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Modern Times!
Student generation X – Y – Z
Generalisation of IT-apps
Mass & social media
More heterogeneous student population
European Educational Space
Bologna – Bachelor / Master
Strict year organisation replaced by credits: flexibility!
1990 – 2010: significant changes in Flemish higher education

Didactic adaptations
Professor – student relation
Evaluation teaching
Guidance and Counselling services within and outside the departments / faculties

etc. Modern Times!!!
Research question 1

Did these changes influence student behaviour, emotions, attitudes?

1990 - 2010

TASTE – Test Abilities for Study and Examination

78 items

4 scales: Study valuation (14) / Self Confidence (19) / Fear of Failure + somatic stress (30) / Procrastination (15)

Theoretically based on Value – Expectancy Model
Research questions

1. Is the VaSEV (TASTE) still understandable after 20 years and accompanying changes?

2. Is the VaSEV factor structure stable?

3. Are scores on the 4 VaSEV scales stable or were generation and contextual changes accompanied by changes in Study valuation, Self Confidence, Fear of Failure and Procrastination?

4. What will be the relation of a test based on Expectancy – Value Theory and and a test based on Self Determination theory?
Question 1 – Understandable?

Yes - Perfectly
Classical testing (paper version)

High school (general)
M 283
F 512

University
M 570
F 295

(70% 1st yr / 20% 2nd yr)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General HS</strong></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical HS</strong></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>340</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High School (5th – 6th year) - paper version
Higher Education (1st Bach) – paper version and on line version

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Bachelor</th>
<th>M 208</th>
<th>739</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F 531</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Bachelor</td>
<td>M 83</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F 173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2: factor structure

Confirmatory factor analysis

Perfect structure, although some items changed in factor loading

VaSEV survived and kept his original shape: 4 scales and 78 items
Question 3:
Results total sample - Males

N 1990 = 853 (High school + Univ)
N 2010 = 377 (High school + Univ)

Study Valuation  ns

Self Confidence  ***  2010 > 62,7>61,3

Fear of Failure  ns (0,053) 2010 > 68>67,3

Procrastination  ns
Question 3:
Results total sample - Females

N 1990 = 807 (High school + Univ)
N 2010 = 529 (High school + Univ)

Study Valuation ns

Self Confidence *** 2010 > 58.1 > 57

Fear of Failure ns

Procrastination ns
Question 3:
Results High School - Males

N 1990 = 283 (High school General)
N 2010 = 294 (High school General + Technical)

Study Valuation  ns

Self Confidence  *  1990 > 62.8 > 61.1

Fear of Failure  ns

Procrastination  ns
Question 3: Results High School - Females

N 1990 = 512 (High school General)
N 2010 = 356 (High school General + Technical)

Study Valuation  ns

Self Confidence  ***  1990 >  58.7 > 57.6

Fear of Failure  ns

Procrastination  ns
Question 3:
Results University - Males

N 1990 = 570
N 2010 = 83

Study Valuation    ns
Self Confidence    ns
Fear of Failure    ns
Procrastination    ns
Question 3:
Results University - Females

N 1990 = 295
N 2010 = 173

Study Valuation: 2010 > 51.4 > 50.7
Self Confidence: ns
Fear of Failure: ns
Procrastination: ns
In despite of manifest generation and contextual changes over the last 20 years

the majority of mean scores on Study Valuation, Self Confidence, Fear of Failure and Procrastination did NOT change

When significant differences were found, they were only minimal and seem in reality not relevant
### Additional: Gender differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HS – G</th>
<th>HS – T</th>
<th>Prba</th>
<th>Acba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pcr</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pcr</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender differences: conclusion

Hypotheses are retained.

Females have

- Tendency toward more ‘motivation’ (except univ)
- Less Self Confidence
- Clearly more Fear of Failure
- Less Procrastination (except univ)
Additional Differences between Study domains:
HS General vs HS Technical

SV – no difference

SC – General > Technical for F

FF – Technical > General for M and F

Pcr – Technical > General for M and F

FF - Females score higher in Higher Education
### Differences between study domains: Prof. Bachelors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Biomedical</th>
<th>Exact Sc</th>
<th>Human Sc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pcr</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differences between study domains: Prof. Bachelors

No clear conclusions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Biomedical</th>
<th>Exact Sc</th>
<th>Human Sc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pcr</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differences between study domains: Academic Bachelors

Rather negative tendency in Human sciences for Males
Question 4 : Self Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci)

Zelf Determinatie Vragenlijst (Van Steenkiste et al. 2009) - 16 items – 4 per scale

External regulation
Introjected regulation
Identified regulation
Intrinsic Motivation
### Scale intercollerations VaSEV- ZDV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>FF</th>
<th>PrC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ExReg</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>**(-)</td>
<td>**(+).</td>
<td>**(+).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INReg</td>
<td>**(+).</td>
<td>** (-)</td>
<td>** (+)</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDReg</td>
<td>** (+)</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>** (+)</td>
<td>** (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IntrM</td>
<td>** (+)</td>
<td>* (+)</td>
<td>** (+)</td>
<td>** (-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions in the expected direction: the more external control / regulation, the more negative motivational parameters.
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