

VALIDATION OF THE SPANISH VERSION STUDENT COURSE EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE AND THE APPROACHES TO STUDYING INVENTORY IN DEPRIVED CONTEXTS

Validación de la versión española del Cuestionario de Experiencia en el Curso y del Inventario de Aproximación al Estudio en contextos desfavorecidos

Manuel Ángel González Berruga. University Antonio de Nebrija (*España*).

Cristina Marmolejo. PUCE Esmeraldas (*Ecuador*).

Fecha recepción: 01/05/2025 - Fecha aceptación: 23/06/2025

ABSTRACT

In order to achieve quality education in higher education, it is necessary to have tools that take into account the particularities of the socio-economic and cultural context. The present research aims to validate the Student Course Experience Questionnaire (SCEQ) and the Approaches to Studying Inventory (ASI) in Spanish in the Ecuadorian context, with a view to developing a tool that emerges from the perspectives of university students. The results of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis yield data that do not align with the desired measures, thus necessitating the implementation of an Exploratory Factor Analysis, which consequently produces a questionnaire comprising three categories: Good Teaching Style, University Workload and Generic Skills Scale. The Exploratory Factor Analysis validates the ASI.

KEYWORDS

Quality of teaching, questionnaire validation, higher education, latino education, deprived context.

RESUMEN

Para lograr una educación superior de calidad, es necesario contar con herramientas que tengan en cuenta las particularidades del contexto socioeconómico y cultural. El objetivo de la presente investigación es validar en el contexto ecuatoriano el Student Course Experience Questionnaire (SCEQ) y el Approaches to Studying Inventory (ASI) en español, con miras a desarrollar una herramienta que surja de las perspectivas de los estudiantes universitarios. Los resultados del análisis factorial confirmatorio no se alinean con las medidas deseadas, por lo que es necesario aplicar un análisis factorial exploratorio, que produce un cuestionario compuesto por tres categorías: Buen estilo docente, Carga de trabajo universitario y Escala de competencias genéricas. El análisis factorial exploratorio valida el ASI.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Calidad de la enseñanza, validación de cuestionarios, enseñanza superior, educación latina, contexto desfavorecido.

INTRODUCTION: QUALITY LEARNING IN DEPRIVED CONTEXTS

The attainment of quality teaching in higher education is the objective to which university institutions aspire, and it is imperative that we engage in constant reflection on this subject in order to comprehend and enhance school processes. In accordance with the principles of QuantCrit (Quantitative Critical Race Theory), it is of paramount importance to consider the resources and materials available within the context in which the research is being conducted (Strunk & Mwavita, 2025). This approach enables the identification of areas for enhancing teaching quality, thereby directing efforts towards the realisation of an education and a society that is characterised by social justice, equity, and equality in rights and professional opportunities (Castillo & Gillborn, 2023).

In countries of Latin American region, higher education institutions are located in diverse geographical areas and provinces, encompassing a range of socio-economic and cultural levels. In the case of Ecuador, it has been observed that the context exerts an influence on the teaching and learning process of students (Bernabé et al., 2022; González-Berruga, et al., 2022; Medina, Pinzón & Salazar-Méndez, 2021) or access to education (Ponce & Carrasco, 2017). A comparison of higher education outcomes with the socio-economic and cultural background of students is obscured in general analyses, such as in the IBE report on higher education in Ibero-America (Montes & Osorio, 2024) or in the data about universities at national level (SENESYT, 28 January 2025).

Drawing upon the Latin American and Ecuadorian context, Escobar-Jiménez & Delgado (2019) underscore the imperative to assess the quality of higher education teaching in relation to specific contexts. Similarly, Murillo (2007) emphasises the necessity of developing research that is contextually specific, given the absence of universality in research findings. The present research focuses on the region of Esmeraldas in Ecuador. The region's socioeconomic and cultural context is characterised by significant complexity, as

evidenced by data indicating that in 2023, 49.1% of the population experienced poverty and 26.2% extreme poverty. On a national scale, the corresponding figures were 23.9% and 8.7%, respectively. Furthermore, the region's employment landscape is marked by a 24.5% unemployment rate, compared to the national average of 36.3%. Additionally, 26.1% of the population is not engaged in formal education or employment, a figure that stands in contrast to the national average of 18.6% (INEC, 2025).

Teaching quality can be studied from a variety of perspectives, including productive pedagogies (Bature & Atweh, 2020; González-Berruga, 2018) and productive lesson study (Samaniego & Espinosa, 2022; Espinosa et al., 2018). Other relevant approaches include inclusive education (Booth & Ainscow, 2011), based on elements that ensure student achievement and outcomes (Preston et al., 2016), humanising pedagogy (Manase & Ngubane, 2024) from the perspective of school risk (Freund, Zriker & Sapir, 2022; Escudero, 2013) or sustainable development (Verhelst et al., 2020).

In this instance, a tool framed within the studies of teaching quality and effective teaching was selected (Chapman et al., 2016), with the following characteristics being taken into consideration: 1) the provision of accurate and general information on the teaching-learning process, and 2) a reduced number of items to facilitate the analysis of the data. The following tools were selected as a result of these premises: the Student Course Experience Questionnaire (SCEQ) and the Approaches to Studying Inventory (ASI). The SCEQ is a modification of the Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) (Wilson, Lizzio & Ramsden, 1997) that fits the characteristics of a tool suitable for the university setting and has adequate reliability (Barattucci & Zuffo, 2012; Ginns, Prosser, & Barrie, 2007; Trigwell & Ashwin, 2003).

Barattucci & Zuffo's (2012) 23-item version was selected on the basis of its adequate construct validation, adequate indices, and, considering students of different departments,

its demonstrated good discriminant validity. The ASI is a reduced version of the Revised Approaches to Studying Inventory by Entwistle & Ramsden (1983), with 6 items for deep and shallow focus, as employed by Trigwell & Ashwin (2003) and Barattucci & Zuffo (2012). The ASI has demonstrated adequate consistency (Barattucci et al., 2017; Barattucci & Zuffo, 2012; Trigwell & Ashwin, 2003) and shows acceptable fit indices (Barattucci & Zuffo, 2012).

The aim of this research is to validate the Student Course Experience Questionnaire (SCEQ) and the Approaches to Studying Inventory (ASI) in Spanish in the Ecuadorian context, with a view to developing a tool that emerges from the perspectives of university students. The motivation for the research lies in the need for data collection tools that allow us to know objectively the quality of teaching in higher education and to be able to make decisions for the improvement and development of teaching and learning processes. In contexts characterised by socio-economic and cultural deprivation, social conflict and other forms of social instability, it is of the utmost importance to conduct rigorous evaluations of the quality of education. Such evaluations enable decision-makers to make informed and appropriate decisions, as they provide a clear and precise understanding of the educational reality.

METHODS

This is content validation research of the SCEQ with 23-item and the ASI with 12-item (Barattucci & Zuffo, 2012) in the Ecuadorian context. The following steps were taken to translate and adapt the English version of the SCEQ and ASI into Spanish. Firstly, the translation into Spanish was carried out by a teacher with expertise in education, who was reviewed by three specialists in English to Spanish translation and university teachers who were familiar with the Ecuadorian context. The Spanish translation was then translated back into English and revised by a specialist. This double translation was done to check that the content of the items coincided

and that no information was lost. The grammatical and conceptual content of the final Spanish version was validated by five university lecturers, four lecturers from the faculty of education and one lecturer from the faculty of nursing, and by five students from the faculty of education. The final version of the SCEQ can be seen in Table 1 and the ASI in Table 2.

Table 1. SCEQ final version. Note. The Spanish items of the original questionnaire are displayed. Original work.

Good Teaching (GT)	1. Los docentes me motivan para hacer mi mejor trabajo (My tutors motivate me to do my best work)
	2. Los docentes invierten mucho tiempo para comentar mi trabajo ya sea de forma oral o escrita (My tutors put a lot of time into commenting (orally and/or in writing) on my work)
	3. Los docentes se esfuerzan en hacer interesantes las asignaturas (My tutors work hard to make their subjects interesting)
	4. Los docentes son extremadamente buenos explicando conceptos o ideas (My tutors are extremely good at explaining things)
	5. Por lo general, los docentes me dan información útil sobre mi progreso en clase (My tutors normally give me helpful feedback on my progress)
	6. Los docentes se esfuerzan para comprender las dificultades que puedo tener con las tareas de clase (My tutors make a real effort to understand difficulties I may be having with my work)
Clear Goals and Standards (CGS)	7. Los docentes dejan claro desde el principio lo que esperan de los estudiantes (The tutors made it clear right from the start what they expect from students)
	8. Por lo general, he tenido una idea clara de lo que lo que estoy haciendo y se espera que haga en la carrera (I have usually had a clear idea of where I am going and what is expected of me in this degree course)

	9. En ocasiones ha sido duro descubrir lo que se esperaba de mí en la carrera (It has often been hard to discover what is expected of me in this degree course) 10. Siempre es fácil conocer el nivel de trabajo esperado en la universidad (It is always easy to know the standard of work expected at college)
Appropriate Assessment (AA)	11. Muchos docentes me hacen preguntas solamente sobre hechos o conceptos (Too many tutors have asked me questions just about facts) 12. Mis docentes parecen más interesados en evaluar lo que he memorizado que lo que he comprendido (My tutors seem more interested in assessing what I have memorised than what I have understood) 13. Para conseguir buenas notas en las asignaturas debes tener una buena memoria (To do well in this degree all you really need is a good memory)
Appropriate Workload (AW)	14. Hay mucha presión, que considero indeseable, por parte de la universidad (There is a lot of unwanted academic pressure on me as a student at college) 15. Generalmente, dispongo del tiempo suficiente para comprender lo que tengo que estudiar (I am generally given enough time to understand the things I must learn) 16. El gran volumen de trabajo que tenemos durante el curso significa que no puedo comprenderlo todo a fondo (The sheer volume of work to be got through in this degree means I can't comprehend it all thoroughly) 17. La carga de trabajo en la universidad es muy alta (The workload given to me is too heavy)
Generic Skills Scale (GSS)	18. Las clases de la universidad han desarrollado mi habilidad de trabajar en equipo (The degree course has helped me develop my ability to work as a team member)

	19. Las clases de la universidad me han permitido mejorar mis habilidades de análisis (The degree course has sharpened my analytic skills) 20. Las clases de la universidad me han permitido desarrollar mi confianza al enfrentarme a problemas desconocidos (As a result of my degree course, I feel confident about tackling unfamiliar problems) 21. Las clases de universidad me han permitido desarrollar mis habilidades para resolver problemas (The degree course has developed my problem-solving skills) 22. Las clases de universidad me han permitido mejorar mis habilidades para la comunicación escrita (The degree course has improved my skills in written communication) 23. Las clases de universidad me han ayudado a desarrollar la habilidad de planificar mi trabajo (My degree course has helped me to develop the ability to plan my own work)
--	---

Table 2. ASI final version. Note. The Spanish items of the original questionnaire are dis-played. Original work.

Deep Approach (DA)	1. En ocasiones, me cuestiono sobre cosas que he escuchado en clase o leído en los libros (Often I find myself questioning things I hear in lectures or read in books) 2. Cuando estoy leyendo un artículo o un libro, intento encontrar por mi mismo lo que el autor quiere decir (When I am reading an article or book, I try to find out for myself) exactly what the author means 3. Cuando estoy trabajando en una nueva asignatura o tema, intento ver como las ideas se relacionan entre sí (When I am working on a new topic, I try to see how all the ideas fit together) 4. Cuando leo, analizo los detalles cuidadosamente para ver como se encajan con el contenido general de la lectura (When I read, I examine the details carefully to see how they fit in with what's being said)
---------------------------	--

	5. De vez en cuando me encuentro pensando sobre ideas o conceptos que he aprendido en la universidad cuando estoy haciendo otras cosas (I often find myself thinking about ideas from my course when I'm doing other things something else) 6. De vez en cuando, las ideas de los libros de texto o de los artículos me llevan a crear largos hilos de pensamiento por mi cuenta (Ideas in course books or articles often set me off on long chains of thought of my own)
Surface Approach (SA)	7. Me concentro únicamente en aprender la información que necesito para pasar de curso (I concentrate on learning just those bits of information I have to know to pass) 8. A menudo tengo problemas para dar sentido a las cosas que tengo que recordar (I often have trouble in making sense of the things I have to remember) 9. Mucho de lo que estoy estudiando tiene poco sentido y me da la impresión de que son pequeñas píldoras de información que no están conectados (Much of what I am studying makes little sense: it's like unrelated bits and pieces) 10. A menudo me siento que me ahogo frente a la cantidad de material con la que tengo que trabajar (Often I feel I am drowning in the sheer amount of material I'm having I have to cope with) 11. A menudo estoy preocupado por si soy capaz de enfrentarme al trabajo de la universidad de manera apropiada (I often worry about whether I'll ever be able to cope with the University work properly) 12. A menudo me pregunto si el trabajo que estoy haciendo aquí es valioso y merece la pena (Often I find myself wondering whether the work I am doing here is really worthwhile)

For SCEQ and ASI a 5-point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) was used. In the case of the SCEQ, the category Good Teaching (GT) is concerned with the

methodology and attitude of the teachers regarding the learning process; the category Clear Goals and Standards (CGS) is focused on the clarity of the objectives and the expected student performance during the study process; the category Appropriate Assessment (AA) is concerned with the memoristic or procedural components on which the teacher focuses when assessing; the category Appropriate Workload (AW) is related to the students' perception of the university's workload; and the Generic Skills Scale (GSS) category focuses on assessing the skills that the student has developed thanks to the university. In ASI, the Deep Approach (DA) category measures significant study involvement attitudes, and the Surface Approach (SA) category measures superficial attitudes and feelings related to a lack of study involvement.

SAMPLE

The research was conducted at the Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador (PUCE) Esmeraldas campus. PUCE has been identified as the institution with the most comprehensive and significant data and results in Ecuador and the province of Esmeraldas (QS World University Rankings, 2025). It is noteworthy that this university operates within a depressed socio-economic context as has been observed. The data were collected during the second semester of 2023, spanning the months of July to August. The sample size was determined to be 208 respondents, representing a subset of the total population of 1,315 undergraduate students enrolled at PUCE Esmeraldas (PUCE Esmeraldas, 2024). This sample size was sufficient to allow for the calculation of precise statistics with a margin of error of 6% and a confidence level of 90%. Students' participation in the questionnaire implies acceptance of the informed consent stated at the beginning of the questionnaire.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Reliability is measured using both Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega, both considered adequate when $\alpha \geq .70$ and $\omega \geq .70$ (Agbo, 2010; Aithal & Aithal, 2020; Hayes &

Coutts, 2020). The KMO (Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin) measure was employed to assess the sampling adequacy for each item, while the Bartlett sphericity test was utilised to ascertain the existence of any correlations among the variables.

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) determines if the questionnaire measures what it is intended to measure by assessing if the items fit the theoretical categories. The CFA with the factorial index χ^2 is used due to its robustness to violations of normality when there are more than 100 observations (Rojas-Torres, 2020). Furthermore, the maximum likelihood component is utilized as it has been proven to be a reliable measure even when the data has a non-normal distribution (Li, 2016). The recommended fit criteria for assessing model fit are CFI (Comparative fit index), TLI (Tucker-Lewis's Index), RMSEA (Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation), SRMR (Standardised Root Mean Square Residual) and chi-square (χ^2), considering the appropriate values are CFI $\geq$.95, TLI $\geq$.90, RMSEA $\leq$.05, SRMR $\leq$.08, $\chi^2/p \geq$.05, (Jordan, 2021). AIC (Akaike Information Criterion) and BIC (Bayesian Information Criterion) was used to compare the models. Appropriate values indicate a variance between 0 and 2 for AIC and 0 and 6 for BIC (Cavanaugh & Neath, 2019; Neath & Cavanaugh, 2012).

To attain a model with an acceptable level of fit, we utilized exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with the robust maximum likelihood procedure and oblimin rotation (Ledesma, Ferrando, & Tosi, 2019) to devise a reliable and valid questionnaire (Ferrando, & Lorenzo-Seva, 2014). The validity of the questionnaire was measured using RMESEA, TLI, BIC and χ^2 . Analysis was performed using Jamovi 2.3.28.0.

RESULTS

Reliability

The reliability of the SCEQ yielded $\alpha=.928$ and $\omega=.936$. By dimensions, the values for GT, CGS, AA, AW and GSS are $\alpha=.940$, $\omega=.940$, $\alpha=.786$, $\omega=.815$, $\alpha=.625$, $\omega=.654$ and $\alpha=.577$, $\omega=.645$, respectively. In the case of AW, upon

removing item 15 (I am generally given enough time to understand the things I must learn), we obtain an $\alpha=.724$ and $\omega=.736$.

In the case of ASI it gives overall $\alpha=.882$ and $\omega=.890$, and by dimensions DA $\alpha=.919$ and $\omega=.920$; SA $\alpha=.839$ and $\omega=.840$.

KMO and Bartlett test

In the case of SCEQ, Bartlett sphericity test indicate that the variables are significantly correlated to perform the confirmatory analysis with $\chi^2=3500$, $gl=253$, $p<.001$.

KMO (Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin) yielded an MSA (Measure of Sampling Adequacy) of .711 for item 17 (The workload given to me is too heavy). Ferrando et al. (2022) posit that values with MSA $< .75$ should be eliminated from the analysis. Consequently, item 17, along with item 15, will be accorded heightened scrutiny in forthcoming analyses.

In the ASI, Bartlett's test of sphericity demonstrates that the variables are correlated with $\chi^2=1491$, $gl=66$, $p<.001$. The KMO indicate no value below .75 in the MSA.

Confirmatory and exploratory factor analysis

In the case of the SCEQ and ASI, the chi-square test shows a statistically significant association with $p<.001$ (see Table 3).

Table 3. Chi square for SCEQ and ASI

	χ^2	gl	p
SCEQ	597	220	<.001
ASI	235	53	<.001

The components for SCEQ and ASI exhibit data that does not align with the acceptable values (Table 4).

Table 4. CFA components for SCEQ and ASI

		SCEQ	ASI
IC 90% of RMSEA	CFI	0.890	0.876
	TLI	0.873	0.845
	SRMR	0.115	0.0689
	RMSEA	0.0907	0.129
	Lower	0.0820	0.112
	Upper	0.0995	0.146
	AIC	11044	5815
	BIC	11308	5938

In order to achieve a more accurate and reliable model, EFA is performed for SCEQ and

ASI. The most appropriate model is identified by the removal of items 15 and 17 (Table 5).

Table 5. SCEQ model fit measures. Note. Original work.

		23 ítems	No ítem 17	No ítem 15	No ítems 15 y 17
IC 90% of RMSEA	RMSEA	.0703	.0678	.0711	.0683
	Lower	.0604	.0572	.0607	.0570
	Upper	.0808	.0790	.0822	.0800
Model testing	TLI	.919	.929	.923	.933
	BIC	-618	-567	-551	-505
	χ^2	380	330	346	296
	gl	187	168	168	150
	p	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001

A model emerges with three correlated factors that explain up to 62% of the variability (see Table 6). Bartlett's test of sphericity indicates the correlation with $\chi^2 = 3313$, gl = 210, $p < .001$.

Table 6. Factors variance of SCEQ. Note. Original work.

Factor	SC Loadings	% of variance	% accumu- lated
1	6.38	30.4	30.4
2	4.45	21.2	51.6
3	2.20	10.5	62.0

As illustrated in Table 7, the first factor encompasses the majority of items from the categories of 'Good teaching' and 'Clear goals and standards'. The second factor encompasses items from the domains of Appropriate assessment and Appropriate workload, in addition to item 9. The third factor corresponds to the Generic Skills Scale category.

Table 7. Model loadings with 3 factors. Note. Original work.

	Factor			Unicity
	1	2	3	
Item 1	.878			0.287
Item 3	.873			0.246
Item 5	.864			0.265
Item 2	.859			0.310
Item 6	.812			0.291
Item 7	.795			0.249
Item 4	.790			0.260
Item 8	.646			0.322
Item 10	.491			0.463
Item 20		.936		0.240
Item 21		.864		0.315
Item 19		.832		0.259

Item 23	.816	0.169
Item 22	.727	0.214
Item 18	.478	0.546
Item 12	.738	0.447
Item 14	.614	0.637
Item 16	.609	0.637
Item 9	.568	0.583
Item 13	.563	0.641
Item 11	.362	0.590

In the case of the ASI, an EFA is performed, resulting in the emergence of a model that explains 56.9% of the variance (Table 8).

Table 8. Factors variance of ASI. Note. Original work.

Factor	SC Loadings	% of the variance	% accumu- lated
1	4.01	33.4	33.4
2	2.82	23.5	56.9

Two factors have been identified where the variables demonstrate a significant correlation. This finding was confirmed through a Bartlett's test, which yielded a result of $\chi^2 = 1491$, gl=66, $p < .001$. The items demonstrate a high degree of compatibility with the original ASI model (Table 9).

Table 9. Loading factors of ASI. Note. The 'Maximum Likelihood' extraction method was used in combination with an 'obli-min' rotation. Original work.

	Factor		Unicity
	1	2	
Item 4	0.891		0.181
Item 5	0.877		0.265
Item 3	0.843		0.316
Item 2	0.779		0.413
Item 1	0.737		0.390
Item 6	0.696		0.474
Item 11		0.779	0.389
Item 8		0.723	0.494
Item 10		0.709	0.457
Item 12		0.694	0.488
Item 9		0.654	0.627
Item 7		0.460	0.680

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The CFA data of SCEQ do not align with the values indicated by the confirmation of the questionnaire categories. Consequently, the decision has been taken to remove items 15 'I am generally given enough time to understand the things I must learn' and 17 'The workload given to me is too heavy' from the EFA, as these items can be included in item 16

'The sheer volume of work to be got through in this degree means I can't comprehend it all thoroughly'. The application of the EFA model yields a tripartite structure, with the subsequent identification of more appropriate values. The first factor can be designated 'Good Teaching Style', as it encompasses items pertaining to methodology, teaching style, and the pedagogical relationship of teachers to students. This includes motivation, clarity of tasks and objectives to be achieved, and feedback on students' work. The second factor is referred to as University Workload, as it refers to the specific workload of teachers or the workload of the university in general, however, this workload is derived from the university. The final factor corresponds entirely to the Generic Skills Scale category. The ASI EFA corroborates the two categories of Deep Approach and Surface Approach, as postulated in the research conducted by Barattucci & Zuffo (2012).

The aim objective of validating the Student Course Experience Questionnaire (SCEQ) and the Approaches to Studying Inventory (ASI) in Spanish within the Ecuadorian context has been accomplished. The validation process has yielded a questionnaire comprising three categories that aligns optimally with the model. The newly developed instrument has been designated the Student Course Experience Questionnaire in Ecuador (SCEQE), with the intention of distinguishing it from the SCEQ. The SCEQE comprises three categories,

namely: Good Teaching Style, University Workload and Generic Skills Scale. The final format of the SCEQE can be found in Appendix I. The validation of the ASI demonstrates its robustness as a questionnaire that allows for the identification of the deep or superficial approach to students' work.

Further research is required in order to validate both the SCEQ and the SCEQE to enhance the comprehension and development of instruments to evaluate the teaching effectiveness. This validation should be carried out using larger samples within or outside the Ecuadorian context, and in different socio-economic and cultural contexts. In the Ecuadorian and Latin American context, the use of the SCEQ, SCEQE and ASI is recommended for the evaluation of teaching quality, as well as for the investigation of the variables that explain the quality of the teaching process and school failure in higher education.

REFERENCIAS BIBLIOGRÁFICAS

- Agbo, A. A. (2010) Cronbach's Alpha: Review of Limitations and Associated Recommendations. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 20(2), 233-239. DOI: 10.1080/14330237.2010.10820371
- Aithal, A. & Aithal, P. (2020). Development and Validation of Survey Questionnaire & Experimental Data – A Systematical Review-based Statistical Approach. *International Journal of Management, Technology, and Social Sciences (IJMTS)*, 5(2), 233-251. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.3724105
- Bature, I. J. & Atweh, B. (2020). Mathematics Teachers Reflection on the Role of Productive Pedagogies in Improving Their Classroom Instruction. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, 6(2), 319-335. DOI: 10.12973/ijem.6.2.319
- Barattucci, M., & Zuffo, R. G. (2012). Measuring learning environment perceptions: validation of the Italian version of the approaches to studying inventory and the student course experience questionnaire. *TPM*, 19(1), 15-33. DOI: 10.4473/TPM19.1.2

- Barattucci, M., Pagliaro, S., Cafagna, D. & Bosetto, D. (2017). An examination of the applicability of Biggs' 3P learning process model to Italian university. *Journal of e Learning and Knowledge Society*, 13(1), 163-180.
- Bernabé, L., González, M., Espinoza, M. & Armijos, I. (2022). Calidad de la enseñanza remota en el contexto universitario en Esmeraldas, Ecuador, desde la experiencia docente. *Sathiri*, 2(17), 82-101. DOI: 10.32645/13906925.1132
- Booth, T. & Ainscow, M. (2011). *Index for Inclusion: developing learning and participation in schools*. Bristol, Centre for Studies in Inclusive Education (CSIE).
- Castillo, W. & Gillborn, D. (2023). *How to "QuantCrit:" Practices and Questions for Education Data Researchers and Users*. (No. 22–546). Working Paper. Retrieved from Annenberg Institute at Brown University. DOI: 10.26300/v5kh-dd65
- Cavanaugh, J. & Neath, A. (2019). The Akaike information criterion: Background, derivation, properties, application, interpretation, and refinements. *WIRES, Computational Statistics*, 11(3), 1460. DOI: 10.1002/wics.1460
- Chapman, C., Muijs, D., Reynolds, D., Sammons, P., & Teddlie, T. (2016). *The Routledge International Handbook of Educational Effectiveness and Improvement: Research, policy, and practice*. London, Routledge.
- Entwistle, N. & Ramsden, P. (1983). *Understanding student learning*. London, Croom Helm.
- Escobar-Jiménez, C., & Delgado, A. (2019). Quality and Quality in Higher Education: A Theoretical Discussion in Ecuadorian Higher Education System. *REDU. Revista de Docencia Universitaria*, 17(2), 159-175. DOI: 10.4995/redu.2019.11740
- Escudero, J. M. (2013). *Estudiantes en riesgo, centros escolares de riesgo*. Spain, DM.
- Espinosa, A., Datukan, J., Butron, B. & Tameta, A. (2018). Perceptions of pre-service chemistry teachers on the utilization of productive lesson study as a framework for teaching and learning. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 12(1). DOI: 10.20429/ijstl.2018.120109
- Ferrando, P., Lorenzo-Seva, U., Hernández-Dorado, A., & Muñiz, J. (2022). Decálogo para el Análisis Factorial de los Ítems de un Test. *Psicothema*, 34(1), 7-17. DOI: 10.7334/psicothema2021.456
- Ferrando, P. & Lorenzo-Seva, U. (2014). El análisis factorial exploratorio de los ítems: algunas consideraciones adicionales. *Anales de psicología*, 30(3), 1170-1175. DOI: 10.6018/analesps.30.3.199991
- Freund, A., Zriker, A. & Sapir, Z. (2022). Optimal Educational Climate among Students at Risk: The Role of Teachers' Work Attitudes. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 37(1), 207-226. DOI: 10.1007/s10212-021-00545-1
- Ginns, P., Prosser, M. & Barrie, S. (2007). 'Students' perceptions of teaching quality in higher education: the perspective of currently enrolled students'. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(5), 603 - 615. DOI: 10.1080/03075070701573773
- González-Berruga, M. A. (2018). *Análisis de los factores de riesgo escolar en la Educación Secundaria obligatoria*. Phd Dissertation. University of Murcia.
- González-Berruga, M. Á., Coronel-Tenorio, A. K., Bernabé, M. L., & Vera, S. C. (2022). Factores de Riesgo en Estudiantes Universitarios en el Contexto de Pandemia. *Hallazgos*21, 7(3), 252–272. DOI: 10.69890/hallazgos21.v7i3.591
- Hayes, A. F. & Coutts, J. J. (2020) Use Omega Rather than Cronbach's Alpha for Estimating Reliability. But.... *Communication Methods and Measures*, 14(1), 1-24. DOI: 10.1080/19312458.2020.1718629
- INEC (2025, January 28). Encuesta nacional de empleo, desempleo y subempleo. https://www.ecuadorencifras.gob.ec/documentos/web-inec/Sitios/micrositios_visualizadores/

- Jordan, F. (2021). Valor de corte de los índices de ajuste en el análisis factorial confirmatorio [Cut-off value of the fit indices in the confirmatory factor analysis]. *PSOCIAL, Revista de Investigación en Psicología Social*, 7(1), 66-71.
- Ledesma, R., Ferrando, P. & Tosi, J. (2019). The use of exploratory factor analysis in RIDEF: Guidelines for authors and reviewers. *Associação Iberoamericana de Diagnóstico e Avaliação Psicológica*, 3(52), 173-180. DOI: 10.21865/RIDEF52.3.13
- Li, C. H. (2016). Confirmatory factor analysis with ordinal data: Comparing robust maximum likelihood and diagonally weighted least squares. *Behavioural Research Methods*, 48, 936-949. DOI: 10.3758/s13428-015-0619-7
- Manase, N. & Ngubane, S. (2024). Reimagining Postgraduate Supervision: Fostering Inclusivity and Support for Students at-risk in Open and Distance Learning Environments. *Research in Social Sciences and Technology*, 9(1). DOI: 10.46303/ressat.2024.21
- Medina, J., Pinzón, K., & Salazar-Méndez, Y. (2021). Determinantes del Rendimiento Académico de los Estudiantes de una Universidad Pública Ecuatoriana. *Revista Politécnica*, 47(2), 53-62. DOI: 10.33333/rp.vol47n2.05
- Montes, N. & Osorio, L. (2024). Panorama de la educación superior en iberoamérica a través de los indicadores de la red indices. Relevamiento 2023. OEI.
- Murillo, J. (2007). School Effectiveness Research in Latin America. In T. Townsend (Ed.), *International Handbook of School Effectiveness and Improvement* (pp. 75-92), Springer.
- Neath, A. & Cavanaugh, J. (2012). The Bayesian information criterion: background, derivation, and applications. *WIREs, Computational Statistics*, 4(2), 199. DOI: 10.1002/wics.199
- Preston, C. et al. (2016). Conceptualizing Essential Components of Effective High Schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*. DOI: 10.1080/15700763.2016.1205198
- PUCE Esmeraldas (2024). *Rendición de cuentas 2023*. <https://www.pucese.edu.ec/informe-de-rendicion-de-cuentas-2023/>
- Ponce, J., & Carrasco, F. (2017). Acceso y Equidad a la educación superior y posgrado en el Ecuador. Un enfoque descriptivo. *Mundos Plurales - Revista Latinoamericana de Políticas y Acción Pública* 3(2), 9-22. DOI: 10.17141/mundosplurales.2.2016.2841.
- QS World University Rankings (2025, January 28). QS World University Rankings: Latin America & The Caribbean 2025. <https://www.topuniversities.com/latin-america-caribbean-overall?search=ecuador>
- Rojas-Torres, L (2020). Robustez de los índices de ajuste del análisis factorial confirmatorio a los valores extremos. *Revista de Matemática: Teoría y operaciones*, 27(2), 383-404.
- Samaniego, K. K. B., & Espinosa, A. A. (2022). Developing mathematics-enhanced chemistry research lessons through productive lesson study: Insights from in-service teachers. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 27(3), 89-99. DOI: 10.15663/wje.v27i3.736
- SENESYT (2025, January 28). Visualizador de indicadores de educación superior. <https://sia.senescyt.gob.ec/universidades-y-escuelas-politecnicas-informacion-matricula/>
- Strunk, K. & Mwavita, M. (2025). *Design and Analysis in Quantitative Educational Research*. London, Routledge.
- Trigwell, K., & Ashwin, P. (2003). Undergraduate students experience of learning at the University of Oxford. Oxford, Oxford Learning Institute.
- Verhelst, D., Vanhoof, J., Boeve-de Pauw, J. & Van Petegem, P. (2020). Building a conceptual framework for an ESD-effective school organization. *The Journal of Environmental Education*. DOI: 10.1080/00958964.2020.1797615
- Wilson, K. L., Lizzio, A. & Ramsden, P. (1997) The development, validation and application of the Course Experience Questionnaire. *Studies in Higher Education*, 22(1), 33-53.

APPENDIX I

STUDENT COURSE EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE IN ECUADOR (SCEQE)

Good Teaching Style

1. My tutors motivate me to do my best work
2. My tutors put a lot of time into commenting (orally and/or in writing) on my work
3. My tutors work hard to make their subjects interesting
4. My tutors are extremely good at explaining things
5. My tutors normally give me helpful feedback on my progress
6. My tutors make a real effort to understand difficulties I may be having with my work
7. The tutors made it clear right from the start what they expect from students
8. I have usually had a clear idea of where I am going and what is expected of me in this degree course
9. It is always easy to know the standard of work expected at college

University Workload

10. It has often been hard to discover what is expected of me in this degree course
11. Too many tutors have asked me questions just about facts
12. My tutors seem more interested in assessing what I have memorised than what I have understood
13. To do well in this degree all you really need is a good memory
14. There is a lot of unwanted academic pressure on me as a student at college
15. The sheer volume of work to be got through in this degree means I can't comprehend it all thoroughly

Generic Skills Scale

16. The degree course has helped me develop my ability to work as a team member
17. The degree course has sharpened my analytic skills
18. As a result of my degree course, I feel confident about tackling unfamiliar problems
19. The degree course has developed my problem-solving skills
20. The degree course has improved my skills in written communication
21. My degree course has helped me to develop the ability to plan my own work

Acknowledgements

To PUCE Esmeraldas for allowing this research to be carried out.

Mailing information

Name: Manuel Ángel González Berruga
Address: Maestro Varela Street, 7, 2º Izq. 02005. Albacete, Spain.
Phone Number: +34637900440
Email: mgonzalb@nebrija.co