

SUCCESS FACTORS IN ENGINEERING: A STUDY ON STUDENTS' LEARNING ORIENTATIONS

Aini Nazura Paimin¹, Roger G. Hadgraft², J. Kaya Prpic³, Fatin Najwa Mohd Nusa⁴

¹Faculty of Technical & Vocational Education, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Batu Pahat, Johor

²University of Technology Sydney, New South Wales, 2007, Australia

³The University of Melbourne, Victoria, 3010, Australia

⁴Malaysia Institute of Transport (MITRANS), Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM), 40450 Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia.

Correspondence email: nazura@uthm.edu.my

ABSTRACT

Factors influencing study success are multiply. The issues of high dropout rates in higher education, including in engineering, has led to some researchers focusing their research on understanding relationship between students' learning approaches and academic performance. The current study add into the current literature in this area to deepen our understanding of the role of learning strategy in the study success of engineering students. While technology-based learning approached are becoming more popular, students nowadays are expected to be more independent and autonomous in learning. This study applied a concurrent mixed method design to get breadth and in-depth information about learning strategies involved in the learning processes of engineering students. A revised version of R-SPQ-2F learning orientation instrument was used to explore learning strategies of final year engineering students at an institution in Malaysia and Australia. The quantitative data were analysed using SPSS version 22 to inform the most important learning strategies used. The findings are further explained using data from semi-structured interviews which were conducted with the similar participants. Information gained from both studies contribute to a deeper understanding of factors contributing to study success of the engineering students at the two universities. The finding provides answers and reasoning to the differences in the learning strategies of students at both learning contexts and suggest strategies for universities to help improve students' learning experiences and minimise attrition rate in engineering programs. Special attentions are highlighted to the inclusion of the conative element that is always neglected in many research.

Keywords: Academic Achievement, Conation, Interest, Learning Orientation, Learning Strategy.

INTRODUCTION

Factors influencing study success are multiply. Researchers put effort in investigating the factors and promoting various ways to improve success rate among higher education students. The government have spent large amounts of money and effort to sustain engineering education programs. In Malaysia, the development of knowledge workers in this area has consistently become part of our national education development plan, which aims to increase the supply of professional skilled workers in engineering [1]. In Australia, the critical shortage of engineers has been consistently raised over recent years. For example, completion rate for mechanical engineering courses decreased 9.2 per cent over the five years to 2016, and decreased 16.8 per cent over the year to 2016 [2] and the results reflect the trend in attrition. Even though engineers' shortage has never been an issue in Malaysia, graduating in engineering with good overall academic performance can potentially increase employability after graduation. Therefore, focusing on improving their performance is highly desired. Where universities are federally funded, the local universities are financed and lecturers are allocated based on the numbers of undergraduate students enrolled in the course. As a consequence, the decrease in the numbers of undergraduate students affects the financial support given to the university. Other financial stakeholders who are also affected include scholarship providers and parents.

Higher attrition rate in engineering does not necessarily means that more attention, efforts and investment are required from stakeholders. Rather, these findings give us a sign that despite the various efforts made to facilitate learning we do not fully understand how the student are experiencing learning, how they are dealing with challenges, what factors influence their success, and why some students can be successful while others drop out from the program. These concerns have resulted in the focus of research over the past 15 years on understanding students' attrition, demotivation and drop-out rates in engineering programs [3], [4], [5]. There is some agreement

about the factors contributing to attrition such as lose of interest and poor performance. In contrast, there is much debate about factors contributing to success. Despite of many research conducted and models introduced to understand success, there are mixed results generated from the research, making it difficult to develop firm conclusions about the factors influencing study success in engineering. The objective of this research is to investigate learning orientations of engineering students and explore factors influencing their success in engineering program. Specifically, this study aimed.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Student Learning Orientation

Scholars who performed research in this area has focused on understanding the behaviour of learners [6],[7],[8]. Students' Approaches to Learning (SAL) research uses a more holistic approach in attempting to understand student motivation to learn, and is usually focused at the general curriculum level when compared to other studies on learning motivation which focus on exploring learning at the course level. In the current study, the SAL approach was selected because it has the capability to provide useful information in understanding student motivation and learning at a general curriculum level thus can be applied to better understand success factors of students in engineering.

There are three major approaches to study SAL. One line of research has taken a broader perspective on understanding individual differences in approaching learning [9] [10]. The other line of researches have also concentrated on investigating the SAL factors and the contribution to students' success (E.g.,[12]). There is also a large volume of research published which focuses on understanding patterns of study approach and the relationship with cognitive processing activities and other aspects of learning (e.g., personality, attitude) [11]. Knowing the differences in students' learning is especially important because it helps explain the influence of typical orientation on the way students approach learning and the effectiveness of learning and performance.

Researcher described learning orientations as "the whole domain of personal goals, intentions, motives, expectations, attitudes, worries and doubts of students in doing courses or studies" [13]. The primary researchers on learning orientations applied phenomenological studies using qualitative interviews to identify the variety of way students approach learning. The researchers categorised learning approaches into deep and surface approaches based on information gathered from interviews [14],[15]. Various self-report instruments were developed and SAL models were extended based on this original idea of SAL. A researcher had proposed another category of learning approach, the strategic approach, or what Biggs described in his model as achieving approach [7]. Biggs used a classification similar to that of [14], and further split the deep and surface categories into motive and strategy to form other sub-classifications: deep strategy, deep motive, surface strategy, surface motive, achieving strategy and achieving motive.

The more recent research in SAL uses three categories of learning orientation namely deep approach, achieving approach, and surface approach. Deep approach learners are those who are intrinsically motivated and prefer meaningful learning experiences. Such learners tend to approach learning by exploring knowledge in depth, understanding the meaning of new knowledge, and relating a new idea with previous knowledge [11], [16]–[18]. Achieving approach learners always determine ways to excel or achieve the highest grade, for example, by using previous exam papers to predict questions [16], [18]. For that purpose, they show reasonable effort in study, manage their time well, organise learning resources well, and are selective in choosing learning materials. On the other hand, learners who are categorised under the surface learning approach often rely on memorising and put less effort into exploring new knowledge [11], [17]–[19]. They may be too dependent on learning materials provided by lecturers and prefer "spoon feeding".

The different approaches determine the diversity of quality in learning outcome [7]. For example, deep approach learning (composed of deep strategy and deep motive) links to a deep learning outcome, and produces a committed, well-structured, and self-independent learner rather than an extrinsically-dependent learner. Previous research [20] reported that students who are less committed to learning have a high probability of not continuing their studies; approximately 32% of the study samples were engineering students. This model proposed that students who possess deep strategy and deep motive have the potential to become a self-independent and performance-oriented learner. Therefore, one suggested hypothesis in the current study was that engineering students who approach deep and achieving approach learning could have greater potential to succeed and persist in engineering whereas students who possess surface approach learning are those who are less motivated in learning; therefore, could have the potential to drop out from the system.

B. Factors Influencing Learning Orientation

Biggs's suggestion implies that diversity in the students' learning approach (i.e., strategy used) might be influenced by a number of factors including extrinsic motivational elements, and may possibly be contextually and culturally dependent. A research speculated that students use different approaches to learning dependent on the curriculum used [18]. It is indeed possible that the way students approach learning depends on how the curriculum is designed. There are several contextual factors that influencing student perception in engineering [21]. These included learning environment (i.e., laboratory, lecture and classroom setting), problem solving activities (i.e., tutorial sheets, assignment questions and work examples), social aspects of learning (i.e., discussion activities in lectures, and informal group work in tutorials and assignments), perception of staff (i.e., approachable, enthusiastic and teaching approach), student motivation (i.e., interest, assessment, engagement and task perception) and subject demand (i.e., independent reading, prior learning, perceived difficulty and work experience). When considering curricula used in engineering, this assumption is seen as relevant. One of the most common reasons for the drop out from engineering was differing expectations about the curriculum [5]. Students claimed that they had difficulties in understanding the curriculum. It was expected that some students failed to develop learning strategies that best suited with the engineering curriculum which led to a loss of interest to continue the journey. Students tend to adopt surface approaches if they feel that the course is unstructured, or they are overloaded with work and assignments, or poor feedback is given in class [21]. Students are more engaged and adopt a deep approach in class if they value the learning activities or academic tasks and see them as important.

It is also possible that students establish learning strategies that are in line with the learning activities or assessment criteria introduced in class. Final year engineering students are expected to have a stable dispositional learning orientation and to have become familiar with the learning activities designed, especially if similar learning approaches are throughout the program. It is a challenge for some first-year engineering students to get a sense of familiarity with all the common engineering processes. Therefore, an important aspect of research perhaps is not to investigate how the contextual settings or cultural influences might impact on strategy development or the approaches used. Instead, a study focusing on understand strategies adopted by the engineering students (in order to familiarise themselves with the curriculum), and how these learning experiences might influence their success in engineering needs to be undertaken. It is often in educational settings that we determine what we believe is important for our students instead of understanding what benefits them from their own perspectives.

A self-report instrument of Study Process Questionnaire (SPQ) was developed [7], to measure students' general orientation in approaching learning. The SPQ is a 42-item questionnaire, consisting of deep, surface, and achieving approach measures. A longitudinal and cross-disciplinary study was conducted among higher education students in Australia to test the reliability and validity of this instrument at course specific level and at general program level (i.e., throughout studies until graduation). Findings revealed that there were huge differences between the learning approach of Arts, Education, and Science students. For example, the Arts and Science students had the same deep approach scores in their first-year study, but the pattern diverged sharply as they progressed in their studies. The Art students' scores fluctuated in the first three years of study, but increased sharply in the final year. Inversely, Science students' scores on deep approach declined towards the minimum level in the third year maintaining low level scores in the final year. The high workload towards the end of the Science program may have caused students to change the way they approached learning. Findings of this study demonstrated that students approached learning in various ways, and suggested that they may act and react differently according to program requirements [13]. Biggs further established two hypotheses in light of the findings of the study: (i) students who are driven by certain motivations will establish a particular learning strategy that is congruent with the motivation, and (ii) the combination of the motivation and strategy approaches is more effective to predict performance.

The review of the literature so far reveals that there are central agreements that the learning orientation of students is observable and measureable. However, the reviewed studies were less coherent, as the information about student differences in learning were scattered and provided no firm conclusions about the important learning orientations that engineering students should possess to enable them to succeed in the program. Previous research stressed that it is crucial to understand student learning perceptions in engineering if researchers intend to understand the factors that contribute to success, retention and dropout rates in engineering [21].

The issues of high dropout rates in higher education, including in engineering, has led to some researchers focusing their research on investigating the relationship between learning approaches and academic performance [11] [15] [19] [22]. Findings of these studies have yielded useful information regarding the relationships, which were presented as both the magnitude of relationship (either positively or negatively correlated) and the strength of relationship (low, medium, or high). Although there is a common agreement that students' learning orientations

are linked to their study performance [10], [12], [21], [22], findings of these studies indicate mixed results. Some of the studies found that only a deep approach to learning (deep strategy and deep motive) can predict study performance [10],[12],[22]. For example, [10] found that deep approach leaning significantly predicted study performance of science students at an Australian university, while students who left the program had a greater tendency towards surface learning. In the study of [15] among university students who enrolled in Nursing, Radiography and Language and Communication courses found no direct and significant relationship between locus of control, self-concept, surface approach learning and academic performance. The main concern was the suitability of the questionnaire items to be applied in the Malaysian learning context. Since the R-SPQ-2F was developed in Australia (Western countries) there was a concern whether the situation best described learning orientation of the Malaysian students and the language used could be easily understood by the participants..

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A concurrent mixed method designed [23] was applied in this study combining data from the quantitative and qualitative studies. The quantitative study used the R-SPQ-2F instrument to investigate the learning strategies possessed by final year engineering students. Several criteria that have been given emphasis and attention during this study were, (i) confirming reliability of the construct, (ii) investigating the relationships between deep learning strategies and academic performance (as measures by cumulative grade point average) and, (iii) to understand the underlying factors that forms the development of learning strategies. Samples for quantitative study involves 135 and 132 final year engineering undergraduates who studying civil, electrical and mechanical engineering at Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia (UTHM) and the University of Melbourne respectively. According to [24], a minimum of 85 samples are required to perform Pearson Correlation Analysis.

Only five items from the deep approach scale (deep strategy) were presented in the current study to focus the measure into intrinsic motivational factors only. These five items will be further discussed in relation to the qualitative findings. The coefficient of Cronbach alpha was used as a measure to evaluate the internal consistency of the R-SPQ-2F scale. The deep strategy scales of the R-SPQ-2F have reliability estimates of $\alpha = 0.77$. The α values obtained are comparable with most reliability testings for the SPQ-2F instrument which were normally ranged between 0.6 to 0.7 [25],[26]. The value of 0.7 or more was considered sufficient to confirm the inter-item consistency[27]. Since there are only five items for representing constructs of deep learning strategy, a slightly less Cronbach alpha value for these constructs was accepted [27]. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22 was used to perform the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient analysis in order to determine the degree of interrelatedness (strength) between learning strategy and students' academic performance. The strength value was measured according to [28] guideline: from $r=0.10$ to 0.29 indicates small, from $r=0.30$ to 0.49 indicates medium and from $r=0.50$ to 1.0 indicates large.

The interviews were conducted among 18 of the similar participants in the same semester period to ensure trustworthiness of the data. Findings of the qualitative analysis was used in conjunction with the findings of the quantitative study, for the purpose of supporting and validating the findings. In certain cases, participants were given an opportunity during the interview to explain or elaborate any answers provided in the questionnaire especially when the story of their learning experiences did not match with the information given. This method enabled the researcher to get clarification for any uncertain answers that merged in both data sources thus, can ensure credibility and accuracy of the findings.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The quantitative study investigated five elements of deep approach strategies of R-SPQ-2F instrument of [25]. Students are expected to achieve greater success if they studies in a meaningful way (i.e., do sufficient work to summarise topics, self-testing to get meaningful understanding, spend time relating new ideas to various knowledge and seek for more information about topics, and having a vigorous interaction with suggested reading in class), as proposed by [25]. The correlation coefficient findings revealed that deep approach strategy was significantly correlated with the study performance of the Malaysian participants only ($r_{MY} = 0.27$; $p < 0.01$) as demonstrated in TABLE I.

Even though findings of the quantitative study revealed no significant difference between learning strategy construct and academic performance of the Australian students, interview findings revealed that engineering students at both learning contexts recognised the importance of establishing study strategies to ensure successful

in engineering. The medium strength of relationship could be because the items measures learning strategy intrinsically whereby interview findings demonstrated that they are highly depending on external support to ensure effective strategies. Example of interview responses that match the survey questions are as shown in TABLE II.

TABLE I. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR DEEP LEARNING STRATEGY CONSTRUCT AND ITEMS, FOR MALAYSIA AND AUSTRALIA DATA.

Table Heading	Table Column Heading		
	Table subheading	column	Subheading
copy	More table copy ^a		

a. Significant at the 0.01 (two tail)

TABLE II. COMPARISON OF QUANTITATIVE MEASURES AND EXAMPLES OF RELATED STRATEGY BEHAVIOURS FROM QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS.

Strategy Component (questionnaire)	Learning Strategy (interview)
Self-testing to get meaningful understanding I test myself on important topics until I understand them completely.	• Lots of practice in drawing • Get seniors notes with answers and practice doing the calculations until get the understanding • Do calculation part in group projects to practice • Practicing a lot on solving tutorial problems • Do the calculation part in group projects as a practice for exam • Read through all materials and concentrate on tutorial questions and past exams
Vigorous interaction with suggested content I make a point of looking at most of the suggested reading that goes with the lectures.	• Use subject syllabus as a guideline, mark topics that have been covered and read next topic beforehand • Use the same book as suggested in the subject syllabus • Use own short-notes/note taking in class • Use seniors notes/any available resources • Use past exam/test papers • Refer to library books/journals • Refer to lecture module/notes/syllabus • Use online resources (get information from websites)
Do enough work to form conclusion I have to do enough work on a topic so that I can form my own conclusion before I am satisfied.	• Do summary of lecture notes using colour, coordinate, • use coding for referencing • Do topics summary using mind mapping or short note • Refer to lots of resources to gain an understanding • Do lots of reading to enable understanding • Studying in group to combines ideas about topics • Ask lecturer or tutor to get a firm answer • Imagining real object/application helps understand the processes • Do past year exam/test papers to challenge knowledge/gain confidence
Spend extra time to obtain more information/integrate knowledge about interesting topics I find most new topics interesting and often spend extra time trying to obtain more information about them. I spend a lot of my free time finding out more about interesting topics that have been discussed in different classes.	• Integrating of practical knowledge, visualisation and the underlying theory enabling it to be applied to other related tasks • Seeing a real object helps understand how things work (by watching television /searching on Internet/watching YouTube (e.g. Discovery channel)/ • Seeing demonstration in labs/do observation at site work

Finding of the qualitative study also discovered several strategies perceived to be important for the engineering students. Studying in groups, maximise use of learning materials, and mastery of engineering skills and practices are examples of common strategies used by participants in the context studied. Some of the strategy behaviours can explain strategy measures in the quantitative and the cluster of strategy proposed for the qualitative study are comparable with strategies explained by [29] except for studying with peers and mastery skills. It is notable that students developed and applied strategies for three reasoning namely for processing information (e.g., use visualisation technique or create a mind mapping), for achievement motivation (e.g., score good in test or exam, mastery skills or competency development), and for survival in the engineering program; all of which are used jointly or separately by the students during the learning process and towards success.

When being asked about strategies perceived to be important for students to be successful in the program, there are some evidence found that there was a mismatch in the intention of using the strategies as demonstrated in Table III. It is notable that the deep strategy measure of the R-SPQ-2F instrument is a multi-dimension domain. The item 3 for example, measures cognitive strategy (self-testing) in relation to intention attribute of conation (the intention to get an understanding). It may be argued that relating the strategy with intention is a reasonable way to identify attributed causes of the behaviour, whether intrinsically or extrinsically driven. However, this comparison demonstrated an interesting point given that students use such a similar strategy but for different reasons or intentions. In two of the given interview cases, the intention to use such strategy was found to be extrinsically driven, that is to score and pass an exam. This finding provides some evidence into why students who use a similar strategy did not achieve an equivalent learning outcome.

TABLE III. EXAMPLES OF STRATEGY MEASURE IN THE R-SPQ-2F AND THE INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS FROM INTERVIEWS.

An example of deep strategy component of R-SPQ-2F	Interpretation
Item 3: I test myself on important topics until I understand them completely.	This item asked about using a self-testing strategy with the intention to understand the topics.
Interview findings: i) ...if we are hardworking enough and do a lot of practice, I believe we can easily <u>gain an understanding</u> (Malaysian – I6Q4) ii) I am not just looking at the answers, but I also learn and try to do the calculation <u>until I understand</u> how they did the calculation. (Malaysian - 12Q5) iii) I always do all the tutorial problems because I need as much practice as I can get...my housemate done that subject and I got tutorial solutions. The only assessment for these subjects is the exam at the end of semester, <u>so it is sort of thing that we are looking</u> (Australian – I8A2) iv) I just do, just read through all materials and concentrate on tutorial questions and past exams cause lecturers tend to go of the same things for exam topics so if you can do all tutorials questions and you can do past exams <u>you usually can get more than enough to pass exams</u> (Australian – I7Q4)	Two participants reflected that they do lots of self-practice in order to get a meaningful understanding (intention) of the topics. Meanwhile, the other two participants reflected that they use of a similar strategy to score or pass in exam (intention) .

The deep approach strategies of the R-SPQ-2F also covers aspects related to meaningful understanding that relates to interest whereas in reality, some of the interview participants acknowledged that they applied any strategies that they think might be best “work” at the time. It was also observed that some participants discussed their strategy without relating the strategy to their interest feelings. The impression conveyed was that some of the participants may have less conscious attitude concerning interest but has greater intention towards achieving their desired goal. The design of engineering curricula, which heavily emphasise on collaboration in group projects and applied sciences in practice (implementing theories and principles to understand practice), is expected to have contributed to the less than complete strategies that should be possessed by engineering students. Moreover, engineering curriculum also covers multiple areas of knowledge and skills. There were examples that engineering students whose intention are towards professional development tend to develop interest in a specialise area that is far beyond the content in their syllabus and the strategy used was directed towards this interest and intention. This is

expected to be one of the reasons why some of the deep strategy measures did not significantly predict success of the Australian students even though students agreed that such a strategy applied to them. Therefore, it should be notable here that fostering deep approach strategies among engineering students may be less than ideal for some learning contexts in solving problem related to poor performance. Nevertheless, the selected deep approach strategies in the quantitative study are still important. Students should also put initiative to foster intrinsic interest and intention in order to persist regardless of the study location. Intention (conation) has been proved to be important as a striving mode behind the establishment of learning strategies among the students.

CONCLUSIONS

This research provide an insight towards a possible integration between learning strategy and other motivational factors to influence engineering students' academic performance at two different learning contexts, Malaysia and Australia. This section summarises the overall findings gathered from the mixed method study. The quantitative finding demonstrated that there was a relationship between learning strategy and academic performance of the Malaysian students whereas the Australian students may need to integrate their learning strategies with other motivational elements to ensure greater academic success. Findings of the qualitative study have made it clear that the quantitative findings measure a small particular area of learning strategy only. The qualitative findings also revealed that the inclusion of interest and intention factors is important to consider to better understand factors determining success in engineering. Intention could play different role depending on learning situation but deemed as crucial as a striving mode towards success. Future research also needs to consider the role played by external factors such as lecturers, family and friends and detailed observation of their learning experiences could enabling the extension information of factors influencing success in engineering.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researchers would like to express gratitude to the Malaysia Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE) who provided the financial support for this research and Vot. E15501 for publication of this research. Deep appreciations also dedicated to anyone who directly or indirectly involved in this study.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ismail, A., & Zainal Abiddin, N. (2014). Issues and Challenges of Technical and Vocational Education and Training in Malaysia Towards Human Capital Development. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research* 19.
- [2] Labour Economics Office Victoria, "ANZSCO 2335-12 Mechanical Engineer," Victoria, 2018.
- [3] R. E. Davis, S. Clara, and K. Sullivan, "Why do /don't they stay ? Some preliminary results of an engineering retention study," in *International Conference on Engineering Education & Research*, 2007, pp. 1–6.
- [4] S. E. Walden and C. Foor, "What's to keep you from dropping out? Student immigration into and within engineering," *J. Eng. Educ.*, vol. 97, no. 2, pp. 191–205, 2008.
- [5] E. Godfrey, T. Aubrey, and R. King, "Who leaves and who stays ? Retention and attrition in engineering education," *J. Eng. Educ.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 26–40, 2010.
- [6] R. G. Brockett and R. Hiemstra, *Self-direction in adult learning: Perspectives on theory, research and practice*. London: Routledge, 2018.
- [7] J. B. Biggs, *Student approaches to learning and studying*. Melbourne: Brown Prior Anderson Pty. Ltd., 1987.
- [8] D. Kember, J. B. Biggs, and D. Y. P. Leung, "Examining the multidimensionality of approaches to learning through the development of a revised version of the Learning Process Questionnaire," *Br. J. Educ. Psychol.*, vol. 74, pp. 261–280, 2004.
- [9] P. L. Tan and H. Pillay, "Understanding learning behaviour of Malaysian adult learners: A cross-cultural sensitive framework," *Educ. Res. Policy Pract.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 85–97, Jul. 2007.
- [10] P. Zeegers, "Approaches to learning in Science: A longitudinal study," *Br. J. Educ. Psychol.*, vol. 71, pp. 115–32, Mar. 2001.
- [11] A. Duff and S. Mckinstry, "Students' approaches to learning," *Issues Account. Educ.*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 183–214, 2007.
- [12] P. Tynjälä, R. T. Salminen, T. Sutela, A. Nuutinen, and S. Pitkänen, "Factors related to study success in engineering education," *Eur. J. Eng. Educ.*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 221–231, May 2005.

- [13] Vermunt, J. D., & Vermetten, Y. J. (2004). Patterns in student learning : Relationships between learning strategies , conceptions of learning , and learning orientations. *Educational Psychology*, 16(4), 359–385.
- [14] F. Marton and R. Saljo, “On qualitative differences in learning-I: Outcome and process,” *Br. J. Educ. Psychol.*, vol. 46, no. 4, p. 11, 1976.
- [15] D. Watkins and J. Hattie, “An investigation of the internal structure of the Biggs Study Process Questionnaire,” *Educ. Psychol. Meas.*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 1125–1130, Dec. 1980
- [16] N. J. Entwistle and P. Ramsden, “Understanding student learning,” New York, 1982.
- [17] A. Duff, “Understanding academic performance and progression of first-year Accounting and Business economics undergraduates: The role of approaches to learning and prior academic achievement,” *Account. Educ.*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 409–430, Dec. 2004.
- [18] R. M. Felder and R. Brent, “Understanding student differences,” *J. Eng. Educ.*, vol. 94, no. 1, pp. 57–72, 2005.
- [19] P. Ramsden, *Learning to teach in higher education*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- [20] G. Zhang, T. J. Anderson, M. W. Ohland, and B. R. Thorndyke, “Student graduation : A longitudinal and cross-institutional study,” *J. Eng. Educ.*, no. October, 2004.
- [21] J. Tudor, R. Penlington, and L. McDowell, “Perceptions and their influences on approaches to learning,” *Eng. Educ.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 69–79, Dec. 2010.
- [22] L. Rodríguez and F. Cano, “The epistemological beliefs, learning approaches and study orchestrations of university students,” *Stud. High. Educ.*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 617–636, Oct. 2006.
- [23] J. W. Creswell and J. D. Creswell, *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*, 5th ed. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, 2018.
- [24] C. L. Chuan, “Sample size estimation using Krejcie and Morgan and Cohen statistical power analysis: A comparison,” *J. Penyelid. IPBL*, vol. 7, pp. 78–86, 2006.
- [25] J. Biggs, D. Kember, and D. Y. P. Leung, “The revised two-factor Study Process Questionnaire: R-SPQ-2F,” *Br. J. Educ.*, vol. 71, pp. 133–49, Mar. 2001.
- [26] P. C. Burnett and B. C. Dart, “The study process questionnaire: A construct validation study,” *Assess. Eval. High. Educ.*, vol. 25, no. 1, 2000.
- [27] J. Pallant, *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS*, 6th ed. New York: Mc Graw-Hill Education, 2016.
- [28] Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for The Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [29] C. E. Weinstein, J. Jung, and T. W. Acee, “Learning and cognition- issues, concepts, types- Focus on learning,” *International Encyclopedia of Education*. Elsevier Ltd., pp. 323–329, 2010.