

Guidelines for interpretation

The results for specific competences are presented for every combination of Area/Group and separately for Ratings and Rankings as displayed in the corresponding labels on each slide. The results for generic competences are presented separately for each combination of Area/Group and for all areas together separated by groups.

Ratings

It refers to the means for each competence in the 1 to 4 scale. Each competence was rated in terms of *importance* and *achievement*, so there are two results for each competence. The first graphic displays results ordered from the most important to least important competence. Of course the mean for *achievement* does not follow strictly a descending pattern, as the reference for this order is the mean for *importance*. It should be noted that the maximum value for the mean is 4 and the minimum is 1. The mean for *achievement* is normally lower than the mean for *importance*. This is no surprise as this is the case in all other previous TUNING studies (and most studies using this double scale of 'importance' and 'achievement' show similar results). But of course the gap between both means is relevant as it shows how far both means are. A wide gap between two competences is more relevant if the competence is rated as a highly important competence.

After the graphic, the same means are provided in a table where the competences have been ordered by the mean of the *importance* rating score (descending order) as it was done in the graphics before.

Ranking

In the questionnaire, respondents chose the five most important competences. In order to analyze the results, the first chosen competence was assigned 5 points, the second one 4 points, the third one 3 points, the fourth 2 points and 1 point to the fifth and last one. The competences not chosen were assigned zero points. Therefore if all respondents chose one given competence as the first one, the mean of this assigned score would yield a top 5 for the mean of this competence. In the same manner, a given competence never chosen by any of the respondents among the top five would yield a mean of zero. The graphic shows the competences in descending order using this score.

After this graphic, the same results are given in the corresponding table where competences are ordered in ascending order.

Correlations

At the end of these results, correlations among the means given by groups have been calculated. This correlation coefficient measures the sign and intensity of the relationship between the means of the four groups considered in each result: importance, achievement and ranking. This most used coefficient has a minimum value of -1 (maximum possible negative relationship) and a maximum value of +1 (maximum possible positive relationship). A zero would indicate the absence of relationship between the results of any pair of given groups. As you may observe all correlations are positive, as expected. Note that a negative correlation would indicate that two given groups are behaving in an opposite manner. A correlation close to 1 for two groups, let's say *Academics* and *Students* as an example, shows that the means obtained for the set of competences behave in a very similar manner. If this correlation refers to *Importance*, as an example again, it would mean that when a competence is judged by *Academics* as very important, *Students* have considered this competence as very important too (that does not imply that the means are equal in both groups, but both means will be high relatively in each group). In the same manner if a given competence is judged by *Academics* among the least

important ones, *Students* will consider this competence as a competence of least importance (once again that does not imply that the means are equal in both groups, but both means will be relatively low in each group).

Comparing importance and achievement separately between groups

Two final slides are including showing graphics for importance and achievement ratings separately with four groups altogether in each graphic. This graphics allows for comparison between different groups. The competences are ordered just as they were listed in the original questionnaire.