The Validity of The Experiences of Teaching and Learning Questionnaire (ETLQ) as a measure of quality learning. A Systematic Critical Literature Review

Abstract

Introduction

The Experiences of Teaching and Learning Questionnaire (ETLQ) is assumed to measure learning quality via two main scales: The Students’ Perceptions of the Teaching-learning Environment scale, and the Students Approaches to Learning scale. ETLQ was initially developed in the UK as an instrument to help direct local educational development initiatives for quality learning (1). It has since been adapted and used in other countries as a measure of quality learning (2, 3). Recently, the Danish Government decided that university students’ scores on an adapted version of ETLQ (‘Læringsbarometeret’) should influence the economy of Danish universities directly in the coming years. The aim of this study was to examine the validity evidence of the ETLQ. The objectives were 1) to evaluate the current degree of support for the validity of the ETLQ as a measure of quality learning using a modern validity framework, and 2) to suggest directions for future ETLQ validation research.

Method

The study design was a systematic critical review. ERIC, Academic Search Premier, Scopus and four Scandinavian databases were searched, and supplemented with a cited reference search in Google Scholar as well as a search of the developers’ project web page. Two researchers independently screened titles and abstracts for relevance relative to predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria. The included studies were critically appraised by minimum two researchers independently, and a final consensus appraisal was reached by the research group. The criteria for quality appraisal of validity studies used were developed by researchers based on the validity framework outlined in the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing (4, 5).

Results

Results will be available for presentation at the conference in May 2020.

Discussion/conclusion

Results will be discussed against relevant and current literature at the conference.
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