



|                |                     |  |  |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--|
|                |                     | <b>University</b>                            | <b>Glasgow Caledonian</b>  |
|                |                     | <b>Department</b>                            | <b>Caledonian Business School</b>  |
|                |                     | <b>Module</b>                                | <b>Consumer Buyer Behaviour</b>  |
|                |                     | <b>Overview</b>                              | This is a level two core module in the marketing suite of programmes and is an optional module available to most other degrees in the CBS undergraduate programme framework. It attracts an enrolment of c300 students each year. Consumer Buyer Behaviour builds on the teaching within the first year module, Marketing Fundamentals and develops students' appreciation of consumer behaviour concepts while deepening their understanding of the ways in which consumer behaviour influences marketing decisions.  |
|                |                     | <b>Drivers for change</b>                    | To reduce staff workload and improve students' progression by implementing weekly online tests with feedback (25% of final grade) and to replace the end of module exam with 3 pieces of inter-related, progressively demanding, group-based, coursework (25% each). In addition, to establish electronic submission and marking of coursework for quicker turnaround as previously the module tutors had found it very tight to meet GCU assessment policy guidelines for a 3 week turnaround of results back to students.  |
|                |                     | <b>Intervention</b>                          | <p>Before REAP the module was assessed by</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Coursework comprising a 3 week individual diary which was used to inform</li> <li>2. a 2,500 word essay submitted in week 8 (40%): Feedback in week 10</li> <li>3. Group paper presentation (20%)</li> <li>4. Exam – Individual 3 hours in week 15 (40%)</li> </ol> <p>In the first year of REAP module assessment was re-designed to be 100% course work comprising</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Weekly, open book online MCQ tests with individual feedback (25% of final grade)</li> <li>2. Staged submission through the semester of 3 group based, progressively demanding written papers (25%) each i.e. in weeks, 6, 9 and 12. Each group paper did have individually identified contributions.</li> <li>3. Introduced use of electronic submission and marking of coursework for quicker turnaround</li> </ol> <p>In the second year of REAP, modifications were made following evaluation of the initial pilot.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Allowing a 'practice week' before entering the continuously assessed weekly online tests with feedback (25% of final grade)</li> <li>2. The first two pieces of coursework were still group based but the third and final piece was changed to be individual coursework enabling students to show their individual potential. (Each 25% of final grade)</li> <li>3. Electronic submission and marking was continued</li> </ol> |
|                |                     |  | <b>Activities</b>  |
| <b>PROCESS</b> | <b>EMPOWER-MENT</b> | <b>Principle 1</b><br>(clarify criteria)     | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Feedback was recorded on the first paper by the tutor specifically relating to criteria that had been set by the module teaching team. This was given in a very detailed manner to enable the students to respond and make improvements with the student group to enhance scholarly activity for paper 2. This new improved criteria was discussed with the students on Blackboard and directly with students in class. This happened again for paper 3. Therefore, students were actively engaged with the assessment criteria which proved to be successful. It was found that on the occasions when students did actively engage in this process, the group paper marks improved on each submission.</li> <li>2) In year 2 of REAP examples of previous coursework were marked and discussed by the students themselves to enhance their understanding of the formulation of criteria process as part of the seminar programme.</li> </ol>  |
|                |                     | <b>Principle 2</b><br>(self-assess, reflect) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Weekly online MCQs in BB linked to lecture programme and core text book</li> <li>2) The group paper feedback identified individual student work which allowed for self-reflection</li> </ol>   |



|            |   |   |   |
|------------|---|---|---|
| ENGAGEMENT | GIBBS & SIMPSON'S 4 CONDITIONS OF TIME & EFFORT ON TASK | <b>Principle 3</b><br>(tutor feedback)      | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) MCQs feedback allowed students to self-correct</li> <li>2) The progressively staged coursework as outlined above assisted students to self-correct after each stage of submission.</li> </ol>   |
|            |   | <b>Principle 4</b><br>(peer feedback)       | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Specific feedback dialogue opportunities were planned during seminars after each stage of the coursework submission. For example, written feedback on the coursework was discussed in seminar time and this allowed dialogue between peers and tutor-student dialogue.</li> <li>2) More generically, feedback was posted on BB and also outlined in lectures for all students and they were encouraged to email seminar tutors with individual questions for individual dialogue if required. This happened regularly because the students were submitting coursework on line anyway.</li> <li>3) Examples of excellent work were assessed and discussed using previous year's student's work.</li> <li>4) MCQ feedback was discussed in class</li> </ol>   |
|            |   | <b>Principle 5</b><br>(motivation)          | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Students reported that weekly MCQs created motivation to regularly read the core text book which they found enjoyable and easier to manage than revising for exams at the end of the semester "I liked the weekly tests, it meant that I actually read the whole book as I went along so I learned more rather than cramming for an exam at the end of term" (Student comment).</li> <li>2) Students were given individual feedback on the group course work and this assisted with motivating individuals for the next submission</li> <li>3) Each week the module leader posted a motivational 'Happy tip' on BB taken from Dr David Niven's book <i>Happy People</i> (2005) which outlined scientific research on how to be happy. Students reported that these were 'interesting' and 'fun'.</li> </ol> |
|            |   | <b>Principle 6</b><br>(close feedback loop) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The progressive learning papers were designed to explicitly do this.</li> <li>2) Weekly MCQs – students reported that their scores improved with time.</li> </ol>   |
|            |   | <b>Principle 7</b><br>(shape teaching)      | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Seminars after the submission of each piece of course work where used to discuss feedback given to students.</li> <li>2) Generic feedback was also posted on Blackboard and highlighted in lectures for all students.</li> </ol>  |
|            |   | <b>Condition 1</b><br>(in and out of class) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Directed study time involved undertaking weekly online MCQs, these were date released and closed to enforce paced completion.</li> <li>2) Open book approach to online MCQ tests required regular reading of chapters from core text book</li> <li>3) A mixture of online, individual, group, seminar and lectures was used in this module</li> </ol>   |
|            |   | <b>Condition 2</b><br>(spread evenly)       | <p>All of the coursework used in this module was designed to distribute effort throughout semester For example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Weekly online MCQs, - regular distribution of effort and learning throughout semester.</li> <li>2) Open book approach therefore regular reading of chapters from core text book</li> <li>3) Staged learning papers therefore paced written submission</li> </ol>  |
|            |   | <b>Condition 3</b><br>(deep not surface)    | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Progressively more demanding learning papers provided opportunities to engage in a more deepening learning experience. For paper one, students were required to write about individual decision making theory and were given extensive feedback on academic quality of writing style, grammar and referencing. In paper 2, students wrote about decision making and buying habits of other people and were required to research through interview completion and comparing and contrasting results with peers, using analytical skills. Paper 3 required students to create a final coursework which required the information from papers 1 and 2 to be utilised creating a customer led marketing strategy, this stage being the most difficult.</li> </ol>  |
|            |   | <b>Condition 4</b><br>(high expectations)   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Individual and group feedback was given communicating clear and progressively higher expectations to students as the semester weeks went by through feedback from the learning papers.</li> </ol>   |



|         |                         |   |
|---------|-------------------------|---|
| OUTCOME | Efficiencies            | Staff marking time – the first year of the project staff were new to online marking and found the task very time consuming and onerous. The second year due to the loss of a member of staff, some staff took on the task of a heavier marking load and found on line marking time consuming and difficult. Other staff members continued with the online approach as they were more comfortable with it. The administration of the online tests was also time consuming for the module leader and administrator due to the learning of a new system which also had technical difficulty in the first year. This was better the second year however, due to the tragic and sudden death of the module leader, this also became difficult due to lack of expertise of the weekly test technology within the staff teaching team. It is possible and likely that in normal circumstances, the online marking approach would have been easier the second year running.   |
|         | Informal Learning Gains | It's unlikely that the new assessment scheme helped decrease staff workload (even if difficulties throughout the 2 year period had not occurred) however, from informal ongoing discussion with students, it is believed they had a better learning experience and many reported to enjoying the course and assessment. Students loved the online tests and preferred this method to an end of term exam, reporting to have learned more this way. Students also reported that they liked on line feedback and appreciated receiving their grades instantly (MCQs) and quickly on line via their tutors. On the first year they believed that although they generally enjoyed the coursework, some students felt that 3 pieces of coursework did not allow individual potential to be assessed fully. In the second year the final learning paper became an individual submission and due to high numbers, it was decided to submit as a paper submission and was therefore marked by hand rather than on line. This meant that students did not receive their final marks until after the assessment Boards in June. There appeared to be some confusion with the final paper in the second year, perhaps because some individuals found the most difficult report daunting and did not have the support of the group. |
|         | Formal Learning Gains   | N/A   |