

**INSTRUMENT VALIDATION AND EVALUATION OF  
PROBLEM-BASED LEARNING TUTORIAL  
PERFORMANCE OF UNDERGRADUATE  
NURSING STUDENTS**

**Melanie Lack**

**A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the  
Witwatersrand, Johannesburg in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree**

**of**

**Master of Science in Nursing**

**Johannesburg, 2009**

## DECLARATION

I, Melanie Lack declare that this dissertation is my own unaided work. It is being submitted for the degree of Master of Science in Nursing in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination at this or any other University.

---

Melanie Lack

\_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2009

## **PUBLICATIONS**

### **1. USING SUBJECTIVE JUDGEMENT TO DETERMINE THE VALIDITY OF A TUTORIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT**

Health SA Gesondheid Volume 14 Number 1 (March 2009 edition).

### **2. WEIGHTING OF ITEMS IN A TUTORIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND RESULTS.**

Health SA Gesondheid Volume 14 Number 1 (March 2009 edition).

## ABSTRACT

**PURPOSE:** The purpose of this two-phased study was to determine the performance of undergraduate nursing students in problem-based learning (PBL) tutorials using a validated evaluation instrument. **RELEVANCE:** to determine the effectiveness of the PBL learning approach relative to the South African student. Phase 1 led to the validation of an instrument and Phase 2 evaluated the performance of nursing students in PBL tutorials using the validated instrument. **PARTICIPANTS:** Phase 1 participants included academic experts (n=8) selected by means of purposive, maximum variation sampling. Phase 2 participants included the total population of undergraduate nursing students (n=53) and facilitators (n=6). **METHODS:** A quantitative research approach was used to inform the overarching design that was descriptive and comparative in Phase 2 of the study. Phase 1 employed statistical techniques for instrument validation and refinement. Phase 1 data were collected in three round of a Delphi survey. After completion of the first two rounds a rating instrument with a 4-point (0-3) rating scale was developed referred to as the Tutorial Performance Rating Instrument. During the third and final round of the Delphi survey 'weighting' of each main-item, sub-items and the rating scale took place, incorporating the Subjective Judgement Model using pair-wise comparisons on linear visual analogue scales. **ANALYSIS:** Relative weights were determined and following statistical analysis ratio scales were developed creating a unique 'weight' to each item and the rating scale. This 'weight' was represented in a percentage allowing each main-item construct and each sub-item to be placed in a hierarchy from highest to lowest percentage. Calculation on a student assessment would become time consuming and subject to error if done manually. A computer-based program referred to as the Tutorial Performance Evaluator was developed to carry out all the calculations of the percentages allocated to the items and rating scale. A replica of the Tutorial Performance Rating Instrument was built into the programme. In Phase 2 of the study a self-assessment and facilitator-assessment on each student's tutorial performance first-to fourth-year was carried out using the Tutorial Performance Rating Instrument. Following a one on one meeting between the student and the facilitator consensus agreement was reached on an acceptable rating against each item on the evaluation instrument. The latter was entered into the computer and a percentage for each main-item construct and a total percentage was calculated efficiently and accurately in 20 seconds. **RESULTS:** The results showed that first-year students struggled in all aspects of the PBL tutorial. Furthermore they did not possess the skills required for self-assessment. A small group of the second-year students struggled in the tutorials but were better able to carry out a self-assessment. The third-year students showed a slight drop in score when compared with the second-year students and this could be attributed to the new subjects introduced in the third-year of study. There was a substantial improvement in the results achieved by the fourth-year students in all the aspects of the PBL tutorial and showed a good correlation in carrying out a self-assessment when compared with the facilitator assessment.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** This was a cross-sectional study and a longitudinal study should be carried out in future research to assess the individual's progress from first-to fourth-year in the PBL approach to learning. Greater academic support should be given to first-year students or alternatively the 'at risk' students should be given a foundation course to assist them with communication skills and learning skills.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I wish to acknowledge the contribution of the following people without whose help this study could not have materialised:

Professor Judith Bruce for her guidance and supervision from conception to completion of this study.

The nursing students who participated in this study.

The facilitators from the Department of Nursing Education University of the Witwatersrand.

The Experts from the Problem-Based Learning expert group.

The Department of Nursing Education at the University of the Witwatersrand, for allowing me to use the original Tutorial Performance Evaluation Instrument that became the starting point of this study.

Mr. P.Ferreira for his support in helping me develop the computer programme.

Professor Pieter Becker for his support in statistical analysis and interpretation in the early part of the study and Mr Musenge, the Bio-statistician at the Epidemiology Data Centre, Faculty of Health Sciences, for his support in statistical analysis and interpretation in the latter part of the study.

The Faculty Research committee for their grant of R2000.00.

**Mrs L Voicht - Professional Independent Editor**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DECLARATION	ii
PUBLICATIONS ARISING FROM THIS STUDY	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
LIST OF TABLES	xv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xviii
LIST OF ANNEXURES	xix

### CHAPTER ONE: ORIENTATION TO THE STUDY

1.1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.2	BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY	1
1.2.1	Problem-Based Approach to Teaching and Learning and Constructivism	6
1.2.2	Requirements for South African Undergraduate Nursing Students	9
1.3	PROBLEM STATEMENT	10
1.4	RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY	11
1.5	PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	11
1.6	RESEARCH QUESTIONS	11
1.7	RESEARCH OBJECTIVES	12
1.7.1	Phase-One Objectives	12
1.7.2	Phase-Two Objectives	12
1.8	DEFINITION OF TERMS	14

1.9	OVERVIEW OF METHODOLOGY	15
1.10	SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	15
1.11	ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	15
1.12	CONCLUSION	18
1.13	OUTLINE OF THE STUDY	18

## **CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW**

2.1	INTRODUCTION	19
2.2	PROBLEM-BASED LEARNING	19
2.2.1	Historical Perspective	20
2.2.2	PBL Process	22
2.2.2.1	Facilitator	23
2.2.2.2	Group Process	26
2.2.2.3	Evaluation	30
2.3	CHALLENGES OF PBL	34
2.4	UNDERGRADUATE NURSING STUDENT	35
2.5	CONCLUSION	42

## **CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY PHASE 1**

3.1	INTRODUCTION	44
3.2	RESEARCH DESIGN	44
3.3	RESEARCH METHODS	44
3.3.1.	Population and Sample	45
3.3.1.1	The Sampling Method	45
3.3.1.2	Sample Eligibility Criteria	46
3.3.2	Data Collection Techniques	48

3.3.2.1	The Delphi Technique	48
3.3.2.2	The Subjective Judgement Model	50
3.3.2.2.1	Paired Comparison Analysis	52
3.3.2.2.2	Visual Analogue Scales	53
3.3.3	Data Collection Procedure	56
3.3.3.1	Round One Survey	57
3.3.3.2	Round Two Survey	61
3.3.3.3	Pilot Study	64
3.3.3.4	Round Three Survey	69
3.4	VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY	73
3.5	CONCLUSION	73

#### **CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS: PHASE 1**

4.1	INTRODUCTION	75
4.2	APPROACH TO DATA ANALYSIS	76
4.2.1	Determining Content Validity	76
4.2.2	Determining Construct Validity	77
4.3	THE STUDY RESULTS	78
4.3.1.	Content Validity	78
4.3.2	Construct Validity and weighting of items	86
4.4	DEVELOPMENT OF COMPUTER-BASED PROGRAMME	100
4.5	CONCLUSION	105

#### **CHAPTER FIVE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY PHASE-2**

5.1	INTRODUCTION	106
5.2	RESEARCH DESIGN	106

5.3	RESEARCH METHODS	107
5.3.1	Population and Sample	107
5.3.2	The Research Setting	109
5.3.3	Approach to Data Collection	110
5.3.4	Data Collection Procedure	111
5.4	APPROACH TO DATA ANALYSIS	115
5.5	VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY	116
5.5.1	Validity	116
5.5.2	Reliability	116
5.6	CONCLUSION	117

## **CHAPTER SIX: DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS: PHASE 2**

6.1	INTRODUCTION	
	118	
6.2	DATA ANALYSIS	119
6.3	THE STUDY RESULTS	122
6.3.1	Inter-Class Comparison of Student Tutorial Performance Scores	122
6.3.1.1	Problem Solving Skills	126
6.3.1.2	Contributions	132
6.3.1.3	Communication	138
6.3.1.4	Critical Thinking Skills	142
6.3.1.5	Learning Skills	147
6.3.1.6	Personal Growth	152
6.3.1.7	Leadership Skills	158
6.3.2	Reliability between Facilitator and Student	162
6.5	CONCLUSION	174

**CHAPTER SEVEN: DISCUSSION, MAIN FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS,  
LIMITATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS**

7.1	INTRODUCTION	176
7.2	SUMMARY OF THE STUDY	176
7.3	DISCUSSION OF RESULTS: PHASE 1	177
7.3.1	Personal Growth	177
7.3.2	Creative Thinking	179
7.3.3	Leadership	179
7.3.4	Learning Skills	180
7.3.5	Contributions	181
7.3.6	Problem-Solving Skills	181
7.3.7	Communications	182
7.3.8	Critical Thinking Skills	182
7.3.9	Weighting of Items	184
7.3.10	Tutorial Performance Evaluator (TPE)	185
7.4	DISCUSSION OF RESULTS: PHASE 2	186
7.4.1	First-Year Students	186
7.4.2	Second-Year Students	193
7.4.3	Third-Year Students	195
7.4.4	Fourth-Year Students	197
7.4.5	Comparison between Facilitators and Students' Scores	201
7.5	MAIN FINDINGS	204
7.6	STUDY LIMITATIONS	207
7.7	RECOMMENDATIONS	207
7.7.1	Nursing Education	207
7.7.2	Research	208

7.8	CONCLUSION	208
	REFERENCE LIST	210

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1.1 The Problem-Based Learning Characteristics	5
3.1 Delphi Technique Sequence	55
3.2 Pilot Study Mean Scores: First-Year Students	66
3.3 Pilot Study Mean Scores: Second-Year Students	66
3.4 Pilot Study Mean Scores: Third-Year Students	67
3.5 Pilot Study Mean Scores: Fourth-Year Students	67
3.6 Example of a Visual Analogue Scale	70
3.7 Example of Weighting on the Rating Scale	72
4.1 Visual Analogue Scale Descriptors Main-items	90
4.2 Visual Analogue Scale Descriptors sub-items	91
5.1 Distribution of Students First-year to Fourth-year	108
5.2 Gender Distribution of Students Total Population	108
5.3 Student Mean Age First-Year to Fourth-Year	109
5.4 Data-Sets in Relation to Data Analysis	114
6.1 First-year Students Tutorial Performance Scores	123
6.2 Second-year Students Tutorial Performance Scores	123
6.3 Third-year Students Tutorial Performance Scores	124
6.4 Fourth-year Students Tutorial Performance Scores	124
6.5 Mean Tutorial Performance Scores First-year to Fourth-year	125
6.6 Mean Score First-year to Fourth-year Problem Solving	129
6.7 Mean Score First-year to Fourth-year Contributions	135
6.8 Mean Score First-year to Fourth-year Communications	140
6.9 Mean Score First-year to Fourth-year Critical Thinking	145

6.10	Mean Score First-year to Fourth-year Learning Skills	150
6.11	Mean Score First-year to Fourth-year Personal Growth	155
6.12	Mean Score First-year to Fourth-year Leadership	160
6.13	Correlation of Mean Scores between Facilitator and Student	173

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table</b>	<b>Page</b>
1.1 Overview of Research Methodology	13
2.1 Percentage of L2 Learners in the First-Year Intake of Nursing Students	37
2.2 S.A.N.C. Gender Demographics of registered Nursing Students	39
3.1 Demographic Data on the Expert Group	47
3.2 Nominal Scale – Lynn (1986)	59
4.1 Expert Ratings in Round One Delphi	79
4.2 Expert Ratings in Round Two Delphi	81
4.3 Proportion of Experts whose Endorsement is Required to Establish Content Validity	84
4.4 Weighting Scores on 4- point Likert Scale	85
4.5 Measurement in mm. of Main-items on the VAS	87
4.6 Measurement in mm. of sub-items on the VAS	87
4.7 Relative weights of Main-items and sub-items	95
4.8 Hierarchy of items	97
4.9 Weights (%) on the Original Likert Scale	98
4.10 Weights (%) on the Ordinal Scale	99
4.11 Percentages allocated to Main-items	100
4.12 Weighting of Main-items and sub-items and relative weights	101
4.13 Completed Tutorial Performance Evaluator	102
5.1 Total Number of Data Sets in each Year of Study	113
6.1 Summary of Scores between First-year to Fourth-year	

	Students in Problem-Solving Skills	127
6.2	Analysis of Variance: Problem-Solving Skills	127
6.3	Comparison of Problem-Solving Skills by year of study	128
6.4	Percentage of Students obtaining a 0-3 Rating in Problem-Solving Skills	130
6.5	Summary of Scores between First-year to Fourth-year Students in Contributions	133
6.6	Analysis of Variance: Contributions	133
6.7	Comparison of Student Contributions by Year of Study	134
6.8	Percentage of Students obtaining a 0-3 Rating in Contributions	136
6.9	Summary of Scores between First-year to Fourth-year Students in Communication Skills	138
6.10	Analysis of Variance: Communication Skills	139
6.11	Comparison of Communication Skills by Year of Study	139
6.12	Percentage of Students obtaining a 0-3 Rating in Communication Skills	141
6.13	Summary of Scores between First-year to Fourth-year Students in Critical Thinking Skills	143
6.14	Analysis of Variance: Critical Thinking Skills	143
6.15	Comparison of Critical Thinking Skills by Year of Study	144
6.16	Percentage of Students obtaining a 0-3 Rating in Critical Thinking Skills	146
6.17	Summary of Scores between First-year to Fourth-year Students in Learning Skills	148
6.18	Analysis of Variance: Learning Skills	148
6.19	Comparison of Learning Skills by Year of Study	149
6.20	Percentage of Students obtaining a 0-3 Rating in Learning Skills	151
6.21	Summary of Scores between First-year to Fourth-year Students in Personal Growth	153
6.22	Analysis of Variance: Personal Growth	153

6.23	Comparison of Score by year in Personal Growth	154
6.24	Percentage of Students obtaining a 0-3 Rating in Personal Growth	156
6.25	Summary of Scores between First-year to Fourth-year Students in Leadership Skills	158
6.26	Analysis of Variance: Leadership Skills	159
6.27	Comparison of Leadership Skills by Year of Study	159
6.28	Percentage of Students obtaining a 0-3 Rating in Leadership Skills	161
6.29	Results of First-year Facilitator Assessment	163
6.30	Results of First-year Students' Self-Assessment	163
6.31	Results of Second-year Facilitator Assessment	165
6.32	Results of Second-year Students' Self-Assessment	165
6.33	Results of Third-year Facilitator Assessment	168
6.34	Results of Third-year Students' Self-Assessment	168
6.35	Results of Fourth-year Facilitator Assessment	171
6.36	Results of Fourth-year Students' Self-Assessment	171
6.37	Comparison of Facilitator and Student Mean Scores First-Year to Fourth-Year	174

## ABBREVIATIONS

<b>BA (Cur):</b>	Bachelor Curationis
<b>B.Ed (Hons):</b>	Bachelor of Education (Honours)
<b>B.Nurs:</b>	Bachelor of Nursing
<b>BSc (Hons):</b>	Bachelor of Science (Honours)
<b>D (Cur):</b>	Doctor Curationis
<b>L2 Learner:</b>	English second language
<b>MA (Cur):</b>	Master Curationis
<b>M.Ed:</b>	Master Of Education
<b>MSc (Nurs):</b>	Master of Science (Nursing)
<b>MSc (OT):</b>	Master of Science (Occupational Therapy)
<b>PhD:</b>	Doctor of Philosophy
<b>PBL:</b>	Problem-Based Learning
<b>SANC:</b>	South African Nursing Council
<b>TPEI:</b>	Tutorial Performance Evaluation Instrument
<b>TPRI:</b>	Tutorial Performance Rating Instrument
<b>TPE:</b>	Tutorial Performance Evaluator
<b>VAS</b>	Visual Analogue Scale
<b>WC:</b>	Weight of Construct
<b>WI:</b>	Weight of Item
<b>WS:</b>	Weight of Ordinal Scale

## LIST OF ANNEXURES

		<b>Page</b>
ANNEXURE A	Original Tutorial Performance Evaluation Instrument	222
ANNEXURE B	Postgraduate Committee Approval Letter	223
ANNEXURE C	Protocol Approval Letter	224
ANNEXURE D	Clearance Certificate and Protocol Number	225
ANNEXURE E	Information Letter to Expert Group	226
ANNEXURE F	Student Letter and Consent Form	227
ANNEXURE G	Round-One Questionnaire	229
ANNEXURE H	Round-Two Questionnaire	232
ANNEXURE I	Tutorial Performance Rating Instrument	235
ANNEXURE J	Descriptors of the Rating Scale	236
ANNEXURE K	Round-Three Instructions and Visual Analogue Scales	237
ANNEXURE L	Weights of Main-items and sub-items	248
ANNEXURE M	Computer-based Tutorial Performance Evaluator	249
ANNEXURE N	Phase 2 Statistical Data	250