

## The Student Survey on Educational Technology 2002: Methodology and Descriptives

*Debbie E. McGhee*  
*February, 2003 (updated 05/07)*

### INTRODUCTION

During autumn quarter, 2002, Educational Partnerships and Learning Technologies (EPLT) convened a group of campus stakeholders<sup>1</sup> and worked with the Program for Educational Transformation Through Technology (PETTT) and the Office of Educational Assessment (OEA) to carry out a survey of students at the three University of Washington (UW) campuses regarding the ways in which students use, and would like to use, technology in support of their education. The ultimate aim of the survey was to improve teaching and learning at the UW by: 1) contributing to a University-wide conversation about uses of instructional technology and pedagogy in general, 2) increasing student and faculty awareness of ways in which technology can be used in service of teaching and learning, and 3) facilitating informed decision-making regarding allocation of UW resources. This study was a companion to the Faculty Survey on Instructional Technology conducted in Winter, 2001.

### METHOD

#### Sample

The population was defined as all students 18 years of age or older who were enrolled as of the tenth day of autumn quarter 2002 at the Seattle, Bothell, or Tacoma campus; additionally, a student must not have been selected for any other concurrently-running OEA survey. From that population, 3000 students were randomly selected.

#### Instrument

The questionnaire was developed in consultation with EPLT, the Student Technology Fee Committee, Computing and Communications, and the UW Libraries. It was comprised of questions about the types of technology used by students and faculty and methods of use and was accompanied by a cover letter explaining the survey purpose and timeline. The questionnaire was intended to be equally appropriate for novice and expert users of computer technology. Most of the items were closed format (i.e., multiple-choice or Likert-type scales), but there were also many open-ended items. Most items contained multiple questions.

Because the [full questionnaire](#) was lengthy, ten versions containing various subsets of items were created. All versions included the first several demographic items. Beyond that, the versions were constructed so that each item appeared with every other item at least once. Each version was exactly

four pages long. Table 1 maps out the ten versions of the questionnaire. Participants were randomly assigned to questionnaire version.

**Table 1. Item map for the ten versions of the *Student Survey on Educational Technology***

Version	Order of items before renumbering																
A	1-7	8s	9	10	11	12	19	20	13	14	15	16	17	18	28		
B	1-7	8s	11	21	22	23	24	13	9	10	12	28					
C	1-7	8L	9	10	11	12	13	25	26	27	28						
D	1-7	8s	9	10	11	12	19	20	21	22	23	24	15	16	17	18	28
E	1-7	8L	9	10	11	12	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	25	26	27	28
F	1-7	8L	9	10	11	12	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28			
G	1-7	8s	19	20	21	22	23	24	13	14	15	16	17	18	28		
H	1-7	8L	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	25	26	27	28			
I	1-7	8L	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
J	1-7	8L	13	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28						

## Procedure

The first round of recruitment was done via [email](#) (October 30). Students were briefly told about the purpose of the study and provided with a URL for the online version of the questionnaire. Approximately one week later a paper version of the questionnaire with accompanying [cover letter](#) was mailed to those 2780 students who had not yet replied online, and one week after that a [follow-up email](#) was sent (November 19). As an incentive to complete the questionnaire, students had the opportunity to enter a drawing for a \$300 University BookStore gift certificate. In order to protect participants' confidentiality, identifying information was not retained with the key-entered or online data.

## Response rate

The vast majority ( $n=2995$ ) of the sample had email addresses on file. Although five of the initial emails bounced and 43 hardcopy mailings were returned to sender, there were no participants for whom both the email and letter were undeliverable. A total of 961 students (32%) completed the questionnaire. Participants were somewhat more likely to complete the paper version (59%) than online the version (41%). By comparison, faculty in the 2001 study were twice as likely to respond on paper (68%) than online (32%).

**Table 2. Number of respondents by questionnaire version.**

<b>Version</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
A	84	8.7
B	96	10.0
C	83	8.6
D	76	7.9
E	123	12.8
F	94	9.8
G	105	10.9
H	109	11.3
I	109	11.3
J	82	8.5
Total	961	

## **RESULTS**

A preliminary view of the survey results is provided by the overall frequency distributions and means (as appropriate) for each of the closed-ended items.

[Descriptive Statistics](#)

A more detailed narrative summary is provided in the file linked below.

[Narrative Summary](#)

<sup>1</sup> The stakeholder groups included the Student Technology Fee Committee, EPLT, Computing and Communications, UW Libraries, OEA, and PETTT.