Report on HDR Student Survey, MUSEQ-R 2006,
Executive Summary

Background
1. The MUSEQ-R annual survey of all enrolled HDR students was developed in 2006, in consultation with the Higher Degree Research Committee (HDRC), to provide MQ HDR students with a confidential feedback instrument as part of Macquarie's commitment to providing an evidence base for a strong and supportive research culture.

2. The survey is based on the annual national Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ) for completed HDR students, thus allowing comparison with previous MQ HDR feedback and national ratings. The survey was administered by the Management Information Unit (MIU).

3. The response rate was 29% (n= 376). 35% of respondents were first-year HDR students (n=121). 92% of external domestic students (n=95) participated in the survey and 26% of respondents (n=98) were international students.

4. Divisional student response was generally proportional with MQ's HDR population. ELS had the highest participation (44%) while Law and EFS had the lowest, 15% and 16% respectively.

Findings
1. MUSEQ-R students rated their overall satisfaction with their research experience so far (77%) lower than 2004 PREQ MQ (82%) and national graduates (83%). MPhil and part-time students are more likely to be satisfied with their research experience (86% and 80% respectively). Charts 2a, 4 & 8b

2. The highest overall satisfaction rating was for supervision (81%) and the lowest for support services (71%). First-year HDR students are the most satisfied with their supervision experience (87%) compared with later year students. Chart 2c

3. On the PREQ scales MUSEQ-R students are more satisfied with supervision (75%) than 2004 MQ (69%) graduates. First year HDR students were most satisfied with supervision (80%), consistent with the findings of the 2006 Improving the first year research experience project. All MUSEQ-R respondents are less satisfied with their skill development (80%) and infrastructure (61%) than 2004 MQ (90% & 69%) and national graduates (91% & 70%). Chart 7c

4. First year HDR students rated their satisfaction with intellectual climate highest (66%) compared with other HDR students (56%) and MQ and national 2004 graduates (57% & 58%), consistent with the 2006 Improving the first year research experience project findings. Chart 7c

5. External HDR students had the highest response rate and have comparatively low levels of satisfaction with supervision (70% cf internal 76%), intellectual climate (50% cf 58%), infrastructure (49% cf 65%) and overall satisfaction with their research experience (72% cf 78%). Chart 10

6. International HDR students are more satisfied than domestic students with infrastructure provision (66% cf 60%) and less satisfied with intellectual climate (52% cf 58%). There is, however, considerable divisional variation with L&P international students markedly more satisfied with intellectual climate (64% cf 49%) and ICS international students more strongly dissatisfied with intellectual climate than domestic students (29% cf 62%). Chart 7 Int.

7. While domestic and international students rate their satisfaction on the PREQ skill development scale similarly (84% domestic cf 81% international) there is marked variation in rating on the MQ specific item Q11 provision of research methods training. Domestic students rate 57% satisfaction and international students rate 43%. This difference in perception is marked within the Divisions ELS, ICS and L&P. Charts 7 Int, 17Int
8. Students in professional doctorate programs have lower levels of satisfaction than PhD and MPhil students with supervision (71% cf 75% & 76%), intellectual climate (43% cf 58% & 55%) and infrastructure (48% cf 63% & 64%). Chart 8b

9. There was considerable variation among divisional ratings on the three overall satisfaction ratings, the PREQ scales and the 11 MQ specific items. Division-specific reports have been produced where there was at least a 20% response rate. Of these, ICS student satisfaction ratings are of most concern. Charts 6, 11,16b, 17b, 18b, 19b, 20b, 21b, 22b, 23b, 24b

**Recommendations**

1. Improve the overall MUSEQ-R response rate to 50% or better and improve each divisional response rate to 30-50% of their enrolment. [A/Professor Neumann; Divisional Directors HDR].

2. Develop a stronger institutional and divisional HDR feedback culture in second and third years as a key part of quality enhancement (e.g. 1st year response rate = 35% cf MUSEQ-R 29%) [A/Professor Neumann; Divisional Directors HDR].

3. Examine ways to improve satisfaction among students at later stages of their HDR candidature by providing more targeted support e.g. in supervision and intellectual climate. [Directors HDR]

4. Examine how external domestic HDR student satisfaction with different aspects of their research experience (e.g. supervision, intellectual climate and infrastructure) can be improved and advise HDRC on divisional strategies for improvement. [Directors HDR]

5. Examine how the research experience of international HDR students, in particular in relation to intellectual climate and the provision of appropriate research methods training, can be improved and advise HDRC on divisional strategies for improvement. [Directors HDR ELS, ICS, L&P]

6. Examine how Divisions offering professional doctorate programs can improve satisfaction levels with supervision, infrastructure support and intellectual climate. [Dean L&P and Dean MGSM]

7. Examine which student service improvements could increase HDR satisfaction ratings, (e.g. ITS for internal & external students, space & access to Union services) and advise HDRC on strategies for improvement. [DVC Administration]

8. Examine the reasons for relatively low levels of HDR satisfaction in ICS on almost all items and advise HDRC on ICS strategies to increase HDR satisfaction ratings. [Dean ICS and Director HDR]

*RN, May, 2007*
Background

The MUSEQ-R survey of all enrolled HDR students was developed in 2006 in consultation with the Higher Degree Research Committee. The aim is to provide MQ HDR students with a confidential feedback instrument as part of MQ’s commitment to providing an evidence base for a strong and supportive research culture.

The survey (see Attachment 1) is based on the annual national Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ) survey for completed HDR students, modified appropriately for in candidature students rather than graduates. It includes an additional 11 items developed to give a specific feedback on Macquarie University. Students are asked to respond to statements using a 5 point scale to indicate the extent of agreement on each item. Like the PREQ survey, MUSEQ-R also collects information about respondents and their candidature. Thus there are:

- 34 items comprising PREQ items (with any necessary modifications) and 11 MQ specific items
- Two open ended questions
- Respondent program and individual characteristic items.

The design of MUSEQ-R allows comparison with previous MQ HDR feedback and national ratings.

The survey was administered by the Management Information Unit (MIU), which also administers the national PREQ and CEQ surveys as well as the Graduate Destinations Survey. MIU follows the standard survey administration procedures required by Graduate Careers Australia (GCA) and the AVCC. This ensures student confidentiality.

The survey was administered online from mid-November to mid-December 2006 with the option of hard copy completion with a reply-paid envelope to MIU.

HDR Student Profile and Response Rate

The response rate to the first MUSEQ-R survey was 29% (n= 376). By comparison the national response rate to the PREQ is around 50% and MQ’s 2004 graduate response rate to the PREQ was 52% (n=62).

Slightly more than one third of MUSEQ-R respondents (n=121) were first year HDR students, giving a 35% response rate of the first year HDR population.

The respondent profile had a slightly higher proportion of full-time and female respondents, while nearly all external domestic students responded 92% (n=95).

Of the respondents 26% (n=98) were international HDR students. Table 1 shows the response rate of different categories of students.
Table 1: Actual numbers and response rate for HDR population and respondents for all sub-categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population (n)</th>
<th>Respondents (n)</th>
<th>Response Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL MQ</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External (Dom)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Doc</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAppLing</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dpsych</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Half of the respondents reported that they were scholarship holders (n=177).

Divisional student response was generally proportional with MQ’s HDR population. Table 2 shows the actual divisional response rate. ELS had the highest participation (44%) while Law and EFS had the lowest, 15% and 16% respectively.

Table 2: Actual numbers and response rates for all Divisional Populations and Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population (n)</th>
<th>Respondents (n)</th>
<th>Response Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACES</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFS</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELS</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGSM</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCMP</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Division of Law had 7 participants and EFS had 11 participants. Thus, given the small number of respondents in these Divisions there is no separate reporting of their student ratings.

The Divisions with the largest participation in terms of actual numbers were ELS n=123 and L&P n=70.

Findings

The findings below and the accompanying charts are presented in terms of ‘explicit agreement’. This combines the agree and strongly agree ratings for each item.
Division-specific results have been produced where there is at least a 20% response rate from the Division. This is important to maintain student anonymity. The generally low divisional response rates should be kept in mind in interpretations of the student ratings.

The discussion highlights findings based on rating differences of more than 5 points based on GCA advice in relation to PREQ that “differences of around 5 points or more may be of interest as they represent a difference of at least a fifth of a standard deviation” ([Postgraduate Research Experience 2005 Report GCA, 2006:3]).

**Overall satisfaction**

There are three overall satisfaction items: item 32 satisfaction with University services and facilities; item 33 satisfaction with supervision; item 34 satisfaction with the quality of the research experience. The latter item is from the national PREQ survey.

MUSEQ-R students rated their overall satisfaction with their research experience so far (77%) lower than 2004 PREQ MQ (82%) and national graduates (83%). MPhil and part-time students are more likely to be satisfied with their research experience (86% and 80% respectively). Charts 2a, 4 & 8b

The highest overall satisfaction rating was for supervision (81%) and the lowest for MQ support services (71%). First-year HDR students are the most satisfied with their supervision experience (87%) compared with later year students. Chart 2c

Divisions rating highest on satisfaction with services were: MGSM, SCMP, L&P, and ELS. HDR students in ACES rated lowest on satisfaction with services. Chart 6

Full-time students rated lower satisfaction than part time students on overall satisfaction with MQ services (Q. 32 67% and 78%) and with their research experience (Q. 34 75% and 80%). Chart 4

Highest overall satisfaction with supervision ratings were in respondents from MGSM (83%) and SCMP (90%) followed by L&P (84%) and ELS (81%). The lowest ratings were from respondents from ACES (65%). Chart 6

The highest overall satisfaction rating with their MQ research experience were respondents from SCMP (90%) and MGSM (83%).

**Ratings on PREQ scales**

The 23 PREQ items are reported on five PREQ scales. These are: supervision; skill development; intellectual climate; infrastructure; and goals and expectations. (see Attachment 2)

On the PREQ scales MUSEQ-R students are more satisfied with supervision (75%) than 2004 MQ (69%) graduates. First year HDR students were most satisfied with supervision (80%), consistent with the findings of the 2006 Improving the first year research experience project. All MUSEQ-R respondents are less satisfied with their skill development (80%) and infrastructure (61%) than 2004 MQ (90% & 69%) and national graduates (91% & 70%). Chart 7c

First year HDR students rated their satisfaction with intellectual climate highest (66%) compared with other HDR students (56%) and MQ and national 2004 graduates (57% & 58%), consistent with the 2006 Improving the first year research experience project findings.
The ratings may reflect the fact that during 2006 many Divisions focussed on strengthening the integration of commencing HDR students. Chart 7c.

External domestic HDR students had the highest response rate and have comparatively low levels of satisfaction with supervision (70%), intellectual climate (50%), infrastructure (49%) and overall satisfaction with their research experience (72%). This difference may not be surprising but given that one third of respondents are enrolled externally is it is an important area of focus for the University to examine a better meeting of the needs of students. Chart 10

International HDR students are more satisfied than domestic students with infrastructure provision (66% cf 60%) and less satisfied with intellectual climate (52% cf 58%). There is, however, considerable divisional variation with L&P international students markedly more satisfied with intellectual climate (64% cf 49%) and ICS international students more strongly dissatisfied with intellectual climate than domestic students (29% cf 62%). Chart 7 Int.

Students in professional doctorate programs have lower levels of satisfaction than PhD and MPhil students with supervision (71% cf 75% & 76%), intellectual climate (43% cf 58% & 55%) and infrastructure (48% cf 63% & 64%). Professional doctorate students are however most satisfied with meeting their goals and expectations (89%) and MPhil students are least satisfied (71%). Chart 8b

There was considerable variation among divisional ratings on the three overall satisfaction ratings, the PREQ scales and the 11 MQ specific items. Division-specific reports have been produced where there was at least a 20% response rate. Of these, ICS student satisfaction ratings are of most concern. Charts 6, 11,16b, 17b, 18b, 19b, 20b, 21b, 22b, 23b, 24b

**MQ specific items**

The MUSEQ-R survey includes 11 MQ specific items (see Attachment 1). These items cover: time with supervisor; aspects of departmental/divisional research climate; skill development opportunities; library support; and aspects of MQ administration.

The overall rating trends discussed above on the PREQ scales are reflected in HDR student ratings on the MQ specific items, namely: higher ratings by first year, part time and MPhil students; lower ratings from professional doctorate and external students. Charts 12, 13, 14, 15

Satisfaction with supervisor time (Q2) ranged from 90% in SCMP and MGSM to a low 69% in ICS. Chart 16B

Less than 60% of respondents perceive a strong research climate for HDR students in their Divisions (Q. 19 research interaction encouraged and Q. 25 respected as fellow researcher). Charts 19B, 20B

While domestic and international students rate their satisfaction on the PREQ skill development scale similarly (84% domestic cf 81% international) there is marked variation in rating on the MQ specific item Q11 provision of research methods training. Domestic students rate 57% satisfaction and international students rate 43%. This difference in perception is marked within the Divisions ELS, ICS and L&P. Charts 7 Int, 17Int
Provision of research methods training (Q11) is seen to be particularly poor in Humanities (41%) and ICS (44%), while the Library (Q 30) is not seen to sufficiently meet the needs of HDR students in ELS (68%) and ICS (55%). The student ratings on the Library support feedback from students in ICS through the Improving the first year research experience project 2003-2006. Charts 17B, 23B

Respondents rated their satisfaction with HDRO support at 58% and satisfaction with their division’s HDR support 68%. The highest ratings for divisional administrative support were from HDR students in SCMP (79%) and MGSM (76%). Chart 18B, 24B

Recommendations

1. Improve the overall MUSEQ-R response rate to 50% or better and improve each divisional response rate to 30-50% of their enrolment. [A/Professor Neumann; Divisional Directors HDR].

2. Develop a stronger institutional and divisional HDR feedback culture in second and third years as a key part of quality enhancement (e.g. 1st year response rate = 35% cf MUSEQ-R 29%) [A/Professor Neumann; Divisional Directors HDR].

3. Examine ways to improve satisfaction among students at later stages of their HDR candidature by providing more targeted support e.g. in supervision and intellectual climate. [Directors HDR]

4. Examine how external domestic HDR student satisfaction with different aspects of their research experience (e.g. supervision, intellectual climate and infrastructure) can be improved and advise HDRC on divisional strategies for improvement. [Directors HDR]

5. Examine how the research experience of international HDR students, in particular in relation to intellectual climate and the provision of appropriate research methods training, can be improved and advise HDRC on divisional strategies for improvement. [Directors HDR ELS, ICS, L&P]

6. Examine how Divisions offering professional doctorate programs can improve satisfaction levels with supervision, infrastructure support and intellectual climate. [Dean L&P and Dean MGSM]

7. Examine which student service improvements could increase HDR satisfaction ratings, (e.g. ITS for internal & external students, space & access to Union services) and advise HDRC on strategies for improvement. [DVC Administration]

8. Examine the reasons for relatively low levels of HDR satisfaction in ICS on almost all items and advise HDRC on ICS strategies to increase HDR satisfaction ratings. [Dean ICS and Director HDR]
Attachments:
1. MUSEQ-R Survey 2006
2. PREQ survey items by PREQ scale
3. Chart 2A: Comparison of Overall Satisfaction Ratings, MUSEQ-R v PREQ MQ v PREQ National
5. Chart 4: MUSEQ-R 2006 Overall Satisfaction Ratings, by Mode of Attendance
6. Chart 6: MUSEQ-R 2006 Overall Satisfaction Ratings by Division
7. Chart 7C: MUSEQ-R 2006 Comparison of PREQ Scale Means, All MQ and First Year Respondents with PREQ 2004 National and MQ figures
8. Chart 7 Int: MUSEQ-R 2006 Comparison PREQ Scale Means by Division Domestic & International HDR
9. Chart 8B MUSEQ-R 2006 Comparison of PREQ Scale Means, by Degree (PhD v Prof. Doc v MPhil)
11. Chart 11: MUSEQ-R 2006 Comparison of PREQ Scales by Division
12. Chart 12: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items: All MQ v First Year Respondents
15. Chart 15: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items by Mode of Study
16. Chart 16B: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items by Division cf MQ & First Year, Q2 "Sufficient Time with Supervisor"
17. Chart 17B: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items by Division cf MQ & First Year, Q11 " Provision of Appropriate Training in Research Methods"
18. Chart 17 Int: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items Domestic & International by Division Q11 " Provision of Appropriate Training in Research Methods"
19. Chart 18B: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items by Division v MQ & First Year, Q15 "Dep't / Div Administration is Effective in Supporting Research"
20. Chart 19B: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items by Division of MQ & First Year, Q19 "Interaction between Researchers is Encouraged in Dep't / Div"
21. Chart 20B: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items by Division of MQ & First Year, Q25 "Feel Respected as Fellow Researcher within Dep't / Div"
22. Chart 21B: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items by Division of MQ & First Year, Q28 "Learnt to Prepare a Budget for Research"
23. Chart 22B: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items by Division of MQ & First Year, Q29 "HDRO Website is Helpful in Accessing HDR Candidature Information"
24. Chart 23B: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items by Division of MQ & First Year, Q30 "The Library Meets my Library Research Needs"
25. Chart 24B: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items by Division of MQ & First Year, Q31 "HDRO Administration is Effective in Supporting my Research Candidature"
## MUSEQ-R 2006 Questions (PREQ + MQ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Red = Questions added for MUSEQ-R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Supervision is available when I need it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The time that I have with my supervisor/s is sufficient for my current needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have access to a suitable work space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I understand the standard of work that is expected of me as a research student in my Department / Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Department / Division provides opportunities for social contact with other postgraduate students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My research has further developed my problem-solving skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My supervisor/s make/s a real effort to understand difficulties I face</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have good access to the technical support I need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel integrated into the Department / Division’s community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I have learned to develop my ideas and present them in my written work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Macquarie has provided appropriate training in research methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am able to organise good access to necessary equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My supervisor/s provide/s additional information relevant to my topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My research has sharpened my analytical skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My Department / Division administration is effective in supporting my research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My Department / Division provides opportunities for me to become involved in the broader research culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I am given good guidance in topic selection and refinement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I have good access to computing facilities and services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Interaction between researchers is actively encouraged in my Department/Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Doing my research has developed my ability to plan my own work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My supervisor/s provide/s helpful feedback on my progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. A good seminar program for postgraduate students is provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The research ambience in the Department / Division stimulates my work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I have received good guidance on my literature search</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I feel respected as a fellow researcher within my Department/Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. As a result of my research I feel confident about tackling unfamiliar problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. There is appropriate financial support for research activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I have learnt to prepare a budget for my research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The HDRU website is helpful in accessing HDR candidature information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The Library meets my Library research needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The HDRU administration is effective in supporting my research candidature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of University services and facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of my supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of my high degree research experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Red = Questions added for MUSEQ-R
## PREQ Items by Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision</strong></td>
<td>1. Supervision was available when I needed it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. My supervisor/s made a real effort to understand difficulties I faced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. My supervisor/s provided additional information relevant to my topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. I was given good guidance in topic selection and refinement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. My supervisor/s provided helpful feedback on my progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. I received good guidance in my literature search.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skill Development</strong></td>
<td>6. My research further developed my problem-solving skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. I learned to develop my ideas and present them in my written work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. My research sharpened my analytic skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. Doing my research helped me to develop my ability to plan my own work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26. As a result of my research, I feel confident about tackling unfamiliar problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual Climate</strong></td>
<td>5. The department provided opportunities for social contact with other postgraduate students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. I was integrated into the department's community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. The department provided opportunities for me to become involved in the broader research culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. A good seminar program for postgraduate students was provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23. The research ambience in the department or faculty stimulated my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>3. I had access to a suitable working space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. I had good access to the technical support I needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. I was able to organise good access to necessary equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. I had good access to computing facilities and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. There was appropriate financial support for research activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thesis Examination</strong></td>
<td>2. The thesis examination process was fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. I was satisfied with the thesis examination process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. The examination of my thesis was completed in a reasonable time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals and Expectations</strong></td>
<td>4. I developed an understanding of the standard of work expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. I understood the required standard for the thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. I understood the requirements of thesis examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>28. Overall, I was satisfied with the quality of my higher degree research experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pink = Questions removed for MUSEQ-R
Chart 2A: Comparison of Overall Satisfaction Ratings
MUSEQ-R v PREQ MQ v PREQ National

Q.32 MUSEQ-R 2006 Services (374)
 Explicit Agreement (%)
71

Q.33 MUSEQ-R 2006 Supervision (375)
 Explicit Agreement (%)
81

Q.28 (34) MUSEQ-R 2006 Experience (375)
 Explicit Agreement (%)
77

Q.28 PREQ MQ 2004 Experience (62)
 Explicit Agreement (%)
82

Q.28 PREQ Nat 2004 Experience (2,987)
 Explicit Agreement (%)
83

Explicit Agreement (%)
Chart 2C: MUSEQ-R 2006 Comparison of Overall Satisfaction Ratings
2004 PREQ National & MQ and MUSEQ-R All MQ & First Year Respondents

- Q.28 PREQ Nat 2004 Experience: 83%
- Q.28 PREQ MQ 2004 Experience: 82%
- Q.28 (34) MUSEQ-R 2006 Experience: 78%
- Q.32 MUSEQ-R 2006 Services: 70%
- Q.33 MUSEQ-R 2006 Supervision: 81%
Chart 4: MUSEQ-R 2006 Overall Satisfaction Ratings by Mode of Attendance

Q 32 Services: Full-time (252) = 67\%, Part-time (123) = 78\%
Q 33 Supervision: Full-time (252) = 81\%, Part-time (123) = 83\%
Q 34 Experience: Full-time (252) = 75\%, Part-time (123) = 80\%
Chart 7C: MUSEQ-R 2006 Comparison of PREQ Scale Means
All MQ and First Year Respondents with PREQ 2004 National and MQ figures

Explicit Agreement (%)
MUSEQ-R 2006 Comparison PREQ Scale Means by Division
Domestic & International HDR

Supervision Intellectual Climate Skill Development Infrastructure Goals and Expectations Overall Satisfaction

Explicit Agreement %

MQ Dom (278)  MQ Int (98)  ELS Dom (85)  ELS Int (38)  ICS Dom (18)  ICS Int (14)  LP Dom (52)  LP Int (18)
Chart 8B MUSEQ-R 2006 Comparison of PREQ Scale Means by Degree (PhD v Prof. Doc v MPhil)
Chart 10: MUSEQ-R 2006 Comparison of PREQ Scale Means by Mode of Study

Explicit Agreement (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Intellectual Climate</th>
<th>Skill Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Goals and Expectations</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- All MQ (376)
- Internal (281)
- External (95)
Chart 11: MUSEQ-R 2006
Comparison of PREQ Scales by Division

Explicit Agreement (%)

- Supervision
- Intellectual Climate
- Skill Development
- Infrastructure
- Goals and Expectations
- Overall Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Intellectual Climate</th>
<th>Skill Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Goals and Expectations</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACES (17)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELS (123)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM (58)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;P (70)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGSM (29)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS (32)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCMP (29)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MQ (376)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 12: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items
All MQ v First Year Respondents

Explicit Agreement (%)

- Q2 Supervisor time: 88%
- Q11 Research Training: 53%
- Q15 Div/Dep't Admin: 68%
- Q19 Interaction Encouraged: 71%
- Q25 Respected as Researcher: 66%
- Q28 Budget Prep: 58%
- Q29 HDRO Website: 62%
- Q30 Library: 52%
- Q31 HDRO Admin: 54%
- Q25 Respected as Researcher: 53%

Legend:
- All MQ (376)
- 1st Yrs (121)
Chart 14: MUSEQ-R 2006
Non-PREQ Items by Mode of Attendance

Explicit Agreement (%)

- Q2 Supervisor time: 82, 83
- Q11 Research Training: 53, 50
- Q15 Div/Dep't Admin: 68, 66
- Q19 Interaction Encouraged: 56, 56
- Q25 Respected as Researcher: 58, 57, 59
- Q28 Budget Prep: 62, 65
- Q29 HDRO: 55
- Q30 Library: 54, 53, 56
- Q31 HDRO Admin: 58, 58, 59

Legend:
- Yellow: All MQ (376)
- Purple: Full-time (253)
- Teal: Part-time (123)
Chart 15: MUSEQ-R 2006
Non-PREQ Items by Mode of Study

Explicit Agreement (%)

- All MQ (376)
- Internal (281)
- External (95)
Chart 16B: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items by Division of MQ & First Year
Q2 "Sufficient Time with Supervisor"

Explicit Agreement (%)

- SCMP (29): 90%
- ICS (32): 69%
- MGSM (29): 90%
- L&P (70): 79%
- HUM (58): 81%
- ELS (123): 82%
- ACES (17): 82%
- 1st Yr (121): 88%
- All MQ (376): 82%
Chart 17B: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items by Division of MQ & First Year
Q11 "Provision of Appropriate Training in Research Methods"
MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items Domestic & International by Division

Q11 "Provision of Appropriate Training in Research Methods"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MQ</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MQ</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELS</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELS</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explicit Agreement %

- MQ Dom (278)
- MQ Int (98)
- ELS Dom (85)
- ELS Int (38)
- ICS Dom (18)
- ICS Int (14)
- LP Dom (52)
- LP Int (18)
Chart 18B: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items by Division v MQ & First Year
Q15 "Dep't / Div Administration is Effective in Supporting Research"

- SCMP (29) 79
- ICS (32) 59
- MGSM (29) 76
- L&P (70) 68
- HUM (58) 69
- ELS (123) 67
- ACES (17) 59
- 1st Yr (121) 71
- All MQ (376) 68

Explicit Agreement (%)
Chart 19B: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items by Division of MQ & First Year
Q19 "Interaction between Researchers is Encouraged in Dep't / Div"

Explicit Agreement (%)
Chart 20B: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items by Division cf MQ & First Year
Q25 "Feel Respected as Fellow Researcher within Dep't / Div"

Explicit Agreement (%)

- SCMP (29): 59%
- ICS (32): 63%
- MGSM (29): 59%
- L&P (70): 59%
- HUM (58): 52%
- ELS (123): 56%
- ACES (17): 47%
- 1st Yr (121): 70%
- All MQ (376): 58%
Chart 21B: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items by Division cf MQ & First Year
Q28 "Learnt to Prepare a Budget for Research"
Chart 22B: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items by Division of MQ & First Year
Q29 "HDRO Website is Helpful in Accessing HDR Candidature Information"
Chart 23B: MUSEQ-R 2006 Non-PREQ Items by Division of MQ & First Year
Q30 "The Library Meets my Library Research Needs"

Explicit Agreement (%)

- SCMP (29): 69%
- ICS (32): 55%
- MGSM (29): 72%
- L&P (70): 77%
- HUM (58): 74%
- ELS (123): 68%
- ACES (17): 88%
- 1st Yr (121): 70%
- All MQ (376): 70%