted means |
| Rasch scores | 1 | 0.9727 | 0.9711 |
| Means | 0.9727 | 1 | 0.9978 |
| Weighted means | 0.9711 | 0.9978 | 1 |
| Cronbach's alpha | Raw | 0.8157 |  |
| Standardised | 0.9934 |  |

The main finding here is that correlations between the three methods are exceptionally high, with minimum correlations of 0.94 between Rasch scores and the weighted means method in the teaching and assessment themes (tables 5 and 6) and reaching almost one between means and weighted means methods in the generic skills and learning experiences theme (table 7).

Cronbach’s raw alpha scores encompassing the three aggregation methods are 0.77 for teaching, 0.80 for assessment, and 0.82 for generic skills and learning. The values suggest a very high degree of inter-item correlation.[[2]](#footnote-2) Cronbach’s standardised alpha scores can be interpreted as an indicator of inter-item covariance. In the three themes of teaching, assessment, and generic skills and learning experiences, the standardised values are all around 0.99. This suggests a very similar distribution of Rasch scores, means, and weighted means. Taken together, Cronbach’s raw and standardised scores indicate strong internal consistency and uni-dimensionality between Rasch, means, and weighted means scores, and this is the case for all three groups under consideration. As a result, all three aggregation methods yield comparable results and can be used interchangeably for analysis purposes.

# Conclusion

This paper provides a statistical foundation for the grouping of the satisfaction questions in the Student Outcomes Survey into three coherent categories. Results of the principal component analysis show this grouping is statistically valid.

The second aim of the paper was to create summary measures that encapsulate the three main themes of student satisfaction to aid future research and reporting. To achieve this, three different quantitative methods were devised, evaluated and compared. While all three methods each have a distinct scoring technique, as far as the measurement of the core outcome for each category is concerned, the statistical outcome differed very little.

So which method should be used?

Given that all three methods yield very similar results and that Rasch analysis and weighted means analysis each require explicit preparation of the data, it is reasonable to rely on simple average scores for the three components. This will minimise the required effort and the potential for error among users of the data.

We thus recommend, for analytical purposes, that simple satisfaction means be used for each of the three themes. This methodology can easily be applied retrospectively to historical data and applied to future survey results with minimal effort.

# References

Bontempo, J & Morgan, P 2001, *2001 TAFE Student Survey validation — measuring student perceptions of teaching, assessment and learning*, [The Department of Education, Western Australia].

Curtis, D 2010, *Evaluating institutional performance indicators in VET*, NCVER, Adelaide.

Morgan, P & Bontempo, J 2003, ‘Validating measures of student satisfaction with learning, teaching, assessment in the Western Australian Student Outcomes Survey’, VET Policy and Corporate Communications, Department of Education and Training, Western Australia.

Sevastos, P 2001, *Validation and cross validation of the TAFE student satisfaction scales,* Curtin University of Technology, Perth.

1. Further explanation of these methods is found on pages 11 and 12. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Values in excess of 0.7 are normally considered to signal very strong reliability. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)