OCCASIONAL PAPER

NCVER

Getting on (line) with it … surveying student experiences

SARAH SUTCLIFFE

CENTRE UNDERTAKING RESEARCH IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, CANBERRA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

NCVER NEW RESEARCHER AWARD RECIPIENT

The National Centre for Vocational Education Research (NCVER) New Researcher Award has been created to encourage new researchers (either established researchers new to the vocational education and training (VET) field or new career VET researchers) to present their research at NCVER's No Frills conference. The award also provides new researchers with an opportunity to have their research peer-reviewed and published by NCVER.

In 2007, NCVER awarded seven New Researcher Awards. The recipients were:

- Bronwyn Robinson, RMIT University
- Denise Bell
- John Ward, Chisholm Institute of TAFE
- Melanie Bowman, Charles Sturt University
- Ruth Wallace, Charles Darwin University
- Sarah Sutcliffe, Canberra Institute of Technology
- Toni-Maree Pettigrew, Department of Education, Training and the Arts, Queensland

ISBN 978 1 921412 28 8 web edition

TD/TNC 92.28

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/1974.html>

About the research

One of NCVER's research objectives is to build the research capacity of the vocational education and training (VET) sector. To this end, NCVER sponsored seven new researchers to attend NCVER's 2007 No Frills conference. One of these awards went to Sarah Sutcliffe. This paper is based on her presentation at the conference.

Student experience surveys are an important tool for vocational education providers to measure their performance and meet quality and reporting demands. Surveying students online is a cost-effective way to collect students' feedback; however, using an online survey tool is not always a simple matter of moving from a mail-out survey to an online instrument. In particular, motivating students to engage with an online survey can be difficult, which can mean lower response rates.

This paper explores the issues which the Canberra Institute of Technology came across in their move from a paper-based student experience survey to an online survey.

Key messages

- The benefits of surveying students online include lower costs, ease of administration, fewer data-entry errors and quicker data processing; however, surveying online can also have drawbacks, such as lower response rates.
- Successfully engaging students is essential to achieving good response rates. This can be done through effective promotion of student surveys which can include monetary rewards or prizes, and emphasising the intrinsic rewards students can obtain from having a voice in opinion surveys.
- Teachers play an important role in encouraging students to complete student experience surveys.

Tom Karmel
Managing Director, NCVER

Acknowledgements

I would like to formally acknowledge Berwyn Clayton, Director, Centre Undertaking Research in Vocational Education, Canberra Institute of Technology for promoting the idea of this project in the first place and mentoring me throughout the tortuous writing process; Dave Meyers, Senior Researcher, Centre Undertaking Research in Vocational Education, Canberra Institute of Technology for managing the Student Experience Survey; Stephen Darwin, Senior Manager, Education Development Centre, Canberra Institute of Technology for his initial support and useful feedback; and NCVER for supporting new researchers like me to get in there and have a go.

Contents

Introduction 6

Background 7

Survey structure and communication strategies 8

- Survey structure 8
- Communication strategies 8

Survey issues and discourse 10

- Purpose of surveys 10
- Theories of engagement 10
- Survey engagement models 11
- Response rates 12
- Rewards: Intrinsic vs extrinsic 13
- Access 15
- Confidentiality and security 16

Conclusion 17

References 18

Introduction

One of the many services the Centre Undertaking Research in Vocational Education (CURVE) provides in its capacity as the research unit of the Canberra Institute of Technology (CIT) is the organisation of the Student Experience Survey. Survey tools of a high quality are a necessity, given that the institute is part of the vocational education and training (VET) sector, where training outcomes are emphasised, and where registered training organisation (RTO) status and funding are inextricably linked to the reporting of these outcomes. It is therefore crucial that the institute's Student Experience Survey is a high-quality tool; hence, the importance of the reflective process reported in this paper. This process involves a consideration and exploration of related literature to identify the parallels and differences between survey methods in order to inform and guide future practice.

This paper will cover issues of engagement, response rates, access, as well as confidentiality and security and, in the context of the institute's Student Experience Survey, confirm findings and identify differences, as well as areas for future improvements. Preparation for this paper has afforded the opportunity to reflect on the strategies employed in the 2007 Canberra Institute of Technology's Student Experience Survey.

Background

The following paragraphs describe the 2007 Student Experience Survey used in the Canberra Institute of Technology and introduce some of the internal and external influences that have had an impact on its development.

In addition to providing valuable feedback for teachers and the departments and faculties in which they work, the Student Experience Survey also satisfies some of the performance measures required for the institute to retain its registered training organisation status. The emphasis on training outcomes articulated by the Australian Quality Training Framework (AQTF) 2007 and its Excellence Criteria will heighten the importance of surveys such as the Student Experience Survey as a means of meeting performance requirements.

In June 2006 the ACT Government handed down a budget that included a significant reduction in the Canberra Institute of Technology's funding. As a result, staffing cuts and fiscal efficiencies were made across the institute. In previous years the Student Experience Survey was organised as a paper-based survey with considerable money spent on printing and data entry. Given the new financial constraints, an online version of the Student Experience Survey was developed to reduce financial costs. It was in this environment that the online 2007 Student Experience Survey was launched.

Survey structure and communication strategies

Survey structure

The 2007 Student Experience Survey was held from 7–18 May 2007 with an extension to 25 May. The survey instrument included 52 positively focused statements to which the students responded using a 5–0 likert scale, with 5 being 'strongly agree', 1 being 'strongly disagree' and 0 being 'no opinion'. The questions were divided into the following eight categories of student experience, one category per screen:

- ✧ overall satisfaction
- ✧ program quality
- ✧ assessment
- ✧ teaching
- ✧ information
- ✧ administration
- ✧ Canberra Institute of Technology learning support
- ✧ Canberra Institute of Technology environment and facilities.

Students were also given the opportunity to provide comments in two open-ended questions—to describe what they liked best about studying at the Canberra Institute of Technology and the areas where the institute could do better.

The opening screens of the survey required the student to identify themselves to ensure they were in the draw for one of the incentive prizes: five iPod shuffles and five $200 vouchers. On the final screen students were prompted to provide some demographic details. The survey took approximately ten minutes to complete.

Communication strategies

The survey instrument and communication strategies for promoting the survey were developed by the Centre Undertaking Research in Vocational Education in consultation with the Canberra Institute of Technology's Internal Research Committee and staff from the various faculties and divisions. Communication strategies included attending faculty management meetings, Band 2 Network and Teacher Education sessions: to impart to them an understanding of the survey's importance in relation to the 2007 Australian Quality Training Framework and recurrent funding; to identify issues particular to faculties and departments; and to request their support in informing teachers and students about the survey.

Strategies for promoting the survey included:

- ✧ developing an advertising poster with Canberra Institute of Technology Media & Marketing
- ✧ displaying posters across the institute's six campuses
- ✧ displaying an electronic version of the poster as a screen background on all computers in the libraries, flexible learning centres and computer labs across the institute
- ✧ gaining sponsorship (5 x iPod shuffles) from the Canberra Institute of Technology Student Association
- ✧ advertising the survey on the institute Student Association website
- ✧ displaying an electronic version of the poster on the information screens across the campuses
- ✧ speaking to students at the Public Education Day event
- ✧ promoting the Student Experience Survey via all-staff emails, with an endorsement from the institute's Chief Executive Officer
- ✧ promoting the Student Experience Survey on the student flexible learning site (that is, on WebCT)
- ✧ promoting the Student Experience Survey on the login page of the student records management system (that is, Banner)
- ✧ delivering multicoloured paper slips with Student Experience Survey details to canteens, cafes and libraries
- ✧ promoting the Student Experience Survey via student email launched during the survey census period.

Survey issues and discourse

Much of the research literature on student surveys is based on higher education experiences and some of the research only discusses issues related to paper-based surveys. Despite those differences, there are similarities worthy of discussion and reflection; namely, that the students being surveyed are all attending a post-compulsory education institution and issues such as engagement, incentives, access and confidentiality are relevant to both online and paper-based surveys.

Purpose of surveys

The main purpose of the student surveys identified in the literature is to provide a tool for judging the quality of units and courses and which is used as feedback to faculties and teachers with regard to: continuous improvement of those courses; performance management of teachers (Nair et al. 2006); information about 'institutional and educational leadership, management and practice' (Coates 2006, p.1); and in some instances 'to make promotion, tenure and merit pay decisions' (Dommeyer et al. 2004, p.1). The literature also suggests that funding is increasingly tied to these judgements (Nair et al. 2006). Porter (2004) cites an example where funding is tied to the amount of alumni satisfaction with the educational outcomes of the institution.

The Canberra Institute of Technology's purposes for running the Student Experience Survey are similar to a number found in the literature, particularly with regard to continuous improvement. But there is also a significant difference. The purposes cited in the literature are not connected to specific external regulations as is with the Canberra Institute of Technology in relation to Australian Quality Training Framework requirements. To maintain its status as a registered training organisation, the institute must comply with the standards set out by the Australian Quality Training Framework, and these require the institute to measure its performance. To that end the development of the questions in the institute's survey instrument were closely aligned with the performance measures articulated in the 2007 Australian Quality Training Framework standards. This major difference is indicative of the different contexts of higher education and VET.

Theories of engagement

Given the falling response rates of surveys in general (Atrostic et al. 2001 cited in Porter 2004), student surveys (Nair et al. 2006; Dey 1997 cited in Porter 2004) and online student surveys in particular (Johnson 2003), researchers have been exploring why people choose to respond to a survey.

Porter describes two groups of theoretical approaches to survey participation. The first is based on social exchange theory (Dillman 2000 cited in Porter 2004). The three elements of this theory are rewards, costs and trust. Rewards are what the student expects from an activity; costs are

what the student gives up or spends to obtain the reward; and trust is the expectation that the rewards will outweigh the costs (Dillman 2000 cited in Porter 2004). Porter goes on to explain that:

> By offering monetary incentives with a survey, or reducing survey length, the researcher can increase the benefits and reduce the costs of survey participation in the hopes of increasing the probability of response. (Porter 2004, p.7)

In the case of the Student Experience Survey, it was hoped that the possibility of winning one of the ten prizes would outweigh the cost or time that the student gave up to participate.

The second group of theories described by Porter emphasises a psychological approach (Porter 2004). This approach includes:

- ✧ reciprocal benefit; that is, the student will complete the survey because they have a chance to win a prize
- ✧ a wish to help; that is, the student will complete the survey because their assistance is required or that they feel it is their responsibility as a student to complete the survey (Groves, Cialdini & Couper 1992 cited in Porter 2004)
- ✧ compliance with a legitimate authority; that is, the student will complete the survey because the request is sponsored by the educational institution at which they are studying
- ✧ perceptions of scarcity; that is, the student will complete the survey because these surveys are only carried out every two years.

Survey engagement models

Coates (2006) describes a model of engagement that is linked to aspects of the 'reward' element of social exchange theory as well as the 'reciprocity' and 'wish to help' parts of the psychological approach as cited in Porter above. The core of Coates's model rests with the student's belief that their responses have value.

> … that response levels are influenced by each student's perception that their response will enhance the success of the survey and that the survey itself is an important process in which to be involved. (Coates 2006, p.3)

Coates contends that, to achieve such a response, a holistic view of the student must be taken: student engagement is about their total university/institute experience not just their academic experience. If a survey is to attract and engage a student's interest it needs to be connected to the experience of that student. The student engagement model integrates surveys into each student's university experience (Coates 2006) through four phases: pre-survey planning and evaluation, pre-survey promotion, recapturing attention, and stimulating completion and return.

Engagement is also the main feature in the list of strategies developed by the Queensland University of Technology (2007). These strategies form part of the Learning Experience Survey (LEX), where teachers encourage students to work with them to create a high-quality learning environment. Like the Coates model the reward of participation is intrinsic, but the added element in these strategies is the teacher. The students and their teachers are part of the continuous-improvement process. Teachers are encouraged to:

- ✧ tell students what they did with any previous evaluation
- ✧ show students the kinds of questions that are asked in the Learning Experience Survey
- ✧ remind students that they are part of a larger learning community (Queensland University of Technology 2007).

Engagement also played a role in the 2006 work of Nair and his colleagues with non-respondents to a student survey at Monash University. He attributes the success of the survey response rates to the integral use of engagement (Nair et al. 2006).

The Canberra Institute of Technology Student Experience Survey also took a holistic approach to the student's experience at the institute through the survey instrument but did not go as far as that suggested by Coates or the Queensland University of Technology in their pre-survey strategies. The Student Experience Survey instrument included questions about the physical environment, the learning support services, as well as assessment and feedback issues, the quality of their teachers and the content of their courses. In terms of pre-survey strategies the Student Experience Survey was promoted extensively, but the emphasis, apart from conversations at faculty management meetings, was placed on the prospect of winning an iPod or vouchers. The promotion or engagement strategy for the students was heavily focused on monetary reward, not on the importance of their opinion or the value of being part of a survey with potential benefits for themselves and future students at Canberra Institute of Technology.

The teachers were made aware of the institute's Student Experience Survey event through the all-staff emails and through meetings with their departmental heads, but the degree of teacher participation was not at the level promoted by the Queensland University of Technology (2007). For teachers to perceive the Student Experience Survey as a valuable part of their connection with students and their learning environment and not as just another task to add to their already over-burdened work load would require a major change in the pre-planning strategy of the survey. Teachers and their managers would need to see the Student Experience Survey as an integral part of their working life, not something external to it.

Response rates

A number of authors (Johnson 2003; Porter 2004; Dommeyer et al. 2004) point out the many benefits of online surveys, which include ease of administration, lower costs, fewer data-entry errors, quicker data processing and less vulnerability to teacher/faculty influence. But they also point out the issue of obtaining adequate response rates. This was also a major concern for the Centre Undertaking Research in Vocational Education when the decision to change from a paper-based to an online survey was made. Johnson (2003, p.50) described the dilemma exactly:

> Unlike traditional paper-pencil student ratings that are administered in class, online ratings are usually completed outside of class during students' discretionary time. This allows students more time to fill out the rating forms, but it also gives them more freedom in their decision of whether to not to complete the forms.

In relation to previous survey events the Centre Undertaking Research in Vocational Education had delivered packages of surveys to individual classes for students to complete in class time. In an online environment, however, the high response rate achieved by the paper-based method would not necessarily be repeated. Indeed, the response rate for the 2007 online survey, although statistically significant, was less than half that of the previous paper-based survey (Canberra Institute of Technology 2005, 2007).

This issue of response rates in online environments is discussed by Johnson (2003), who cites several factors that may be influential in increasing response rates. These include: student access to computers; amount and quality of communication to teachers and students regarding the online rating system; communication to students on how student ratings are used; and faculty and student support of the online rating system. The communication strategy referred to in Johnson's report connects teachers and students, as did the strategies used by the Queensland University of Technology in its Learning Experience Survey (2007), although the nature of this connection is quite different in the Johnson example.

Johnson's report highlights an investigation of the four different communication strategies between teachers and their students vis-à-vis encouraging them to complete the online survey:

- ✧ making the survey an assignment task with points
- ✧ making the survey an assignment task without points
- ✧ encouraging students to complete the survey
- ✧ not mentioning the survey to the students.

The response rates for the four different strategies were 87%, 77%, 32% and 20%, respectively (Johnson 2003, p.53). Although the first two strategies produced very high response rates, the ethics of such a strategy are problematic. The ethics of assigning an assessment task that is potentially unrelated to the students' current learning program, linking that assessment task to unrelated points/marks that are supposed to represent a students' learning, not a completed online survey, are questionable. This concern was also noted briefly in Johnson's report: 'some faculty and administrators question[ed] the practice of giving extra points to students for completing online forms' (2003, p.57). The difficulties of adding an arbitrary, unrelated assessment task would be exacerbated in the competency-based learning environment of VET. Conversely, if the students were studying courses that had online components, which is now becoming more common across Canberra Institute of Technology, a strategy such as this could be useful.

Rewards: Intrinsic vs extrinsic

Opposing points of view seem to be emerging from the literature relating to the use of rewards to increase response rates. Perspectives on the effects of extrinsic monetary rewards, prizes, vouchers and the like on response rates have proliferated (Porter 2004; Nair et al. 2006; Moss & Hendry 2002; Szelenyi et al. 2005; Porter & Whitcomb 2004). There are also quite different perspectives on the intrinsic rewards of 'having your say', being part of a larger learning community, the individual response being valued, and being involved in a worthwhile process (Coates 2006; Queensland University of Technology 2007; Nair et al. 2006).

The following paragraphs explore and compare the response rates of these two approaches to rewards. Given that Canberra Institute of Technology's Student Experience Survey supported a largely extrinsic view of rewards to the students via the promotional material, this comparison might shed light on possible future directions.

Coates utilised the student engagement model, described earlier in this paper, with participants of the national Graduate Careers Australia surveys that are conducted annually by all Australian higher education institutions (Graduate Careers Australia 2005 cited in Coates 2006). In this study, graduates were effectively surveyed twice, once as part of the formal Graduate Careers Australia surveys and then on a second occasion to gauge their response to the elements of the student engagement model. Although the participants in the survey were higher education graduates, unlike the Canberra Institute of Technology students in the Student Experience Survey, many of the strategies used by Coates parallel the questions that researchers from the Centre Undertaking Research in Vocational Education considered in the development of the Student Experience Survey. Some of the findings from Coates's research are included in table 1.

Table 1 Student engagement model survey statements

Factors affecting decisions to participate in the survey	%
Significance of the survey to you	81
Stated purpose of the survey	81
Whether the survey gives you an opportunity to 'have a say'	75
Size of any prize or incentive offered	31
Likelihood of winning a prize	26

Note: The figures refer to the percentage of positive responses to the statements.
Source: Coates (2006, p.8).

The first three factors listed in table 1 scored highly with the participants, thus illustrating the importance of Coates's holistic approach and intrinsic message of valuing the student's opinion. It also echoes the strategies developed by the Queensland University of Technology (2007). Although the Student Experience Survey posters and messages on computer screens and websites across the Canberra Institute of Technology did include words about students having their say to improve life at the Canberra Institute of Technology, those words and the message imparted them paled into insignificance when compared with the colour and sheer physical size of words in the 'Win' and 'prize' messages. The comparatively low significance given to prizes (refer table 1) would seem to indicate that the Canberra Institute of Technology's Student Experience Survey would benefit from a greater emphasis on the intrinsic rewards students can obtain from having a voice in opinion surveys.

Nair et al. (2006) also refer to the successful use of engagement as integral to better response rates. Although this study focused on the follow-up phone calls made to non-respondents, the focus on intrinsic rewards was similar. These rewards included communicating the importance of participation in the survey process and the value of student feedback to the institution.

What is also interesting about Nair et al.'s study is the popularity of an online option in combination with the engagement focus given by the follow-up calls (table 2).

Table 2 Follow-up phone calls

Outcomes of phone calls	Number	%
Survey was completed over the phone	216	16
Survey re-mailed as requested for completion	282	21
No further contact requested	272	20
Preference made to complete survey online	575	43
Total number called	1345	100

Note: Of the 2674 non-respondents the call centre could only make contact with 50.3% (1345) of former students due to out-of-date phone numbers.
Source: Nair et al. (2006, p.3).

The research on monetary rewards varies greatly between surveys that are delivered online and those that are paper-based and mailed. Porter (2004; Szelenyi et al. 2005) states that prepaid incentives enclosed with the mailed survey consistently raise response rates, while post-paid incentives, that is, paid on completion, do not. He cites numerous examples, including Groves, Singer and Corning's study (2000 cited in Porter 2004, p.13) where a '$5 prepayment increased response rates by 24%'. Porter goes on to cite examples where post-paid incentives have had no impact on response rates (Cook, Heath & Thompson 2000 cited in Porter 2004; Porter & Whitcomb 2004). These post-paid results have most relevance to the Student Experience Survey, since the possibility of students from the Canberra Institute of Technology even winning a prize could only be realised be after the survey was completed.

An extrinsic view of rewards was also identified in the study of non-respondents undertaken by Nair et al. The study found that 24% of students made requests for rewards in return for completing the questionnaire. Nair and his colleagues explain this behaviour by quoting research undertaken on people born in the 1980s, the 'Y-Generation', and their expectations of *quid pro quo*—being given something in return (Sheahan 2004 cited in Nair et al. 2006). These statements reflect student interest in the prizes when researchers from the Centre Undertaking Research in Vocational Education were displaying the posters advertising the Student Experience Survey.

The connection between low response rates in online surveys and post-payment has been the subject of other research. Unlike Porter, Moss and Hendry (2002) refer to research that identifies the lack of a monetary reward in online surveys as a reason for lower response rates compared with postal surveys. They suggest the use of aggregate results as a reward/motivation on survey completion. They report on the online survey used in the University of Sydney Medical Program (Moss & Hendry 2002) that utilised this tool. In this survey the students were able to view the latest aggregate results once they had completed the survey. A 63% response rate was reported for the 2001 survey. Unfortunately, the report did not cite evidence that the high response rate was a result of the use of this aggregate tool. The aggregate tool was one of many ideas suggested by Moss and Hendry, including free email accounts, embedding the survey in an email for easy access, and anonymity.

Access

The Canberra Institute of Technology's Internal Research Committee was concerned with issues relating to accessing the survey**.** Physical access to computers was one issue. In order to solve this potential problem, computers with internet access were made available to students at all campus libraries, the Canberra Institute of Technology Students' Association offices, computer laboratories on all campuses and the flexible learning centres. Access to computers was also part of the discussions at faculty management meetings. Managers stated they would encourage their teaching staff to set aside time when they were in computer labs for students to complete the survey. Arranging the booking of extra time in computer labs, however, was problematic, as most labs were already booked for the semester.

Early research by Selwyn and Robson 1998 (cited in Glover and Bush 2005) also highlights this issue of physical access to technology. These researchers also identify the issue of technological fluency, arguing that, if both these issues are not solved, the data collected would be biased towards those who have both the physical technology and the technical skills to use it. Although this research is at least nine years old and computer technology is becoming more widespread, factors of age and socioeconomic background might still be barriers for some students. Porter (2004, p.9) also raises both these issues, stating that a 'web survey will only be successful if the population has easy access to the internet and is comfortable with using the web'. The fluency aspect was only discussed briefly by the Student Experience Survey committee, the committee believing that those who needed assistance would get it from their teachers when in the computer labs. This, however, potentially ignores those students in classes not taking place in computer labs, and who have no access to technology or the skills to use it.

The language used in the survey instrument was the other issue raised by the institute's Internal Research Committee. The committee members from the Access Education Department, as well as the representative from the trades programs identified aspects of the language used in the survey instrument that needed simplification and clarity. The need for simple sentence constructions was also identified in the literature by Peat (2001 cited in Moss and Hendry 2002), although this issue was identified as an element of good survey design rather than a language issue. Language as an access issue was not identified in the literature. As the literature is largely

concerned with survey work in higher education facilities where entry requires higher literacy levels, a focus on literacy issues may not be perceived as a problem.

Access was also discussed in terms of the ease of reaching the survey page. Dommeyer and Moriarty (2000 cited in Moss and Hendry, 2002, p.585) demonstrated that 'an embedded survey, which was easy to access, had a response rate five times higher then an attached questionnaire that was more difficult to access'. This point was taken into account in the development of the Student Experience Survey and the survey was designed so that the students only had to go to a simple website address <http://www.survey.cit.act.edu.au>, which was advertised across Canberra Institute of Technology. In addition, links to the website were available on the desktops across all computers at the institute, as well as on websites the students regularly access, including the online learning site (WebCT), the student association website (CITSA), and the student records management system (Banner) site.

Confidentiality and security

The confidentiality of the students' responses was a further issue raised by the Internal Research Committee. The committee members wanted students to feel confident that their responses could not be traced back to them and be identified by staff. The online technology was therefore set up so that student contact details (required if students wanted to be eligible for a prize) would not be connected to data files. This concern is reported widely in the literature; providing assurances of confidentiality, for example, is listed as one of the strategies for engaging students in the Queensland University of Technology's Learning Experience Survey (2007). The sensitivity of this issue was highlighted in the report by Johnson (2003) where, although student identification was kept in a separate database from rating results, faculty staff were able to obtain lists of students who had completed their survey so that they could encourage those who had not. This finding also raises issues about privacy and students' rights, as the choice of completing the survey should remain with the student.

Porter describes the assurances of confidentiality in terms of social exchange theory by arguing that 'providing an assurance of confidentiality to the respondent may lower the perceived cost of their response being made public and should also foster a sense of trust' (Porter 2004, p.14). He also points out that, conversely, assurances of confidentiality could actually heighten the respondent's awareness of what might happen if their responses are made public. The message here might be to have that assurance but not to trumpet the cause.

The final issue of concern was security, namely, that the person completing the survey is in fact a student at the Canberra Institute of Technology and that only one survey should be completed. If multiple surveys were completed by individual students the data would be skewed—whether the student wanted to emphasise their opinion by multiple entries or just have a better chance at winning the prizes. In order to solve this issue:

> Students were required to login using their internet username and password, before they were allowed access to the survey. Access rights were set to allow students only one opportunity to fill in the survey. This approach ensured that the anonymity of respondents was preserved (as the login process was isolated from the feedback respondents provided) and also protected the integrity of the data by disallowing respondents repeat access to the survey. This was particularly important given the high quality incentives on offer.
>
> (Canberra Institute of Technology 2007, p.4)

Moss and Hendry (2002) refer to a study by Crawford and others (2001) which found that, the more complicated the password access to the survey, the higher the non-response rate. This validates the importance of the simple login process utilised by the Student Experience Survey. To ensure the login process worked smoothly a trial was conducted with staff members. This trial was successful, as was the login process during the survey census period.

Conclusion

In addition to elaborating on a variety of issues and possible solutions relating to the development and implementation of online surveys, this paper has also identified the dearth of research available on surveys in VET and higher education contexts.

As the research has indicated, student participation in surveys is a complex equation. There is no one answer or solution; intrinsic and extrinsic rewards are not mutually exclusive. To varying degrees both these interpretations of 'reward' have a role to play. A way through this complexity might include a multi-layered approach: prizes could still be part of the package to satisfy the Y-Generation and a running aggregate could also be promoted as a more intrinsic reward. But the overall emphasis would still be on engagement.

The core pieces of research identified in the investigative and analytical stage of this paper are the work by Coates and the strategies of the Queensland University of Technology. The value of their research relates to their holistic view. They highlight the importance of both engaging the student and the holistic learning experience; they emphasise the crucial influence of the teacher and their connection to students. In the context of Canberra Institute of Technology's Student Experience Survey, this engagement should not only include the students and their respective teachers, but the whole institute. Surveys such as the Student Experience Survey are becoming increasingly important tools in the institute's reporting requirements. The Student Experience Survey should be viewed in that light—of value to the whole institute. Engagement on this level would mean that the Student Experience Survey would be viewed not as just an additional task, but as a tool integral to all those involved in creating and improving the learning environment at Canberra Institute of Technology.

References

Atrostic, B, Bates, K, Burt, N & Silberstein, A 2001, in SR Porter, 'Raising response rates: What works?', *New Directions for Institutional Research*, no.121, Spring 2004, pp.5–21.

Canberra Institute of Technology 2005, *Student opinion survey*, Centre for Undertaking Research in Vocational Education, Canberra.

——2007, *Student Experience Survey*, *Student opinion survey*, Centre for Undertaking Research in Vocational Education, Canberra.

Coates, H *Managing survey engagement to improve quality assurance*, viewed May 17 2007, <http://www.auqa.edu.au/auqf/2006/student/hamish_coates_atem_paper.pdf>.

Cook, C, Heath, F & Thompson, R 2000, in SR Porter, 'Raising response rates: What works?', *New Directions for Institutional Research*, no.121, Spring 2004, pp.5–21.

Dey, E 1997, in SR Porter, 'Raising response rates: What works?', *New Directions for Institutional Research*, no.121, Spring 2004, pp.5–21.

Dillman, D 2000 in SR Porter, 'Raising response rates: What works?', *New Directions for Institutional Research*, no.121, Spring 2004, pp.5–21.

Dommeyer, CJ, Baum, P, Hanna, R & Chapman, K 2004, 'Gathering faculty teaching evaluations by in-class and online surveys: Their effects on response rates and evaluations', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, vol.29, no.5.

Dommeyer, CJ & Moriarty, E 2000, in J Moss and G Hendry 2002, 'Use of electronic surveys in course evaluation', *British Journal of Educational Technology*, vol.33, no.5, pp.583–92.

Glover, D & Bush, T 2005, 'The online or e-survey: A research approach for the ICT age', *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, vol.28, no.2, pp.135–46.

Graduate Careers Australia 2005, in H Coates, *Managing survey engagement to improve quality assurance*, viewed May 17 2007, <http://www.auqa.edu.au/auqf/2006/student/hamish_coates_atem_paper.pdf>

Groves, RM, Cialdini, RB & Couper, MP 1992, in SR Porter, 'Raising response rates: What works?', *New Directions for Institutional Research*, no.121, Spring 2004, pp.5–21.

Groves, RM, Singer, E & Corning, A 2000, in SR Porter, 'Raising response rates: What works?', *New Directions for Institutional Research*, no.121, Spring 2004, pp.5–21.

Johnson, T D 2003, 'Online student ratings: Will students respond?' *New directions for teaching and learning*, no.96, Winter, pp.49–59.

Moss, J & Hendry, G 2002, 'Use of electronic surveys in course evaluation', *British Journal of Educational Technology*, vol.33, no.5, pp.583–592

Nair, CS, Adams, P, Ferraiuolo, S & Curtis, A 2006, 'Student engagement: The key to better response rates', *Curtin University of Technology: Evaluation forum 2006*, Bentley, Western Australia, viewed 17 May 2007, <http://lsn.curtin.edu.au/evaluationforum06/abstracts/nair.html>.

Peat, PK 2001 in J Moss and G Hendry 2002, 'Use of electronic surveys in course evaluation', *British Journal of Educational Technology*, vol.33, no.5, pp.583–92.

Porter, SR 2004, 'Raising response rates: What works?' *New Directions for Institutional Research*, no.121, Spring, pp.5–21.

Porter, SR & Whitcomb, ME 2004, 'Understanding the effect of prizes on response rates', *New Directions for Institutional Research*, no.121, Spring, pp.51–62.

Queensland University of Technology 2007, *Increasing response rates: Ideas for your unit,* 2007, viewed 17 May 2007, <http://www.talss.qut.edu.au/staff/evaluations/ideas.jsp>.

Selwyn, N & Robson, K 1998, in D Glover and T Bush 2005, 'The online or e-survey: A research approach for the ICT age', *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, vol.28, no.2, October, pp.135–46.

Sheahan, P 2004, cited in CS Nair, P Adams, S Ferraiuolo and A Curtis, 2006, 'Student engagement: The key to better response rates', *Curtin University of Technology: Evaluation forum 2006*, Bentley, Western Australia, viewed 17 May 2007, <http://lsn.curtin.edu.au/evaluationforum06/abstracts/nair.html>.

Szelenyi, K, Bryant, AN & Lindholm, JA 2005, 'What money can buy: Examining the effects of prepaid monetary incentives on survey response rates among college students', *Educational Research and Evaluation*, vol.11, no.4, August, pp.385–404.