

**People's Democratic Republic of Algeria**

**Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research**

**University of Amar Telidji – Laghouat**

**Faculty of Letters and Languages**

**Department of English**



**Dissection of Data Collection Tool:**

***Analysing the Effectiveness of Questionnaires in Meeting Their  
Research Purpose***

**A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English in Partial Fulfilment  
of the Requirements for Master Degree in ELT**

**Submitted by:**

- Mr. Saadaoui Nadjib

**Supervised by:**

- Dr. Ibrir Latifa

**Board of Examiners:**

- ✓ **Dr. Ben Redda Djamal** University of Laghouat, **Chairman**
- ✓ **Dr. Ibrir Latifa** University of Laghouat, **Supervisor**
- ✓ **Dr. Mhamdi Nadir** University of Laghouat, **Examiner**

**Academic Year: 2024/2025**

## **Dedication**

In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful.

All praise is due to Allah, who granted me strength, patience, and perseverance.

I wholeheartedly dedicate this work to my beloved family.

To my dear father, whose guidance and quiet strength have always inspired me.

To my extraordinary mother, whose unwavering love and prayers have been my  
greatest source of comfort.

To my cherished brothers and sisters, and to my joyful nieces and nephews

your presence has been a constant motivation.

I also extend my deepest gratitude to all who supported me along this journey

To my devoted teachers, my encouraging colleagues, and the dedicated  
department staff.

Thank you for your guidance, encouragement, and belief in me.

This humble achievement is as much yours as it is mine.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Ibrir Latifa, for her dedicated guidance, patience, and trust in my abilities. Her insightful feedback and support were instrumental throughout every stage of this research.

My sincere thanks also go to the respected jury members for graciously agreeing to evaluate this work and for their valuable observations and constructive remarks.

A special acknowledgment is due to Dr. Mhamdi Nadir, whose thought-provoking lectures first opened my eyes to the complexities of questionnaire design. His influence and inspiration played a key role in shaping the focus of this study.

## **Abstract**

Questionnaire design is a critical yet underdeveloped skill in graduate research training. This study investigates the quality of student-designed questionnaires in applied linguistics research, with a specific focus on clarity, relevance, bias-free wording, logical flow, scaling and format, and reliability/validity. Through content analysis of five questionnaires produced by Master's students at Amar Telidji University, Laghouat (Algeria). Recurring design issues were identified, including ambiguous wording, leading questions, inconsistent scales, and overlapping categories. Using a rubric-based evaluation, the study revealed that while students often demonstrate thematic relevance and logical sequencing, they frequently struggle with linguistic precision and methodological consistency. The findings highlight a persistent gap between theoretical understanding and practical application in research methods training. In response, this study proposes a six-step framework for questionnaire design that is practical, accessible, and grounded in real student work. It is intended to serve as both an instructional guide and a self-evaluation tool for novice researchers. By bridging the gap between theory and practice, the framework aims to help students produce more valid, reliable, and meaningful data collection instruments in educational research contexts.

**Keywords:** Data Collection Tools - Questionnaire Design - Content Analysis - Rubric-Based Evaluation.

## **List of Abbreviations**

<b>AI:</b>	Artificial Intelligence.
<b>EFL:</b>	English as a Foreign Language.
<b>ELT:</b>	English Language Teaching.
<b>IELTS:</b>	International English Language Testing System.
<b>INTRAC:</b>	International NGO Training and Research Centre.
<b>LMD:</b>	Licence–Master–Doctorate
<b>PHD:</b>	Doctor of Philosophy

## List of Tables

<b>Table 1.1:</b> <i>Tasks Affecting the Reliability and Validity of Questions (Arundel, 2023)</i> .....	12
<b>Table 2.2:</b> <i>Evaluation Rubric</i> .....	22
<b>Table 2.3:</b> <i>Analysis of the First Questionnaire</i> .....	25
<b>Table 2.4:</b> <i>Analysis of the Second Questionnaire</i> .....	27
<b>Table 2.5:</b> <i>Analysis of the Third Questionnaire</i> .....	30
<b>Table 2.6:</b> <i>Analysis of the Fourth Questionnaire</i> .....	34
<b>Table 2.7:</b> <i>Analysis of the Fifth Questionnaire</i> .....	38
<b>Table 3.8:</b> <i>Clarity Scores</i> .....	45
<b>Table 3.9:</b> <i>Average Criterion Scores</i> .....	47

# Table of Contents

Dedication.....	I
Acknowledgements.....	II
Abstract .....	III
List of Abbreviations.....	IV
List of Tables.....	V
Table of Contents.....	VI
<b>General Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.Statement of the Problem.....	1
2.Aim of the Study.....	2
3.Significance of the Study.....	3
4.Research Questions .....	4
5.Previous Studies.....	4
6.Research Methods.....	5
<b>Chapter One: Questionnaire Design and Data Collection Fundamentals.....</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1 Exploring Data Collection Tools in Research.....	8
1.2 Data Collection Methods.....	8
1.2.1 Primary Data Collection Methods .....	9
1.2.2 The Questionnaire as a Primary Data Collection Tool .....	9
1.3 Types of Questions:.....	10
1.4 Question Reliability and Validity:.....	11
1.4.1 Question Reliability.....	12
1.4.2 Question Validity.....	13
1.4.3 Content Validity.....	13
1.4.4 Face Validity.....	13
1.4.5 Construct Validity.....	13
1.4.6 Internal Consistency.....	14
1.5 Effective Questionnaire Design: Importance and Implications .....	14
1.5.1 Questionnaire Design.....	15
1.6 Conclusion.....	16
<b>Chapter Two: Research Methodology, Design, and Analysis.....</b>	<b>18</b>
2.1 Research Design.....	19

2.2 Sampling and Data Sources .....	20
2.3 Evaluation Rubric and Justification .....	21
2.3.1 Evaluation criteria for questionnaires.....	21
2.3.2 Justification.....	23
2.4 Data Analysis.....	25
2.4.1 Analysis of the First Questionnaire:.....	25
2.4.2 Analysis of the Second Questionnaire:.....	27
2.4.3 Analysis of the Third Questionnaire .....	30
2.4.4 Analysis of the Fourth Questionnaire:.....	33
2.4.5 Analysis of the Fifth Questionnaire .....	37
2.5 Conclusion.....	41
2.6 Ethical Considerations .....	42
2.7 Limitations of the Methodology.....	42
<b>Chapter Three: Results, Discussion and Framework Design .....</b>	<b>43</b>
3.1 Results.....	44
3.1.1 Clarity .....	44
3.1.2 Relevance .....	45
3.1.3 Bias-Free Wording.....	45
3.1.4 Scaling and Format.....	46
3.1.5 Logical Flow.....	46
3.1.6 Reliability and Validity .....	46
3.1.7 Summary of Results.....	47
3.2 Discussion and Implications .....	47
3.2.1 Clarity: The Root of Misinterpretation.....	48
3.2.2 Bias-Free Wording: Assumptions and Leading Phrases.....	48
3.2.3 Scaling and Format: Consistency and Usability .....	50
3.2.4 Reliability and Validity: Foundations at Risk .....	50
3.2.5 Implications for Student Research.....	51
3.3 Proposed Framework for Questionnaire Design.....	52
3.3.1 Framework Principles and Goals.....	52
3.3.2 The Six-Step Questionnaire Design Framework.....	52
3.4 Conclusion and Recommendations.....	55
3.4.1 Conclusion.....	55

3.4.2 Recommendations .....	56
<b>General Conclusion .....</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>List of References.....</b>	<b>62</b>
List of References:.....	63
<b>Appendices.....</b>	<b>65</b>
Appendix .....	68
Résumé.....	81
الملخص .....	81

# **General Introduction**

## **Introduction**

Academic research often places a strong emphasis on analysing data, interpreting results, and presenting findings. However, what is sometimes overlooked is the importance of the tools used to gather that data in the first place. That's where questionnaires come in. A questionnaire may appear to be a straightforward tool, but in fact, they have a huge role in shaping how accurate, deep and credible a study is. In many research fields especially those within the social and behavioural sciences such as education, psychology, sociology, and applied linguistics questionnaires are one of the most common ways to collect information from participants.

Designing a questionnaire feels deceptively simple. If the questions seem relevant, you might think you have achieved your objective. But effective questionnaire design requires far more than just relevance it demands clarity, logical structure and the alignment with your research aims. When that is missing, the data will lack reliability and depth leading to weaker or even misleading conclusions, no matter how detailed the analysis may be.

While respected research methodology guides are available (e.g., Creswell, 2018; Bryman, 2016; Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2018; Thomander & Krosnick, 2024), design flaws in questionnaires are still common. This is not just an issue noticed in student-designed questionnaires only, surprisingly similar problems can be found in published research as well. The recurring nature of these issues suggests that there is more to be done to support researchers, especially beginners, in developing stronger and more effective questionnaires.

### **1.Statement of the Problem**

Questionnaires are used in the social and behavioural sciences and many students struggle to design them well. Through the academic journey many of us have been asked to participate in questionnaires and frequently we find ourselves confused and demotivated from the questions we face. Even with the best intentions, a lack of

understanding of principles like clarity, consistency and alignment with research objectives can lead to design errors that can compromise an entire study.

For novice researchers designing a questionnaire seems straightforward just ask a few relevant questions and you are ready to go. But this often results in vague wording, poorly structured response options or questions that are not aligned with the study's objectives. These are particularly problematic in quantitative and mixed-methods research where the quality of the questionnaire affects the accuracy of the findings.

Despite the exposure to theoretical frameworks for questionnaire design there is still a gap between what students are taught and what they can apply in real research contexts. The problem isn't lack of information but lack of practical tools to help students translate methodological knowledge into practice. So flawed questionnaires continue to appear in academic work without reflection on how these flaws affect research outcomes.

This dissertation addresses this ongoing problem by identifying common design errors in student developed questionnaires and providing a practical framework to help novice researchers create clearer, more reliable and purposeful data collection tools.

## **2. Aim of the Study**

This study takes a closer look at the common mistakes researchers often make when designing questionnaires. By identifying recurring issues such as ambiguous wording, inconsistent scaling, and misalignment with research objectives, it aims to develop a clear and practical framework that helps improve in the creation of a high-quality data collection tool. The goal is to make these questionnaires more accurate, easier to interpret, and better suited to their intended purpose, particularly in student-led quantitative and mixed-methods research within the social and behavioural sciences.

The proposed framework is a structured, step-by-step guide presented in the form of a checklist and annotated examples. Its purpose is to be practical, accessible, and directly applicable especially to small-scale academic research. The framework covers key areas such as question formulation, ensuring relevance and focus, layout and

formatting, and logical flow. It also includes common “red flags” and corrective strategies, drawn from an analysis of flawed instruments used in actual student theses. By combining theoretical principles with real-world application, the framework aims to serve as both an instructional resource and a self-evaluation tool for novice researchers seeking to improve the rigour and effectiveness of their questionnaires.

### **3. Significance of the Study**

This study matters both in theory and in practice. On the academic side, it adds to existing research methodology literature by identifying some of the most common mistakes found in student-designed questionnaires that is by offering realistic and corrective strategies which addresses these mistakes. Instead of staying at the level of abstract principles, it focuses on how these issues actually show up in real student work. On a practical level, the study aims to support novice researchers especially students by providing a clear and accessible guide that helps them design a better data collection tool from the start.

This research has the potential to strengthen the overall quality of student led research by improving their questionnaires and better questionnaires can lead to a more accurate data, more reliable findings and research that feels more grounded and credible. This is very important because improved questionnaires do not just benefit individual projects, they can also save time and effort especially in student research where resources and support are often limited.

Ultimately, the hope is that this work makes questionnaire design feel less abstract and more concrete and manageable by encouraging students to see it as a critical and achievable part of the research process rather than a technical difficulty you need to rush through. If students are better equipped to collect good data, they are also more likely to produce research that makes a meaningful contribution to their field.

## **4. Research Questions**

This study sets out to explore how questionnaire design affects the quality of student research, with a particular focus on the types of mistakes that tend to appear and how they can be addressed through a practical design framework. The questions guiding this research are:

### **Research Questions:**

1. What are the most common errors found in student-designed questionnaires?
2. In what ways do these design errors impact the reliability and validity of research findings?
3. What kind of framework can help student researchers develop clearer, more accurate, and more effective data collection tools?

To answer these questions, the study involves a close analysis of student projects using a rubric developed from established research design principles (e.g., clarity, neutrality, alignment with objectives). This rubric serves as the main tool for evaluating the quality of questionnaires in terms of both reliability (consistency across items) and validity (how well questions measure what they're intended to).

## **5. Previous Studies**

The importance of well-designed data collection tools has long been recognised in research methodology literature. Foundational works such as Fowler (1995) and Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2014) have consistently highlighted how clarity, neutrality, and the use of appropriate scaling significantly enhance data quality.

Krosnick (1999) also noted that vague or leading questions can introduce response bias, and therefore skew findings and weaken conclusions. These early works laid the foundation for understanding the basics of questionnaire design

However, while these studies offer a solid theoretical foundation, they often fall short in providing a practical step by step guidance for novice researchers. While Fowler (1995) and Dillman (2014) emphasises the importance of question clarity, their works

focuses on large-scale surveys, leaving a gap in guidance for small-scale student research. Although their guidelines are still valuable and provide theoretical foundations, their guidelines are rarely applied by students due to a lack of actionable examples. In addition, Tourangeau, Rips, and Rasinski (2000) looked at the cognitive processes behind survey responses and found that small changes in wording or question order can impact data validity. But their findings are not always translated into user-friendly recommendations.

More recent research confirms that this gap still exists, despite technological advancements and the availability of digital survey tools. Thomander and Krosnick (2024) in their recent chapter in *The Cambridge Handbook of Research Methods and Statistics for the Social and Behavioural Sciences* provide an update on best practices in question design. They said that “numerous studies have shown that small changes in question wording, formatting, and order can substantially change findings”. Common mistakes such double-barrelled items, vague or ambiguous wording, or inconsistent response formats that remains prevalent in academic studies are far more damaging towards the findings. Despite such work, practical application of questionnaire design is often missing in student research, particularly at the undergraduate and master’s levels. Many students either remain unaware of these works or find them difficult to apply. This dissertation builds on existing research by offering a more hands-on, example-based approach to identifying and correcting common questionnaire design errors.

## **6. Research Methods**

From a methodological perspective, this study is grounded in an interpretivist approach, given the nature of what is being explored. This research is more concerned with how meaning is constructed through language particularly in the way questionnaire items are written and interpreted. The focus is on understanding not just what is being asked, but how clearly and purposefully those questions communicate their intent. As Krippendorff (2004) puts it, “all reading of text is qualitative even when certain

characteristics are later converted into numbers”, which speaks directly to the heart of this research.

To examine this issue from different angles, the study uses a **qualitative-dominant, mixed-method design**. It starts with a **content analysis** of five student-designed questionnaires, with the goal of identifying recurring issues in how these tools are constructed. In addition, the study uses a reflective process often referred to as **armchair research**, which allows for deeper thinking and theory-building by critically engaging with what’s already known. These insights then feed into the development of a practical framework that draws from both the observed data and existing methodological literature.

This combination of approaches makes it possible to look at the problem both practically and conceptually to see where things are going wrong in real examples, and also to ask what that says about how research is taught and practiced more broadly.



**Chapter One: Questionnaire  
Design and Data Collection  
Fundamentals**

## **Introduction**

Understanding the significance of data collection tools is important especially for postgraduate students, beginner researchers, and language teachers. For postgraduate students beginning their research, learning about these tools helps reduce uncertainty and builds confidence, especially when dealing with unfamiliar research tasks for the first time. Tools such as questionnaires, focus group discussions, and observations can initially seem confusing, but gaining a good understanding can make the research process simpler and more effective as it enables students and teachers alike to carry out meaningful, practical research. This knowledge transforms research from something complicated and intimidating into a practical tool that helps improve the overall outcomes.

### **1.1 Exploring Data Collection Tools in Research**

Data collection involves using various methods to gather information about specific study factors, which is then used in data analysis to answer research questions or test hypotheses. Selecting appropriate data collection methods requires careful consideration of the research questions, and methodological constraints. The chosen methodology (e.g., qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods) dictates which data collection tools are appropriate. For example, a qualitative study might prioritise interviews or observations, while a quantitative study may rely on questionnaires or experiments.

According to INTRAC (2017) various methods exist for collecting and analysing data, typically using key tools like interviews, focus groups, observations, photography, videos, questionnaires, and case studies. Data can also come from direct measurements or reviewing existing secondary data.

### **1.2 Data Collection Methods**

Generally, data collection methods are divided into two main categories: primary data collection methods and secondary data collection methods. Primary data collection

involves gathering new data directly from original sources, such as through questionnaires, interviews, observations, or experiments. Researchers collect this data specifically to address their research objectives. On the other hand, secondary data collection methods involve using data that has already been gathered and published by others, such as existing studies, databases, official reports, and historical records. Ajayi, Victor. (2023)

### **1.2.1 Primary Data Collection Methods**

Primary data collection methods are particularly valuable because they allow researchers to directly address their research objectives and questions. Ajayi, Victor. (2023) showcases some of the primary data collection methods such as:

- Surveys and Questionnaires: Structured sets of questions designed to gather specific information from respondents.
- Interviews: Direct conversations between researchers and participants that can provide deeper insights.
- Observations: Systematic recording of events or behaviours as they naturally occur.
- Experiments: Controlled studies designed to test hypotheses by manipulating certain variables.

Each method has strengths and limitations, making the choice of method dependent on the specific goals, scope, and constraints of the research. For instance, observations can capture behaviour directly but may be time-consuming, while surveys and questionnaires can efficiently reach large populations but rely on participants' self-reported data. Given the particular objectives of this research, the focus will be on questionnaires as the primary data collection method.

### **1.2.2 The Questionnaire as a Primary Data Collection Tool**

The questionnaire is one of the most widely used tools for collecting data. It includes a series of questions and often answers designed to gather specific information

(attitudes, perceptions, behaviours, and experiences) from a specific sample of the population that are relevant to the research. They can be tailored to collect both qualitative and quantitative insights. Although questionnaires are less common in purely qualitative research, but they become very useful when the study involves a large number of participants. Among various data collection methods, questionnaires have maintained prominence due to their efficiency, scalability, and flexibility (Thomander & Krosnick, 2024).

However, despite their widespread use, questionnaires must be meticulously designed to avoid pitfalls such as ambiguity, response biases, and inconsistencies in interpretation, all of which can significantly impair the reliability and validity of collected data.

### **1.3 Types of Questions:**

Questionnaires can include a wide range of question types, and various frameworks have suggested categories for them. Both Dillman (1978) and Patton (2001) identified several types of question content they basically fall into these categories:

- 1) Behaviours and experiences
- 2) Knowledge
- 3) Beliefs and opinions
- 4) Attitudes and feelings

Questions can be designed in two main ways. First, they might directly measure specific variables, such as those found in the demographic section of questionnaires. Alternatively, questions can be grouped into indexes or scales, as commonly seen in exams.

Questions generally fall into two categories: closed-ended and open-ended. Closed-ended questions offer respondents a fixed set of answer choices, while open-ended questions allow respondents to provide their own responses. Open-ended questions are typically qualitative and require additional coding later on to analyse the responses. Closed-ended questions, in contrast, are quicker and easier to analyse

because responses are already predefined (Thomander & Krosnick, 2024). This is because there is a small predictable set of similar answers you can get.

According to Dollinger (2015), closed-ended questions include:

- **Checklists:** Allowing respondents to select all options that apply.
- **Multiple-Choice Items:** Offering binary (e.g., yes/no) or categorical choices.
- **Rating Scales:** Enabling participants to express degrees of agreement or frequency.
- **Multiple-item scales:** Set of questions designed to collectively assess a complex concept. Instead of relying on a single item, researchers use multiple questions that each target a different aspect of the same idea, and then combine these responses to produce a more reliable and valid measurement.

In contrast, open-ended questions allow respondents to articulate their thoughts in their own words, yielding rich qualitative data. Dollinger (2015) identifies several forms:

- **Unstructured Questions:** Broad questions without specific guidelines, inviting broader and detailed answers.
- **Sentence Completion Tasks:** Where respondents finish a given sentence, providing insight into their perspectives.
- **Word Association Tasks:** Participants respond with the first word that comes to mind when presented with a stimulus word.
- **Narrative Prompts:** Encouraging detailed accounts or stories related to the topic at hand.

## 1.4 Question Reliability and Validity:

According to Arundel (2023), the reliability and validity of questionnaire data depend heavily on how well theoretical concepts are transformed into clear, effective questions, as well as on the rigour of the testing process during development. The author emphasises that strong reliability and validity do not occur by chance they are the result of deliberate design choices and methodological care. In the suggested table, Arundel

outlines various types of reliability and validity along with the techniques needed to achieve high quality outcomes. He highlights the importance of thoughtful theory translation and cognitive testing as critical strategies in enhancing the accuracy and consistency of questionnaire items.

**Table 1:** *Tasks Affecting the Reliability and Validity of Questions (Arundel, 2023)*

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Task</b>
<b>Question reliability</b>	Questions elicit ‘true’ answers for each individual respondent; individuals who share similar characteristics will provide similar answers.	Cognitive testing
<b>Question validity</b>	Questions measure what they claim to measure, providing accurate results.	Cognitive testing
<b>Content validity</b>	Questions appropriately assess a characteristic or phenomena (response options are suitable).	Cognitive testing
<b>Face validity</b>	Questionnaire includes all necessary questions and asks questions using appropriate language.	Theory translation; cognitive testing
<b>Construct validity</b>	Questions can distinguish between respondents who do and do not report similar events, strategies, etc.	Theory translation
<b>Internal consistency</b>	Selected question items assess the same underlying characteristic or phenomena.	Post-survey analysis (Cronbach’s alpha); confirmatory factor analysis (CFA)

### 1.4.1 Question Reliability

Reliability refers to the consistency of answers that respondents provide. A question is considered reliable if similar individuals (with comparable characteristics) provide similar responses over multiple instances or contexts. High reliability is crucial

for ensuring that the questionnaire results can be trusted. If a question produces different results for the same respondent under similar circumstances, it raises concerns about the question's reliability and the overall integrity of the data.

### **1.4.2 Question Validity**

Validity refers to whether a question accurately measures what it is supposed to measure. A valid question should produce results that truly reflect the phenomenon being studied. Validity is vital for ensuring that the conclusions drawn from the data are correct. If a question is not valid, the data may lead to incorrect conclusions about the population or the phenomenon being questioned.

### **1.4.3 Content Validity**

Content validity assesses whether the questions appropriately cover the characteristic or phenomenon being evaluated. It examines whether the response options are suitable and comprehensive. Ensuring content validity helps in capturing the full scope of what is being measured, thereby providing a more accurate representation of the underlying concept. It typically involves expert judgment to determine if the questions are relevant.

### **1.4.4 Face Validity**

Face validity concerns whether the questionnaire appears to cover all necessary areas and whether the language used is appropriate for the target respondents. It is a subjective assessment of the questionnaire's content. While face validity does not guarantee actual validity, it can influence respondent willingness and motivation to participate in the survey. If respondents feel that the questions are relevant and understandable, they are more likely to provide more thoughtful answers.

### **1.4.5 Construct Validity**

Construct validity assesses whether the questions can effectively differentiate between respondents who do and do not exhibit the behaviours or characteristics being studied. This is done by ensuring that the intended constructs (theoretical concepts) are

meaningfully captured in the questions. Establishing construct validity ensures that the results accurately represent the theoretical concepts under investigation, thus supporting scientific arguments or conclusions based on the research.

#### **1.4.6 Internal Consistency**

Internal consistency evaluates whether multiple items (questions) that are intended to measure the same underlying characteristic produce similar results. This is often assessed using statistical methods such as Cronbach's alpha or confirmatory factor analysis. High internal consistency indicates that the items work harmoniously to measure a single construct. This is crucial for the reliability and integrity of multidimensional measures, as inconsistencies can suggest issues with the questions or the way respondents interpret them.

### **1.5 Effective Questionnaire Design: Importance and Implications**

The effective design of questionnaires is crucial to ensuring data quality and research validity. Questionnaire design needs careful consideration of question wording, clarity, logical sequencing, appropriate scaling methods, and unbiased phrasing to reduce issues of respondent confusion and bias (Dillman et al., 2014).

When creating a questionnaire, it is important to use short, simple, and clearly worded questions that all respondents, regardless of their educational background, can easily understand. Clearly explain the questionnaire's purpose, both in the content and the cover letter, to motivate participants and emphasise its importance. Questions should guide respondents smoothly to keep them engaged and prevent confusion. Avoid assumptions about respondents' experiences, and ensure objectivity by refraining from using clues, suggestions, or hints that could influence their answers. Use positive phrasing whenever possible, and carefully select words to enhance reliability. Each question should address only one topic at a time, avoiding double-barrelled questions. Provide open-ended response options after closed-ended choices wherever suitable.

Finally, place sensitive questions such as those about income or drug use later in the questionnaire, following neutral or general questions, to build trust and minimise respondents' discomfort and disengagement (Ting Yan, 2024).

### **1.5.1 Questionnaire Design**

A fundamental yet often overlooked element of effective questionnaire design is its overall structure. Typically, a well-organised questionnaire consists of three main sections: an introduction, the body of the questionnaire, and a conclusion. The introduction plays a crucial role in setting the tone and guiding participants. According to Schleef (2013), there are seven core components that should be included at this stage: a clear title, a brief explanation of the questionnaire's purpose, a polite request for honest and complete responses, an outline of the questionnaire content along with an estimated completion time, a guarantee of respondent anonymity, the researcher's name and institutional affiliation with contact information, and a note of appreciation.

Before starting to answer the questionnaire, participants are usually asked to provide informed consent. This is often done through an extra information sheet or a consent form, which may include some of the introductory elements outlined by Schleef. The main body of the questionnaire should then present the questions in a logical, easy to follow order to enhance the respondent's experience. Finally, at the end a brief section should thank participants and offer them a way of communication if needed (Stefan Dollinger, 2015).

Regardless of which classification of a question type adopted (behaviours and experiences, knowledge, beliefs and opinions, attitudes and feelings), it is essential that each question is carefully designed to match its intended goal. For example, if the goal is to understand a participant's behaviour, the question should be phrased to reflect that like asking, "How often do you read in English outside the classroom?" rather than posing a vague or indirect question. Dollinger (2015) highlighted that being intentional about the type of question helps ensure that the data collected truly aligns with the research objectives and avoids confusion during interpretation.

When converting initial ideas or raw prompts into fully developed questionnaire items, researchers should be mindful to match the structure of the question to the type of information they are seeking. This alignment between question type and research aim is a key step in producing a coherent and effective questionnaire.

According to Anthony Arundel (2023), creating an effective questionnaire involves meeting a wide range of essential criteria. It should be interesting for participants and be short enough to complete ideally within 15 minutes. The questions must be clearly phrased so that all participants interpret them in the same way, and they should be designed to allow respondents to give accurate and thoughtful answers. A well-designed questionnaire should include only the questions needed to address the research aims no more no less. Meeting these expectations takes time and care; designing and testing a questionnaire properly is not something that can be done in just a few days. These requirements can be grouped into six key areas: translating research questions into questionnaire items, keeping the questionnaire in an appropriate length, designing question content effectively, choosing suitable question formats, ensuring a clear and accessible layout, and selecting the right delivery method

## **1.6 Conclusion**

This chapter has laid the conceptual groundwork for understanding the role and design of questionnaires as primary data collection tools in research. Beginning with an overview of data collection methods, the discussion narrowed its focus to questionnaires highlighting their widespread use, types of questions they employ, and the principles that underpin their effective design. It became clear that the construction of a questionnaire is not merely a technical task but a methodological decision with profound implications for the reliability and validity of the research itself.

Through the examination of key concepts such as clarity, relevance, scaling, and bias-free wording, the chapter emphasised that poor questionnaire design can severely compromise data quality. Terms like internal consistency, face validity, and construct validity were shown to be more than abstract indicators they are essential qualities that

determine whether the data gathered can genuinely support research claims. In this regard, the questionnaire is not just a means of asking questions, but a sophisticated instrument of inquiry that requires careful crafting and theoretical sensitivity.

This chapter also highlighted a gap between theoretical understanding and practical execution, especially among novice researchers. While existing literature provides strong foundations in survey methodology, students often struggle to apply these guidelines effectively in small-scale research settings. As will be shown in the following chapters, this gap frequently manifests in vague wording, inconsistent scaling, and structurally flawed instruments.

These concerns set the stage for the next chapter, which details the methodological framework used to analyse five student-designed questionnaires. By using a rubric grounded in the principles discussed here, the study aims to move from theoretical exploration to practical evaluation ultimately guiding the creation of a framework that novice researchers can rely on to design better, clearer, and more valid questionnaires.



**Chapter Two: Research  
Methodology, Design, and  
Analysis**

## Introduction

This chapter outlines the research design, methodology, and analytical procedures used to evaluate the quality of student-designed questionnaires. The study adopts a qualitative content analysis approach, supported by armchair research and expert-informed rubric evaluation. This triangulated design aims to provide both empirical rigor and reflective insight into the effectiveness of commonly used data-collection instruments in student research.

### 2.1 Research Design

This research is situated within the interpretivist paradigm, which emphasises understanding the subjective meanings embedded in communication and human interaction. An interpretivist lens is particularly suitable for evaluating questionnaires because it focuses on the clarity, coherence, and intent behind the language used in the tools. According to Krippendorff (2004), “all reading of text is qualitative even when certain characteristics are later converted into numbers”. The overall design employs a qualitative-dominant mixed-method approach that combines:

- **Content analysis** of five student-designed questionnaires, the main objective of content analysis is to identify recurring errors in student-designed questionnaires.
- **Armchair research** used for reflective theorising and critical synthesis
- **Framework development** each of the six steps in the framework corresponds directly to common failure points identified through the systematic evaluation process. which aligns with the interpretivist paradigm through its inductive logic and insights drawn directly from recurring issues in student-created questionnaires. Rather than applying a pre-existing model, the framework is constructed from the bottom up, based on the understanding of how students formulate questions, from word selection to the way they organise ideas. This inductive process reflects the interpretivist aim of developing understanding from within the context.

## 2.2 Sampling and Data Sources

A purposive sampling strategy was employed to select five questionnaires created by final-year students from the Department of English at Amar Telidji University in Laghouat. These questionnaires covered range of educational themes, including literature, AI integration, citizenship education, error correction, and technology use in the classroom. The instruments were chosen based on their availability, diversity of focus, and explicit use of structured questions, allowing for comparative evaluation.

- 1- *Toward a Multi-levelled Approach in Error Analysis in Algerian EFL Writing Productions: The Case of Third Year Secondary School Learners, Djoudi Belkacem Secondary School, Laghouat.*
- 2- *The Use of Visual Aids to Enhance EFL Students' Literature Understanding the Case Study of Second-year Students at The Department of English-University of Laghouat*
- 3- *Enhancing Citizenship Education Through The Use of Secondary School Textbooks of English in The Algerian Context a Case Study: Year Two Textbook*
- 4- *The Use of Artificial Intelligence in EFL Literature Classes: An Investigation into the effectiveness of using Copilot in Literary Analysis The case of Master I Students at The Department of English-University of Laghouat*
- 5- *An Investigation of Aspects Hindering the Implication of Blended Learning in EFL Class - Case study Second Year LMD Students in English Department of Amar Thelidji University of Laghouat*

Each questionnaire was anonymised and independently reviewed using an evaluation rubric. Given that these instruments were produced in the same academic context, they provide a unique opportunity to examine shared strengths and weaknesses across student work.

## 2.3 Evaluation Rubric and Justification

### 2.3.1 Evaluation criteria for questionnaires

#### 1. Clarity

- ✓ Items are phrased in **simple, unambiguous language**.
- ✓ **Technical jargon** is minimised or clearly defined.
- ✓ Instructions are **explicit and easy to follow**.
- ✓ Avoids **double-barrelled questions** (e.g., "*Do you agree with X and Y?*").

#### 2. Relevance

- ✓ Each item directly relates to the **research objectives**.
- ✓ No **redundant** or **irrelevant** questions are included.
- ✓ Questions align with the **theoretical framework** of the study.

#### 3. Bias-Free Wording

- ✓ Wording is **neutral**, avoiding leading questions (e.g., "*Do not you think X is bad?*").
- ✓ Avoids **emotionally charged language** or persuasive phrasing.
- ✓ Provides **balanced response options** (e.g., equal positive and negative options).

#### 4. Appropriate Scaling and Response Format

- ✓ **Likert scales** include clear and consistent anchors (e.g., 1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strongly Agree*).
- ✓ **Open-ended questions** are used when detailed, nuanced responses are required.

- ✓ Avoids **overlapping categories** (e.g., *Age range: 20–30, 30–40*).

### 5. Logical Flow and Order

- ✓ The question sequence progresses from **general to specific**.
- ✓ **Sensitive or personal questions** are later placed in the questionnaire.
- ✓ Items are **grouped by theme** to enhance coherence and focus.

### 6. Reliability and Validity Considerations

- ✓ Questions are **pilot-tested**, if possible, to ensure clarity and relevance.
- ✓ Techniques such as **reverse-coded items** are used to check internal consistency.

**Table 2: Evaluation Rubric**

Criterion	Rating (1-5)	Notes/Observations
Clarity		
Relevance		
Bias-Free Wording		
Scaling & Format		
Logical Flow		
Reliability/Validity		

**Rating:**

**1. Poor:** Significant flaws; failure to meet the criteria.

(Example: Questions are confusing, irrelevant, or heavily biased)

**2. Below Average:** Some attempts to meet the criteria but with notable weaknesses.

(Example: Questions are somewhat unclear or occasionally irrelevant)

**3. Average:** Meets basic standards but lacks refinement.

(Example: Questions are functional but could be clearer or more logically ordered)

**4. Above Average:** Strong compliance to the criteria with minor room for improvement.

(Example: Questions are clear, relevant, and mostly well-structured)

**5. Excellent:** Flawless execution of the criteria.

(Example: Questions are precise, unbiased, logically ordered, and optimally scaled)

### **2.3.2 Justification**

The proposed tool for evaluating student research instruments from Laghouat University archives is justifiable as it is firmly rooted in established principles of research methodology and high-quality survey design. The evaluation criteria employed align directly with the widely recognised standards for constructing valid, reliable, and effective data-collection instruments.

Utilising a predefined set of criteria and a systematic rating scale (1-5) was inspired by the structure of the Likert scale and that to enhance the objectivity and rigour of the evaluation process. This structured approach minimises evaluator bias and ensures consistency across the assessment of different instruments, which is a fundamental aspect of sound qualitative and mixed-method evaluation practices. It moves beyond unstructured, subjective reviews to criterion-based assessment.

For the Criterion-Specific Justification, first, **Clarity**, ensuring items are simple, unambiguous, and free of excessive jargon is very important. Unclear questions lead to

misinterpretation by respondents, introducing significant measurement errors and reducing the validity of the collected data (Salant & Dillman, 1994; Fowler, 2014;). Clear instructions are vital for respondent compliance and data quality (Dillman et al., 2014). Simply does the question use a direct, easily understandable language?

Second, **Relevance**, each item must directly relate to the research objectives and theoretical framework. Irrelevant items waste respondent time and can shift from the focus of the data collection. Simply does the item address a research question or objective?

Third, **Bias-Free Wording**, neutral wording is critical to avoid leading questions or emotionally charged language that can push respondents toward an answer and introduce response bias (Thomander & Krosnick, 2024). Providing balanced response options ensures that the full range of potential opinions or experiences can be captured without implicitly favouring one over another. Simply is the question neutrally phrased without assumptions?

Fourth, **Appropriate Scaling and Response Format**, the choice and correct implementation of response scales (like Likert scales with clear anchors) and question formats (open-ended vs. closed-ended) directly impact the type and quality of data obtained, as well as the analytical possibilities (Thomander & Krosnick, 2024). Overlapping categories or poorly defined scales compromise data accuracy and analysis. Simply are the response options clearly defined and logically scaled?

Fifth, **Logical Flow and Order**, the sequence and grouping of questions influence respondents' fatigue, cooperation, and the context within which questions are answered (Dillman et al., 2014). A logical progression, moving from general to specific and placing sensitive questions later, improves the respondent's experience and data completeness. Simply, is there a coherent sequence from general to specific topics?

Sixth, **Reliability and Validity Considerations**, while full psychometric validation might be beyond the scope of student research, evaluating whether the design of the questionnaire shows consideration for these principles (e.g., through pilot testing,

using established scales where possible, or employing consistency checks) is crucial (Arundel,2023). These are fundamental concepts for assessing the trustworthiness of research findings. Simply put does the instrument appear consistent and conceptually sound?

## 2.4 Data Analysis

### 2.4.1 Analysis of the First Questionnaire:

*“Toward a Multi-levelled Approach in Error Analysis in Algerian EFL Writing Productions: The Case of Third Year Secondary School Learners, Djoudi Belkacem Secondary School, Laghouat”*

**Table 3:** *Analysis of the First Questionnaire*

Criterion	Rating (1-5)	Notes/Observations
Clarity	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Most questions are phrased simply but some lack explicit instructions (Q14: "What measures do you take to reduce errors." is open-ended without guidance on response length or focus). Similar issue:(Q15) “Share the reasons which justify errors committed”</li> <li>▪ Ambiguity in wording (Q6): "Errors are obstacles" could be interpreted subjectively; clarify what "obstacles" refers to.</li> </ul>
Relevance	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Questions align with the stated goal of analysing errors in written production (Q10: "The most recurrent kind of errors is related to").</li> <li>▪ Minor Issue, (Q9: "Students do not like to write paragraphs...") slightly deviates as it focuses on student preference rather than error analysis.</li> </ul>

Bias-Free Wording	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Most questions are neutral but some are leading (Q5): "It is important to know the types of errors in order to evaluate written production properly ")</li> <li>▪ Similarly, Q8 ("EFL teachers help learners to avoid errors") is leading, as it implies a positive teaching role that may encourage respondents to agree. Q9 ("Students do not like to write paragraphs and prefer short answers") also introduces bias by assuming a negative student attitude, which may shape the way participants respond.</li> </ul>
Scaling & Format	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Strengths:</b> Likert scales (Q5–Q9) are clear. Open-ended questions (Q14, Q15) allow nuanced feedback.</li> <li>▪ <b>Weaknesses:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Likert scales lack a neutral option, potentially forcing polarised responses.</li> <li>- Open-ended questions lack structural guidance (e.g., Q14, Q15 could specify "List up to three measures/reasons..."). (See Appendix 1, P.67)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Logical Flow	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Strong logical progression:</b> Starts with demographic questions (Q1-Q3), moves to general evaluation methods (Q4), then specific error analysis (Q5-Q10), and finally teaching strategies (Q11-Q15).</li> <li>▪ <b>Minor issue:</b> (Q9) (student preferences) disrupts thematic consistency in the error analysis section. Sensitive questions (Q15) are placed later. (See Appendix 1 PP.66-67)</li> </ul>
Reliability/ Validity	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Strengths:</b> Some questions (Q10) enhance validity by categorising error types,</li> <li>▪ <b>Weaknesses:</b> (Q6): "Errors are obstacles" multiple interpretations leads to inconsistent responses which reduces reliability.</li> </ul>

		Open-ended questions (Q14) (Q15) may lead to inconsistent responses and interpretation without probing guidance.
--	--	--

**Summary:**

The questionnaire addresses relevant aspects of written error analysis in secondary EFL education, although it is relevant it would benefit from several adjustments. Rewording leading or assumptive questions (like Q5, Q8, Q9) will reduce bias and encourages more authentic responses. Questions (like Q6, Q14, Q15) should be clarified to avoid vagueness, with clear words to improve reliability. Adding neutral options in Likert scales and expanding multiple-choice questions with flexible answer fields (e.g., “Other: \_\_\_\_\_”) will improve the questionnaires’ scalability and depth. These enhancements would likely produce more valid and informative responses, supporting both clarity and analysis later in the research.

**Suggested Improvements:**

**Q5** In your opinion, does identifying the types of errors contribute to the evaluation of written production?

**Q6** (“*Errors are obstacles*”): Clarify what kind of obstacles are meant.

“To what extent do learners' errors impact their writing development?”

- Significantly negative impact.
- Moderately negative impact.
- No significant impact.
- Moderately positive impact.
- Significantly positive impact.

**2.4.2 Analysis of the Second Questionnaire:**

*“The Use of Visual Aids to Enhance EFL Students’ Literature Understanding the Case Study of Second-year Students at The Department of English-University of Laghouat”*

**Table 4:** *Analysis of the Second Questionnaire*

Criterion	Rating (1-5)	Notes/Observations
Clarity	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Questions are simple and straightforward (Q1: "How old are you?"). Instructions are clear in the introduction.</li> <li>▪ Weakness, "visual tools" (Part One, Q6); "visual aids" (Part Two, Q2) could be better defined for students, as the term might be unfamiliar to students as they may interpret it inconsistently (e.g., videos, diagrams, slides).</li> </ul>
Relevance	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All questions align with the goal of understanding the impact of visual aids on literature learning (Part Two, Q1: "Have you watched any of these visual aids..."). No redundant or irrelevant items.</li> </ul>
Bias-Free Wording	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Most questions are neutral (Part One, Q3: "Do you like literature classes?").</li> <li>▪ Issue: (Part Two, Q2: "Why do you think that visual aids are helpful") is loaded and leading which may lead respondents to agree.</li> </ul>
Scaling & Format	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Yes/No questions (Part One, Q3) (Part Two, Q2) are clear but lack nuance.</li> <li>▪ Weakness: open-ended questions (Part Two, Q3: "How much interest do you have.") lack structure for consistent responses. No overlapping categories in demographic questions.</li> </ul>
Logical Flow	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Logical and coherent progression: Starts with demographics (Part One, Q1-Q2), moves to general literature perceptions (Part One, Q3-Q5), then specific visual aid experiences (Part Two). No misplaced sensitive questions.</li> </ul>

Reliability/Validity <sup>3</sup>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Yes/No questions are reliable but lack depth.</li> <li>▪ Open-ended questions (Part Two, Q3) may lead to inconsistent responses without probing or structured response options. Part Two, Q1 asks whether any visual aids are used, and Q2 follows by asking whether the participant understood the content as a result (with a simple yes/no response). However, this design poses a validity issue: if a participant is exposed to multiple visual aids but only finds one of them helpful for understanding, the limited response option in Q2 does not allow for this nuance, potentially compromising the accuracy of the data collected.</li> </ul>
-----------------------------------	--	--

**Summary:**

The second questionnaire demonstrates a generally effective structure, with clear and straightforward questions and an introductory section that suits the context well. Clarity is mostly maintained throughout; however, terms like “visual aids” could benefit from clearer definitions to avoid inconsistent interpretation among students. The relevance of the questions is strong, as all items are closely aligned with the research objective of examining how visual tools influence literature understanding. Most of the wording is neutral and avoids bias, though one or two items like asking why visual aids are helpful may lead respondents toward positive responses. The questionnaire format includes a mix of Yes/No, multiple-choice, and open-ended questions, but there are some issues with structure and depth. In particular, open-ended questions lack clear guidance, which may lead to inconsistent and vague responses. That said, the demographic section is well-designed, with non-overlapping categories that enhance clarity and ease of response. The logical flow of the questionnaire is also commendable, progressing coherently from demographics to general perceptions of literature, and finally to experiences with visual aids. However, overall reliability and validity could be improved by refining question phrasing, expanding response options, and offering

more structured instructions for open-ended items. These adjustments would enhance both the consistency and interpretability of the data collected.

**Suggested Improvements:**

**Q6: “Do you use any visual tools...? Why?”**

a. Do you use any visual tools to support your studies?

Yes  No

b. *If yes, which tools and why?* \_\_\_\_\_

**Part Two, Q2:” Why do you think that visual aids are helpful”**

Few ways to make it more neutral by focusing on "impact," "effect," or "role" rather than specifically "helpfulness"

- "To what extent do visual aids **impact** your learning of literature?"
- "What **effect** do visual aids have on your learning of literature?"
- "What **role** do visual aids play in your learning of literature?"

**2.4.3 Analysis of the Third Questionnaire**

*“Enhancing Citizenship Education Through the Use of Secondary School Textbooks of English in the Algerian Context a Case Study: Year Two Textbook “*

**Table 5: Analysis of the Third Questionnaire**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Rating (1-5)</b>	<b>Notes/Observations</b>
Clarity	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Several clarity issues: terms like "citizenship education," "civic values," "well" (Section A, Q3), and "engaging" (Section B, Q3) are undefined, leading to potential misinterpretation.</li> <li>▪ Open-ended questions (Section D Q1: "What are the main opportunities....") lack specific instructions on response length or focus, which can lead to inconsistent answers.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The double-barrelled question in Section A, Q3 ("defines and explains") and Section B, Q2 ("communication, collaboration, and decision-making") significantly reduces clarity.</li> </ul>
Relevance	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Most questions remain relevant</li> <li>▪ Minor Issue: "How many times have you taught Second year?" (Section A) is tangential i.e less directly tied to the study's focus on teaching experience's impact on citizenship education</li> </ul>
Bias-Free Wording	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Most questions shun overtly biased language</li> <li>▪ Issues: Intensifiers like "effectively" (Section B, Q1), "well" (Section A, Q3), "essential" (Section B, Q2), and "engaging" assume certain outcomes are true, which can influence responses. While the double-barrelled structure of Questions 3 and 2 doesn't directly create bias, it can still indirectly make respondents combine their opinions on two different ideas into one response.</li> <li>▪ (Section B, Q3) introduce assumptions (assuming encouragement occurs, or certain skills are essential), subtly leading respondents.</li> </ul>
Scaling & Format	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Overlapping categories in demographics ("20_30 years" and "30_40 years") and lack of neutral options in scales (e.g., Section A, Q4) which may force polarised responses.</li> </ul>
Logical Flow	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Logical Progresses: demographics (Section A), content analysis (Section A), effectiveness in fostering civic values (Section B), and opportunities/challenges (Section D). Sensitive questions (e.g., challenges in Section D) are placed last.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Note: There’s no Section C in the questionnaire, which might be a typo which can create confusion and disrupt coherence.</li> </ul>
Reliability/Validity	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Double-barrelled questions (Section A, Q3; Section B, Q3) reduce reliability, as responses may not reflect true opinions on each component. (See Appendix 3 PP,71-72)</li> <li>▪ Overlapping categories, subjective intensifiers further reduce validity.</li> </ul>

**Summary:**

The third questionnaire tackles an important educational theme citizenship education through textbook content but faces several design issues that undermine its overall clarity and reliability. While the questions are mostly relevant and the logical flow from demographics to textbook content and finally to challenges is strong, clarity is compromised by vague terminology (e.g., “citizenship education,” “civic values,” “well,” “engaging”) that is not clearly defined. These ambiguities, combined with open-ended questions that lack response guidance, may confuse participants and result in inconsistent answers. The presence of double-barrelled questions particularly those combining evaluation and explanation in a single question further weakens validity, as they require respondents to address multiple aspects at once. In terms of scaling and format, the demographic section contains overlapping age categories (e.g., “20–30 years” and “30–40 years”), which can force participants into inaccurate selections. Moreover, Likert-type scales in several questions lack neutral or clearly distinct options, which may lead to polarised or forced responses. While bias in wording is generally avoided, some questions introduce assumptions (e.g., that certain civic skills are “essential” or that engagement occurs), which may influence how respondents answer. Finally, the absence of a Section “C” possibly a typographical error disrupts the document’s structural coherence. Addressing these weaknesses by refining terminology, separating compound questions, providing clearer response instructions, and revising category formats would significantly improve the clarity, reliability, and overall utility of the instrument.



**Table 6: Analysis of the Fourth Questionnaire**

Criterion	Rating (1-5)	Notes/Observations
Clarity	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Several clarity issues arise. "AI tools" and "Copilot" are undefined, potentially confusing students unfamiliar with these terms (Section 1, Q2: "Experience with AI Tools").</li> <li>▪ Section 1, Q1 ("Level") is vague. Does it mean academic level (Master, PhD) or proficiency?</li> <li>▪ Section 6, Q1 ("To what extent do you believe Copilot can help understand literary themes?") lacks intermediate scale options between "Not at all helpful" and "Extremely helpful," making it unclear how to rate moderate opinions.</li> <li>▪ Open-ended questions (Section 5, Q4: "Briefly describe your experience level using Copilot") contradict the multiple-choice options provided, creating confusion.</li> </ul>
Relevance	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Most questions align with the goal of assessing Copilot's effectiveness in literary analysis (Section 6, Q2: "How effective do you think Copilot identifies literary devices?")</li> <li>▪ Weakness: Section 5, Q1 ("Have you previously heard of Copilot?") and Q2 ("Have you ever used Copilot for any purpose?") are less directly tied to literary analysis, as they focus on general awareness and usage, slightly shifting the focus.</li> </ul>
Bias-Free Wording	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Subjective intensifiers like "effective" (Section 4, Q1: "Do you find AI effective in making literary analysis more efficient?"), "more efficient" (same question), "deeper" (Section 4, Q3), "well" (Section 6, Q3), and "helpful" (Section 6, Q1) are undefined and assume positive outcomes,</li> </ul>

		<p>potentially leading respondents (Section 4, Q1 assumes AI makes analysis more efficient)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 4, Q4 ("Has the integration of AI tools in your literature classes improved the quality of literary analysis?") assumes AI is integrated, which may not apply to all respondents, introducing bias.</li> </ul>
Scaling & Format	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Significant flaws exist. Section 6 (Q1 to Q4) use scales with unclear increments (Q1: "Not at all helpful" to "Extremely helpful" with no intermediate options like "Somewhat helpful"), making it hard to capture nuanced responses and forcing extreme choices.</li> <li>▪ Section 1, Q2 ("Experience with AI Tools: None, Minimal, Moderate, Extensive") lacks definitions for terms like "Minimal" vs. "Moderate," risking inconsistent interpretation. Section 5, Q4 provides multiple-choice options ("Beginner, Intermediate, Advanced") but is phrased as an open-ended question ("Briefly describe").</li> <li>▪ No overlapping categories in demographics, but the lack of a "Not applicable" option in questions like Section 4, Q4 (for students who haven't used AI in classes) is a flaw.</li> <li>▪ Open-ended questions (Section 3, Q5) are unstructured.</li> </ul>
Logical Flow	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Logical Progresses: demographics (Section 1), general attitudes toward AI (Section 2), specific AI impact on literary analysis (Section 3), AI as a computational tool (Section 4), experience with Copilot (Section 5), and its contribution to literary understanding (Section 6). No misplaced sensitive questions.</li> </ul>

Reliability/Validity 2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Subjective intensifiers ("effective," "helpful") and undefined terms ("AI tools," "Minimal experience") lead to inconsistent interpretations, reducing reliability. The unclear scales in Section 6 (Q1: "Not at all helpful" to "Extremely helpful") force extreme responses, skewing data. The mismatch in Section 5, Q4 (open-ended vs. multiple-choice) may confuse respondents. Section 3, Q1 ("Have you used AI tools for literary analysis before?") and Q2 ("How often do you use AI tools for literary analysis?") are redundant as Q2 assumes a "Yes" to Q1, potentially frustrating respondents who answer "No" to Q1.</li> </ul> <p>(See Appendix 4 P,74-79)</p>
------------------------	--	---

**Summary:**

The fourth questionnaire presents a well-structured layout with a clear logical flow across sections, progressing from demographic information to attitudes toward AI, its impact on literary analysis, and specific experiences with Copilot. However, several clarity issues hinder its effectiveness. Key terms like “AI tools,” “Copilot,” and subjective descriptors such as “effective,” “helpful,” and “minimal experience” are left undefined, potentially confusing respondents and leading to inconsistent interpretations. Questions in Section 6 particularly suffer from limited scale options often only presenting extreme ends like “Not at all helpful” and “Extremely helpful” which fails to capture moderate opinions and risks skewing results. Additionally, the inconsistent phrasing between open-ended and closed-ended questions (e.g., Section 5, Q4) reduces both clarity and validity. While most questions align with the intended focus on AI’s role in literary analysis, some, particularly in Section 5, shift the emphasis to general awareness or experience with Copilot, slightly diluting the study’s core aim. Bias is also introduced through assumptions that AI tools are already integrated into classes or inherently improve outcomes. Overall, the questionnaire is conceptually relevant and logically organised, but its reliability and validity are weakened by vague language, ambiguous scaling and insufficient response options for non-users.

**Suggested Improvements:**

**Q2: How would you describe your experience using AI tools?**

- None** “I have never used any AI tools.”
- Minimal** “I have used AI tools less than 5 times for very basic or experimental tasks.”
- Moderate** “I use AI tools occasionally (e.g., a few times a month) for routine tasks.”
- Extensive** “I use AI tools frequently (e.g., weekly or daily) for a range of tasks, including more complex ones.”

**Section 3 (Q1 and Q2):**

Since “Q2” assumes “Yes” to “Q1” it is much better to merge them into one question

- 1) Have you used AI tools for literary analysis before?
  - Yes
  - No

*If yes, how often do you use AI tools?*

**Section 5 Q4:**

***Briefly describe your experience level using Copilot***

- a) ***Beginner***
- b) ***Intermediate***
- c) ***Advanced***



Original

***Suggested >>>*** - Please select the option that best describes your current experience level using Copilot.

- a) **Beginner:** Use rarely (1-2 times in total).
- b) **Intermediate:** Use regularly (1-3 times per month).
- c) **Advanced:** Use frequently (2 or more times per week).
- d) **Other:** “....” times per  Day  Week  Month  Total

**2.4.5 Analysis of the Fifth Questionnaire**

*“An Investigation of Aspects Hindering the Implication of Blended Learning in EFL Class - Case study Second Year LMD Students in English Department of Amar Thelidji University of Laghouat”*

**Table 7: Analysis of the Fifth Questionnaire**

Criterion	Rating (1-5)	Notes/Observations
Clarity	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Language Attitude Part 1</u>: "Lessons on computer" (Q1) remains vague (online lessons, software, pdfs, videos, or something else?). "Classic techniques in teaching EFL" (Q12, Q13) is undefined, risking misinterpretation. Q11 ("I enjoy reading in English on the internet") is redundant with Q10 ("I enjoy reading on the internet"), as the context implies English.</li> <li>▪ <u>Blended Learning Part 2</u>: "Lessons on the computer" (Q1) is vague. Q2 ("I have used virtual communities before and I have enjoyed it") combines usage and enjoyment, making the scale's focus unclear. Q3 ("Working and collaborating with others is interesting") lacks context (online or in-person?). "Virtual communities" and "beneficial" (Q4) are undefined.</li> <li>▪ Redundancy between parts (Q1 in both parts is identical) and lack of clarity in key terms reduce overall clarity.</li> </ul>
Relevance	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Strengths</u>: The questionnaire is mostly relevant, but the Language Attitude part includes some less focused questions, slightly weakening the goal.</li> <li>▪ <u>Demographic Section</u>: Age and gender are relevant for contextualising responses, though limited in scope (no academic level).</li> <li>▪ <u>Language Attitude Part</u>: Most questions align with assessing language attitudes (Q6: "I enjoy speaking English in the class"), but Q5 ("I enjoyed the other English classes that I have taken") is less tied to current attitudes, and Q14 ("I</li> </ul>

		<p>enjoy learning through music and movies") is broad and not EFL-specific.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Blended Learning Part</u>: All questions are relevant to blended learning (Q4: "It would be beneficial to talk with other language learners and native speakers of English").</li> </ul>
Bias-Free Wording	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Language Attitude Part</u>: Subjective intensifiers like "important" (Q4: "I believe it is very important to me to learn using a computer"), "efficient" (Q12: "The classic techniques in teaching EFL are efficient"), and "boring" (Q13: "The classic techniques in teaching EFL are boring") assume positive or negative framing, potentially leading respondents ("boring" lacks a counterpart like "engaging"). Repeated "enjoy" (Q1, Q5-Q11, Q14) skews responses toward affective reactions.</li> <li>▪ <u>Blended Learning Part</u>: "Beneficial" (Q4) and "interesting" (Q3) are subjective and undefined, assuming positive outcomes. Q2 assumes a link between usage and enjoyment, biasing responses. Q5 ("I prefer using a textbook than talking in the class") and Q6 ("I prefer using a textbook and working alone than collaborating with others") frame textbooks as the default, potentially biasing against interactive methods.</li> </ul>
Scaling & Format	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Strengths</u>: in both parts the Likert scale (Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree) is consistent, functional and includes a neutral option ("Undecided"), which is good.</li> <li>▪ <u>Weaknesses</u>: Sometimes a different scale type is more appropriate (like frequency or extent). The lack of open-ended questions limits depth, and affective phrasing ("enjoy," "prefer") may not capture cognitive attitudes.</li> </ul>

Logical Flow	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Demographic Section</u>: Placing demographics at the start is standard and appropriate, though limited in scope.</li> <li>▪ <u>Language Attitude Part</u>: The flow is disjointed as it lacks clear grouping computer use (Q1-Q4), general English enjoyment (Q5-Q9), online activities (Q10-Q11), traditional methods (Q12-Q13), multimedia (Q14) lacking clear grouping. Q5 seems out of place.</li> <li>▪ <u>Blended Learning Part</u>: The flow is better computer use (Q1), virtual communities (Q2), collaboration (Q3-Q4), preferences (Q5-Q7) but Q2's focus on past usage is slightly misaligned.</li> <li>▪ Overall, the demographic section provides a starting point, but the repeated Q1 across parts disrupts flow. The two parts lack a cohesive introduction linking them, and transitions between topics are abrupt. Sensitive questions (Language Attitude Q13 on "boring" techniques) are not misplaced.</li> </ul>
Reliability/Validity	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Language Attitude Part</u>: Undefined terms ("classic techniques"), redundant questions (Q10, Q11), and subjective intensifiers ("important," "boring") reduce reliability. The focus on "enjoy" may skew responses toward emotional reactions.</li> <li>▪ <u>Blended Learning Part</u>: Double-barrelled questions (Q2, Q6) obscure true responses. Undefined terms ("virtual communities") and subjective phrasing ("beneficial") add inconsistency. (See Appendix 5 P,80)</li> <li>▪ Respondents agreeing to all "enjoy" statements is heavily biased. The repeated Q1 undermine validity.</li> </ul>

**Summary:**

The questionnaire assessing language attitudes and blended learning demonstrates a moderate level of design quality but the questionnaire is hindered by

several clarity and validity issues. Terms such as “lessons on the computer,” “classic techniques,” and “virtual communities” are left undefined, creating ambiguity for respondents and reducing clarity across both parts. Redundancies, such as the repeated Q1 in both sections and overlapping content in Q10 and Q11, further weaken the structure. While the majority of the questions remain relevant particularly in the Blended Learning section some items in the Language Attitude part deviate slightly. Bias is clearly seen through the use of subjective intensifiers and leading emotional language (e.g., “enjoy,”), which may influence participants’ responses and skew data towards affective rather than cognitive engagement. The Likert scale is generally well-applied, including a neutral midpoint. The questionnaire has a standard demographic section and shows partial logical grouping, but with no open-ended questions which may limit depth. Overall, while the instrument is relevant and shows some structural strengths, its effectiveness is reduced by vague wording and emotional bias that negatively impact both reliability and validity.

### **Suggested Improvements:**

**Part 1, Q1:** instead of “~~*I enjoy lessons on computer*~~” I suggest “*I use online videos for English learning*” (*Frequency scale*)

Q6: instead of “~~*I enjoy speaking English in the class.*~~” I suggest “*I feel comfortable speaking English in class*”

Q7: instead of “~~*I enjoy practicing my English online with people from all over the world.*~~” I suggest “*I find practicing English online with others valuable*”

Q8: instead of “~~*I enjoy writing in English.*~~” I suggest “*I am confident in my ability to write in English.*”

## **2.5 Conclusion**

Data were collected by retrieving the most possible recent student questionnaires (One from 2017; One from 2017; Two from 2024; One from 2025) Five as total. Each item within each questionnaire was independently evaluated using the six rubric

dimensions. Observations were noted regarding language clarity, semantic assumptions, structure, redundancy, and use of scaling.

Patterns were identified using thematic analysis. For example, vague wording such as "effectively" appeared frequently and was categorised under both clarity and bias-free wording problems. Similarly, questions lacking neutral scale options were flagged as scaling and format issues. The analysis not only produced a score for each criterion but also revealed recurrent pitfalls across multiple questionnaires.

This structured coding process was followed by theoretical reflection. Armchair research allowed for deeper insights into why students might default to vague or biased wording such as pressure to sound formal or a lack of exposure to counter examples. These reflections informed the development of the practical framework presented later on.

## 2.6 Ethical Considerations

Although the study did not involve human participants, i.e. existing students work not live participants, ethical clearance was sought from the relevant departmental committee, i.e. institutional approval, to analyse previously submitted student work.

## 2.7 Limitations of the Methodology

- **Sample Size:** The study focused on five questionnaires, which may limit the scope of generalisability.
- **Subjectivity:** While the rubric helped standardise evaluation, the use of armchair research introduced reflective bias.
- **Lack of Pilot Testing:** The proposed framework has not been pilot-tested among students, representing an area for future research.

Despite these limitations, the chosen methodology provided rich, in-depth insights into questionnaire quality and common design flaws in student research.



**Chapter Three: Results,  
Discussion and Framework  
Design**

## **Introduction**

This chapter presents the findings of the rubric-based evaluation of five student-designed questionnaires. The evaluation process followed a structured analytical framework grounded in six core criteria: **Clarity, Relevance, Bias-Free Wording, Scaling and Format, Logical Flow, and Reliability/Validity**. These criteria were chosen to reflect best practices in questionnaire design and to provide a balanced assessment of both surface-level and structural features.

The results are presented thematically, with each criterion examined across all five instruments to uncover shared strengths, recurring challenges, and notable patterns. This comparative approach not only facilitates a deeper understanding of the overall quality of the questionnaires but also allows for a critical exploration of how student researchers approach instrument design. Particular attention is given to elements that compromise data quality such as vague terminology, emotional bias, or inconsistent scaling as well as to those that enhance usability and coherence.

By analysing the questionnaires through this lens, the chapter aims to identify both common pitfalls and examples of effective practice. These insights, in turn, inform the development of a more targeted and supportive framework for guiding novice researchers in designing more valid, reliable, and user-friendly data collection tools.

## **3.1 Results**

### **3.1.1 Clarity**

Clarity was a recurrent issue across nearly all the evaluated questionnaires. Ambiguous wording, undefined terms, and overly broad or vague phrasing significantly compromised comprehension. For example, phrases such as "errors are obstacles" and "critical thinking is encouraged" lacked context or operational definitions. Respondents could interpret such statements differently based on individual perspectives, which introduces inconsistency in responses.

In Questionnaire 3, terms like "citizenship education" and "civic values" appeared without clarification. Such abstract concepts require definition to ensure uniform interpretation. This lack of clarity undermines both the quality of data collected and its subsequent reliability.

### 3.1.1.1 Clarity Scores Across Questionnaires

**Table 8:** *Clarity Scores*

<i>Questionnaire</i>	<i>Clarity Score (1–5)</i>	<i>Notes</i>
<i>Q1</i>	2	Vague prompts, undefined terms
<i>Q2</i>	4	Mostly clear, some minor ambiguities
<i>Q3</i>	2	Multiple abstract concepts left undefined
<i>Q4</i>	3	Generally clear but occasionally imprecise
<i>Q5</i>	3	Some technical jargon not explained

### 3.1.2 Relevance

Most questionnaires scored higher in relevance, with questions generally aligned to the stated research themes. Questionnaire 2, for instance, closely related each item to its research objectives regarding the use of visual aids in teaching literature. However, Questionnaire 1 included items about students' general writing preferences, which diverged from its primary focus on error correction strategies.

Despite this, the overall trend showed intentional effort by student researchers to maintain thematic consistency which is an encouraging sign in early-stage research design.

### 3.1.3 Bias-Free Wording

Bias-Free Wording emerged as a critical concern. Leading or assumptive language was common. For instance, Questionnaire 1 used the item: "EFL teachers help learners avoid errors," which presumes agreement with the statement and frames the teacher's role in a particular light.

The term “effectively” also recurred as a problematic intensifier. In Questionnaire 3, students were asked to rate how "effectively" a textbook encouraged critical thinking. The word implies success and can bias responses unless it is clearly defined or supported by criteria.

Such phrasing introduces bias and reduces the neutrality of the data collection instrument. It suggests expected responses, potentially skewing results and undermining the credibility of findings.

### **3.1.4 Scaling and Format**

Several questionnaires demonstrated inconsistent or inadequate scaling. Questionnaire 4 lacked intermediate options on Likert scales (e.g., jumping from "not helpful at all" to "extremely helpful"), forcing respondents into binary decisions and eliminating nuance.

Questionnaire 3 displayed overlapping demographic categories, such as "20–30" and "30–40," which could confuse respondents and lead to unreliable demographic data. Inconsistencies in formatting such as irregular spacing and abrupt shifts in scale types are also observed, which may affect user engagement and accuracy of response.

### **3.1.5 Logical Flow**

Logical sequencing was relatively well-executed across most instruments. The majority began with demographic information, followed by general questions and then specific items. This progression aligns with best practices for improving respondent comfort and engagement. However, Questionnaire 5 contained redundant items spread across multiple sections (e.g., multiple variants of computer usage frequency), which disrupted flow and increased the risk of disengagement or skipped questions.

### **3.1.6 Reliability and Validity**

Reliability and validity are generally the weakest dimensions. Most tools failed to include pilot testing data, item consistency measures, or references to established

constructs. Double-barrelled questions. (e.g., “I have used virtual communities before and enjoyed it”) are found, especially in Questionnaire 5.

The lack of operational definitions and poor scale design further compromised the internal consistency of these instruments. Without clear constructs and standardised measurement procedures, validity remains questionable.

### 3.1.7 Summary of Results

Summaries of the average scores per criterion across all five questionnaires:

**Table 9:** *Average Criterion Scores*

Criterion	Average Score (1–5)
Clarity	2.8
Relevance	3.6
Bias-Free Wording	2.4
Scaling & Format	2.6
Logical Flow	3.4
Reliability/Validity	2.2

These findings indicate consistent strengths in topic alignment and flow, but recurring weaknesses in clarity, neutrality, and structural reliability.

The next section explores these issues in greater depth through reflective discussion and theoretical interpretation.

## 3.2 Discussion and Implications

This section critically interprets the findings presented earlier by contextualising them within theoretical frameworks and methodological standards. Using armchair research, we explore why certain questionnaire design flaws persist among novice researchers and how these affect the overall quality and reliability of the collected data. Particular emphasis is placed on clarity, bias-free wording, and scaling dimensions that consistently scored lowest in the evaluated instruments.

### **3.2.1 Clarity: The Root of Misinterpretation**

Clarity issues often stem from students' limited exposure to controlled vocabulary and operationalised research language. Terms like "errors are obstacles" or "encourages critical thinking" lack specificity. Without defined metrics or examples, such phrases are open to wide interpretation. For instance, one respondent might interpret "encourages critical thinking" as assigning tasks that require students to analyse and interpret texts in writing, while another might associate it with classroom discussions or debates. This variability in interpretation significantly reduces data consistency, thereby lowering reliability.

Ambiguous or undefined terms hinder participants from fully understanding what is being asked, which leads to random or forced responses. This violates the principle of semantic clarity advocated by Dillman et al. (2014). Improving clarity requires researchers to operationalise abstract constructs and use pre-tested language.

### **3.2.2 Bias-Free Wording: Assumptions and Leading Phrases**

The use of biased or assumptive phrasing is among the most common and detrimental flaws in the analysed questionnaires. When a question includes phrases like "How effectively does the textbook...", it presupposes that the textbook does encourage critical thinking, which introduces a confirmatory bias. Respondents may feel compelled to rate based on the premise rather than critically assess the underlying assumption. Bias in question design not only skews data but also undermines the validity of the entire instrument. According to Krosnick (1999), biased wording leads respondents toward socially desirable or researcher-expected answers. Eliminating such language involves rephrasing to neutral structures for example, changing "How effectively does..." to "To what extent, if at all, does..."

Another example is the following leading question "The classic techniques in teaching EFL are efficient", the word "efficient" carries a positive connotation and presents a judgment about the classic techniques. This can subtly lead respondents to agree with the statement, even if their true opinion is more nuanced or negative. It

assumes that "classic techniques" are efficient, prompting the respondent to confirm this assumption rather than offering a neutral evaluation. A neutral question would not embed a positive (or negative) evaluation within the statement being assessed. To make the question more neutral and less leading, you should remove the embedded judgment of "efficient" and ask the respondent to evaluate the techniques themselves. Here are a few options:

- ✓ (Focus on effectiveness) "Please rate the **effectiveness** of classic techniques in teaching EFL."
  - This replaces "efficient" with "effectiveness," which is a more neutral term for evaluating teaching methods.
- ✓ (Focus on your experience/perception) "Based on your experience, how would you rate the **effectiveness** of classic techniques in teaching EFL?"
  - Adding "Based on your experience" makes the question about the respondent's personal view, further reducing the pressure to agree with a general statement.
- ✓ (More open to different aspects) "To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Classic techniques in teaching EFL are **effective**."
  - This is similar to option 1 but keeps a similar structure to the original question while using a more neutral term.
- ✓ (Asking for a direct evaluation) "How would you describe the **efficiency** of classic techniques in teaching EFL?" (While still using "efficiency," the phrasing is less leading than the original).

Furthermore, the implicit assumption embedded in positively framed statements can alienate respondents who hold contrary views. A more inclusive phrasing invites authentic and diverse responses, enhancing both representativeness and trustworthiness.

### 3.2.3 Scaling and Format: Consistency and Usability

Problems related to scaling and formatting are noted in almost every questionnaire. These included inconsistent Likert scales, absence of neutral response options, and overlapping demographic categories. Poor scaling affects the accuracy of the responses. If participants are forced into extreme options due to missing midpoints, the data collected is skewed by design rather than opinion.

Overlapping categories, such as age groups "20–30" and "30–40," result in classification errors. A participant aged 30 does not know which category to choose. Such design flaws not only confuse respondents but also lead to unreliable demographic data, affecting the study's ability to draw subgroup comparisons.

Scaling issues often arise from students copying templates without adapting them to the specific context or content of their research. Instead, scales should be constructed after clearly defining constructs and determining what level of nuance is required.

### 3.2.4 Reliability and Validity: Foundations at Risk

The low scores in the Reliability/Validity category are not surprising given the clarity and scaling issues previously discussed. **Reliability** refers to the consistency of a measurement instrument. When respondents misinterpret questions, their answers won't be consistent. Cronbach's (1951) work on coefficient alpha emphasises that reliability is contingent upon the homogeneity of items meaning that all items should measure the same underlying construct. If questions are misunderstood, the responses may not reflect the intended construct, thereby reducing the internal consistency and reliability. **Validity** concerns whether an instrument measures what it supposed to measure. When questions address irrelevant aspects or when constructs are not clearly defined, construct validity is threatened. Cronbach and Meehl (1955) introduced the concept of construct validity, emphasising the importance of clearly described constructs and the use of multiple methods to assess them. They argued that without a clear definition of the construct, it is impossible to develop valid measures.

### **3.2.5 Implications for Student Research**

The findings from this study highlight a recurring issue in student-led research while many novice researchers are introduced to the theoretical principles of questionnaire design, they often receive limited guidance on how to apply these principles in practice. Understanding what makes a good question in abstract terms is not the same as being able to create one under real research conditions. Without opportunities to critically evaluate and revise their own tools, students are likely to repeat the same design errors that compromise data quality. This gap is not just a matter of insufficient hands-on training as it may stem from overloaded curricula that prioritise theoretical breadth over practical depth. One way to address this is by adopting more hands-on design activities into research training. For example, including rubric-based assessments and peer critique of sample questionnaires into methodology courses that could give students the chance to reflect on their choices and learn from the mistakes of others. This kind of applied learning can make theoretical concepts feel more concrete and directly relevant to the research process.

The continued appearance of ambiguous questions, unbalanced response options, and inconsistent scaling across the analysed questionnaires also points to the need for clearer, more structured design frameworks. These would not only support students in identifying potential flaws but also provide a step-by-step process for improving their tools before reaching the data collection stage. In turn, this would lead to more precise measurement, greater consistency in interpretation, and ultimately more trustworthy research outcomes. By equipping students with the ability to self-evaluate their instruments using accessible, evidence-informed tools, institutions can foster more rigorous and reflective research practices. In doing so, they not only enhance the quality of individual projects but also contribute to broader goals of research integrity, transparency, and reproducibility within academic settings.

### 3.3 Proposed Framework for Questionnaire Design

Based on the empirical findings and reflective discussions in the previous sections, this section proposes a practical and accessible framework aimed at improving questionnaire design, especially for novice researchers. The framework synthesises theoretical insights, observed design errors, and best practices into a structured checklist to guide students in constructing clear, reliable, and valid data collection tool.

#### 3.3.1 Framework Principles and Goals

The framework is built upon the following foundational goals:

- **Clarity:** Eliminate ambiguity and promote consistent interpretation of questions.
- **Relevance:** Ensure every item aligns with specific research objectives.
- **Neutrality:** Maintain unbiased, assumption-free language throughout.
- **Scalability:** Provide meaningful, balanced response options.
- **Structure:** Organise questions logically to facilitate natural response flow.
- **Validity:** Reinforce conceptual integrity through operational definitions and piloting.

#### 3.3.2 The Six-Step Questionnaire Design Framework

##### Step 1: Define Constructs and Objectives Clearly

- Identify the precise variables or constructs you aim to measure.
- Map each research question to specific items in the questionnaire
- Use operational definitions to describe abstract concepts.

e.g. abstract concepts: ⊗ Student Motivation. ∴ Anxiety. ⊗ Language Proficiency

⊗ Operational Definition: “The level of *motivation* will be measured by how often students voluntarily participate in class activities and complete assignments on time.”

∴ Operational Definition: Anxiety is operationally defined by counting how many times a student hesitates, pauses excessively, or avoids eye contact during a five-minute oral presentation.

∅ Operational Definition: Language Proficiency (evaluating writing, speaking, reading and listening separately or combined such as in “IELTS”)

Writing proficiency is measured by evaluating a student’s essay according to a standard rubric assessing grammar accuracy, coherence, vocabulary use, and overall organisation.

### **Step 2: Draft Questions with Clarity and Simplicity**

- Avoid jargon or overly academic language.
- Break down complex or multi-part questions.
- Use specific terms instead of vague descriptors (e.g., replace “often” with “3 times per week”).

### **Step 3: Ensure Relevance and Focus**

- Remove redundant or off-topic items.
  - a) Avoid asking questions that cover information already known or publicly available. For example, asking “How many times do you study literature in the week?” is unnecessary if this is clearly stated in the timetable.
  - b) Similarly, questions such as “Do you attend English classes at school?” or “Is there a library in your university?” are not relevant if such details are part of institutional records or common knowledge.
  - c) Redundant items such as repeating the same concept in different wording (e.g. "Do you like reading novels?" and "Are novels enjoyable to read?") should also be removed.
- Use expert feedback to assess the necessity of each question.
- Include a short rationale for each item during design to clarify its purpose.

#### **Step 4: Use Bias-Free Wording**

- Avoid presuppositions and emotional framing.
- Biased (Emotionally Framed) Question: *"Do you support the implementation of harsh punishments for students who cheat in exams?"* This question uses emotionally charged language ("harsh punishments") which could influence respondents towards disagreement due to negative connotations.
- Bias-Free (Neutral) Question: *"Do you support implementing stricter policies for students who cheat in exams?"* This rephrased question remains neutral, avoiding emotional framing while maintaining the original intent.
- Use neutral structures (e.g., "To what extent do you agree..." rather than "How effectively...").
- Provide options for all perspectives, including "Not applicable" or "Neutral."

#### **Step 5: Construct Effective Scaling and Format**

- Use balanced Likert scales (e.g., 5- or 7-point with a neutral midpoint).
- Avoid overlapping demographic categories.
- Keep formatting consistent and enough white space (font, spacing, numbering).

#### **Step 6: Test for Reliability and Validity**

- Pilot the questionnaire with a small, representative sample.
- Revise based on feedback regarding unclear or misleading items.
- Cross-check for internal consistency and coverage of key constructs.

Internal consistency: refers to how well the questions that are supposed to measure the same concept actually work together. If you have several questions designed to measure "student motivation," they should all reflect that concept consistently

Coverage of Key Constructs: This means checking that your questionnaire fully covers all the important dimensions of what you're trying to measure not just one part of it.

The proposed framework offers a practical pathway for student researchers to design more effective, rigorous data collection instruments. By transforming theoretical guidelines into actionable steps, this model supports better alignment between research goals and instrument quality, ultimately improving the credibility of academic findings.

## **3.4 Conclusion and Recommendations**

### **3.4.1 Conclusion**

This study has explored the design and evaluation of data collection tools, particularly student-generated questionnaires, with the aim of identifying recurring issues and proposing a practical framework for 9\*improvement. Through a structured rubric-based evaluation of five authentic instruments, key weaknesses were identified in the areas of clarity, bias-free wording, and reliability/validity. These flaws were not isolated incidents but indicative of systemic issues in how research methods are taught and applied in student research contexts.

The research affirmed that while theoretical foundations for questionnaire design are well established, their practical application remains inconsistent. By integrating content analysis with armchair research, this study uncovered a critical gap between what students are taught and what they implement. The most common issues were the results of vague wording, assumptive language, flawed scaling, and untested constructs.

In response, the study proposed a six-step framework for questionnaire design, grounded in both literature and empirical evaluation. This framework serves not only as a tool for current research but also as a pedagogical resource to help students internalise the principles of effective instrument construction.

Improving the quality of data collection tools is not merely a methodological concern it is foundational to the credibility of research itself. By focusing on practical,

example-based guidance and engaging students in reflective critique, this study endeavours to contribute to a culture of methodological rigor and continuous improvement in research training and execution.

### 3.4.2 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, several key recommendations can be made:

1. **Integrate Rubric-Based Training in Research Methods Courses:** Educators should introduce students to rubric-based evaluation early in their academic training, using real-world examples of good and poor design.
2. **Develop and Disseminate Practical Frameworks:** Universities should create accessible, discipline-specific frameworks to guide novice researchers in questionnaire design.
3. **Mandate Pilot Testing of Research Instruments:** All student research projects involving original instruments should include a pilot phase to identify clarity and reliability issues.
4. **Enhance Peer Review and Supervision Practices:** Supervisors should systematically review student questionnaires using structured checklists and provide feedback focused on instrument integrity.
5. **Promote Reflective Design Practices:** Students should be encouraged to reflect on the language, assumptions, and logic of their instruments before finalisation. Armchair research practices can be formally integrated into research design courses.



**General Conclusion**

## **General Conclusion:**

This dissertation began with a fundamental question “How effectively do student-designed questionnaires actually serve their intended research purposes?” Through careful dissection and analysis of five questionnaires created by Master’s students at Amar Telidji University, by using six evaluation criteria, several patterns have uncovered which reveal both the potential and the persistent problems in how novice researchers approach data collection tool design.

This analysis is similar to a comprehensive medical diagnostic process. Just as doctors use standardised criteria to evaluate patient symptoms systematically, this study applied consistent evaluation standards across six critical dimensions: clarity, relevance, bias-free wording, scaling and format, logical flow, and reliability/validity. By examining each questionnaire through this structured lens, we could identify not just what went wrong, but precisely where and why these problems occur so consistently across different students and research topics.

The application of a five-point rating scale to evaluate each questionnaire across the six criteria revealed a troubling pattern. Students consistently scored poorly on technical execution while demonstrating reasonable conceptual understanding. This suggests that the problem lies not in intellectual capacity or motivation, but in the translation process between theoretical knowledge and practical implementation. The knowledge exists, but the procedural skills are needed to apply that knowledge effectively which requires different types of learning experiences than traditional lecture-based instruction provides.

The analysis revealed that clarity represented the most persistent challenge across all five questionnaires examined. Students consistently used language that seemed transparent to them but would confuse respondents from different backgrounds or with varying levels of familiarity with the research topic. Double-barrelled questions appeared frequently that students often do not recognise as problematic. Technical

jargons were used into supposedly straightforward items, creating barriers to comprehension that students may not anticipated.

The bias-free wording criterion revealed equally concerning patterns. Students routinely created leading questions without recognising the ways their own perspectives influenced question phrasing. Emotionally charged language appeared regularly, often reflecting genuine passion for their research topics but compromising the neutrality essential for reliable data collection. Perhaps most significantly, many students failed to provide balanced response options, unintentionally pushing respondents toward particular answers.

Scaling and format problems appeared in every questionnaire analysed, frequently involving overlapping categories that would make data analysis difficult or meaningless. Students often created Likert scales without clear, consistent anchors, or mixed different scaling approaches within single instruments. These technical errors suggest that students understood scaling as an abstract concept but lacked practical experience in creating functional measurement systems.

To understand why these problems, continue to exist despite extensive availability of research methods courses, an examination of how methodological skills are taught is needed. Most research methods courses introduce students to many different research approaches and techniques within limited timeframes. This approach works well for developing conceptual familiarity, but it fails to build the deep procedural knowledge required for effective questionnaire design, the situation resembles learning how to drive by studying traffic laws without ever sitting behind the wheel. Students can discuss methodological principles fluently and even identify problems in hypothetical examples, but they lack the pattern recognition skills that come only through guided practice with real instruments and expert feedback. The evaluation criteria revealed this gap, students who could define validity and reliability in theoretical terms consistently failed to recognise threats to these qualities in their own questionnaires.

Current educational approaches do not provide the specificity for developing genuine competence in questionnaire design. Students typically design their questionnaire once then receive general feedback and proceed to data collection. This process does not allow for the systematic skill development that complex procedural tasks require.

The framework developed in response to these findings addresses this educational gap by creating scaffolded instruction. Just as construction scaffolding supports a building until it can stand independently, educational scaffolding provides temporary support structures that students can use while developing their questionnaires. Each of the six steps in the framework corresponds directly to common failure points identified through the systematic evaluation process. The framework developed here operates like a systematic diagnostic and treatment protocol. Each step addresses specific failure points identified through the analysis while building toward overall instrument effectiveness. Rather than simply advising students to "write clearly," it provides specific strategies for achieving clarity, such as substituting "three times per week" for "often." This specificity helps students recognise and address clarity problems they might not otherwise notice. The framework's effectiveness lies in its ability to transform abstract methodological principles into concrete procedural steps that students can follow systematically. Instead of telling students to "ensure validity," it guides them through specific actions that contribute to valid measurement. Rather than advising them to "avoid bias," it helps them recognise and eliminate particular forms of question bias through detailed examples and systematic checking procedures.

The six-step framework bridges this gap by providing worked examples that show students how they should approach questionnaire design problems. Rather than leaving students to figure out the application process independently. Students need to develop the ability to critique their own work systematically rather than relying entirely on supervisor feedback, which may be limited, delayed, or inconsistent. The rubric-based approach teaches students to recognise common problems in their own questionnaires before they become embedded in final instruments.

The ultimate goal of this work extends beyond immediate improvements in student questionnaire design to fundamental transformation of research culture within higher education. When students develop strong methodological foundations early in their academic careers, they carry these standards forward into their future studies, professional practice, and eventually their own teaching and mentoring responsibilities. This creates a positive feedback loop where improvements in one generation of researchers create better conditions for training the next generation, and better trained students become more competent researchers, who produce higher-quality studies, who eventually become educators and supervisors capable of maintaining rigorous standards with future students. Over time, this process can elevate research quality throughout entire academic disciplines.

Moreover, the skills developed through systematic questionnaire design transfer to other professional contexts that require careful communication and systematic thinking. Students learn to anticipate how others will interpret their words, to structure information logically, to identify and eliminate sources of bias, and to revise their work based on systematic criteria. These competencies prove valuable in many career paths beyond academic research.

This framework has limitations that future research should address systematically. The current study analysed questionnaires from a single institution within a specific cultural and linguistic context, using a sample of five questionnaires from applied linguistics research. Broader validation studies examining questionnaires from different universities, countries, disciplinary backgrounds, and sample sizes would help identify which findings represent universal patterns and which reflect local conditions, future studies should examine whether better-designed instruments actually produce more reliable and valid data in practice, empirical verification through comparative studies would strengthen the case for systematic design training and provide evidence of real-world impact.



# List of References

## List of References:

### Primary Sources

Abouchahid, A., & Britel, A. N. (2017). *Toward a multi-levelled approach in error analysis in Algerian EFL writing productions: The case of third year secondary school learners, Djoudi Belkacem Secondary School, Laghouat* [Master's dissertation, University of Ammar Thelidji Laghouat].

Ait Hocine, M., & Oubelaid, N. (2017). *An investigation of aspects hindering the implication of blended learning in EFL class: Case study of second year LMD students in the English Department of Ammar Thelidji University of Laghouat* [Master's dissertation, University of Ammar Thelidji Laghouat].

Kaouka, R. (2024). *The use of artificial intelligence in EFL literature classes: An investigation into the effectiveness of using Copilot in literary analysis – The case of Master I students at the Department of English, University of Laghouat* [Master's dissertation, University of Ammar Thelidji Laghouat].

Kherici, C. (2025). *The use of visual aids to enhance EFL students' literature understanding: The case study of second-year students at the Department of English, University of Laghouat* [Master's dissertation, University of Ammar Thelidji Laghouat].

Semahi, M. (2024). *Enhancing citizenship education through the use of secondary school textbooks of English in the Algerian context: A case study of the Year Two textbook* [Master's dissertation, University of Ammar Thelidji Laghouat].

## Secondary Sources

- Ajayi, V. O. (2023). A review on primary sources of data and secondary sources of data. *European Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 2(3), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.21091/ejedu.2023.0203>
- Arundel, A. (2023). How to design, implement, and analyse a survey. United Kingdom: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52(4), 281–302. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0040957>
- Dillman, D. (1978). *Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method*. New York NY: Wiley.
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method* (4th ed.). Wiley.
- Dollinger, S. (2015). *The written questionnaire in social dialectology: History, theory, practice*. Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fowler, F. J. (1995). *Improving survey questions: Design and evaluation*. Sage.
- Simister, N. (2017). *Basic tools for data collection*. INTRAC. [www.intrac.org/app/uploads/2017/01/Basic-tools-for-data-collection.pdf](http://www.intrac.org/app/uploads/2017/01/Basic-tools-for-data-collection.pdf)
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Sage Publications.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Fabrigar, L. R. (1999). *Designing good questionnaires: Insights from psychology*. Oxford University Press.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2009). *The handbook of questionnaire design*. Stanford University Press.
- Patton, M. L. (2001). *Questionnaire research: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). LA: Pyrczak Publishing.

Peytcheva, E. & Yan, T. (2025). *A practical guide to survey questionnaire design and evaluation*. United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis.

Salant, P., & Dillman, D. A. (1994). *How to conduct your own survey*. John Wiley.

Schleef, E. (2013). Written surveys and questionnaires in sociolinguistics. In J. Holmes & K. Hazen (Eds.), *Research methods in sociolinguistics* (pp. 42–57). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781394260867.ch3>

Thomander, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2024). Question and questionnaire design. In J. W. Osborne (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of research methods and statistics for the social and behavioral sciences* (Vol. 2, pp. 348–375). Cambridge University Press.

Tourangeau, R., Rips, L. J., & Rasinski, K. A. (2000). *The psychology of survey response*. Cambridge University Press.

# Appendices

## Appendix 1

### The First Questionnaire

*“Toward a Multi-levelled Approach in Error Analysis in Algerian EFL Writing Productions: The Case of Third Year Secondary School Learners, Djoudi Belkacem Secondary School, Laghouat”*

#### **The Questionnaire:**

We would be thankful if you answered the following questions which mainly tackle the procedures adopted to analyse learners’ errors in written production.

1- Gender:

Male    Female

2- Diploma:

License      Master      PHD      Others

3- Professional Experience:

Less than 5 years      Between 5 and 15 years      More than 15 years

4- How do you evaluate written production?

Marks    Observation    Both

5- It is important to know the types of errors in order to evaluate written production properly.

Strongly agree      Agree      Disagree      Strongly disagree

6- Errors are obstacles

Strongly agree                      Agree                      Disagree                      Strongly disagree

7- Writing is the most important skill in secondary school

Strongly agree                      Agree                      Disagree                      Strongly disagree

8- EFL teachers help learners to avoid errors

Strongly agree                      Agree                      Disagree                      Strongly disagree

9- Students do not like to write paragraphs and prefer short answers.

Strongly agree                      Agree                      Disagree                      Strongly disagree

10- The most recurrent kind of errors is related to

Grammar      Lack of Vocabulary      Spelling mistakes      Others

11- Do you invite learners to auto-correct their productions?

Yes      No

12- Do you apply error analysis in correcting written passages?

Yes      No

13- How many sessions do you devote to reduce errors in writing?

14- What measures do you take to reduce errors and push learners to write?

15- Share the reasons which justify errors committed by 3<sup>rd</sup> year secondary school learners.

## Appendix 2

### The Second Questionnaire

*“The Use of Visual Aids to Enhance EFL Students’ Literature Understanding the Case Study of Second-year Students at The Department of English-University of Laghouat”*

Dear colleagues

You are kindly invited to answer this questionnaire which aims to gather information about the effects of using visual on enhancing literature understanding. Your responses will be used to help us understand the impact of using visual aids such as role playing, novels-movie adaptation as teaching tools in literature education. Thereby, you are kindly requested to answer the questions. Thank you for giving it your attention and time.

First, we would like to know:

- 1) How old are you? ... ..
- 2) You are: male or female

Part One:

- 1) Do you like literature classes?

Yes                      no

- 2) Do you feel comfortable in your traditional English literature class?

Yes                      No

Why?

- 3) Do you face difficulties while studying literature?

Yes                      No

- 4) What kind of struggles you face while studying literature?

(a) The course content is so long /confusing

- (b) Easily get bored
- (c) Hard to focus in literature class
- (d) The teacher's methodology is boring
- (e) Lack of motivation Tools

5) What do you think of the teacher's methodology in teaching literature?

- a) Ambiguous
- b) Boring
- c) Exciting

6) Do you use any visual tools to help you in your studies?

Yes            No

Why?

**Part Two:**

1. Have you watched any of these visual aids to study literature?

Movie Adaptations / Posters and Images / Roleplaying

2. Did you understand the lessons from it? Yes      No

2. Why do you think that visual aids are helpful in learning literature?

The literary events were easy to picturise and visuals

Watching or roleplaying characters from different literary novel scan facilitate the way of learning literarture

3. How much interest do you have in literature before and after using visual aids?

4. In your opinion, has the integration of Visual aids contributed positively in elevating your literary understanding?

## Appendix 3

### **The Third Questionnaire**

*“Enhancing Citizenship Education Through The Use of Secondary School Textbooks of English in The Algerian Context a Case Study: Year Two Textbook “*

This questionnaire is designed to gather information about the second-year English textbook used in Algerian secondary schools and its effectiveness in promoting citizenship education. Your responses will be anonymous and will be used solely for academic purposes.

#### **Section A: Personal Information and Content Analysis**

**Name :**

**School Name :**

**Location :**

**How old are you?**

From 20\_30 years        From 30\_40 years        More than 40 years

**How long have you been teaching in Secondary School?**

Less than 5 years        From 5\_10 years        From 10\_15Years        More than 15 years   

**How many times have you taught Second year?**

Less than 5times        From 5\_10 times        More than 10 times

**(To what extent does the second-year English textbook for Algerian secondary schools address themes and concepts related to citizenship education?)**

This section aims to understand the themes and concepts related to citizenship education covered in the textbook.

**1. How frequently are themes related to citizenship education (e.g., democracy, human rights, civic responsibility) addressed in the textbook?**

- Never
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- Frequently
- Always

**2. Please list some examples of themes and concepts related to citizenship education that you found in the textbook. (Open-ended)**

**3. How well do you think the textbook defines and explains these themes and concepts?**

- Not well at all
- Somewhat poorly
- Adequately
- Well
- Very well

**4. Does the textbook provide opportunities for students to explore different perspectives on the themes and concepts presented?**

- No
- To a limited extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a significant extent
- Yes

Section B: Effectiveness in Fostering Civic Values (How effectively are these themes and concepts presented in fostering civic values among students?)

This section explores how effectively the textbook presents citizenship themes to foster civic values among students.

**1. In your opinion, how effectively does the textbook encourage students to think critically about civic issues?**

- Not at all effective
- Somewhat ineffective
- Moderately effective
- Quite effective
- Highly effective

**2. Does the textbook provide opportunities for students to develop essential civic skills such as communication, collaboration, and decision-making?**

- No
- To a limited extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a significant extent
- Yes

**How engaging are the activities and exercises in the textbook in promoting civic participation among students?**

- Not engaging at all
- Somewhat unengaging
- Neutral
- Somewhat engaging
- Highly engaging

Please elaborate on any specific examples you found in the textbook that effectively promote civic values among students. (Open-ended)

**Section D: Opportunities and Challenges (What opportunities and challenges exist in utilizing this textbook for citizenship education within the Algerian context? )**

This section focuses on the potential of the textbook for citizenship education within the Algerian context.

1. What are the main opportunities you see in using this textbook for promoting citizenship education in Algerian secondary schools? (Open-ended)
2. What are the biggest challenges you see in using this textbook for promoting citizenship education? (Open-ended)
3. Do you have any suggestions for how the textbook could be improved to more effectively promote citizenship education? (Open-ended)

## Appendix 4

### **The Fourth Questionnaire**

*“The Use of Artificial Intelligence in EFL Literature Classes: An Investigation into the effectiveness of using Copilot in Literary Analysis The case of Master I Students at The Department of English-University of Laghouat”*

This questionnaire aims to gather information from students in the Department of English at Ammar Theledji University of Laghouat regarding their experiences with the use of AI in literary analysis. The survey aims to gather data on the effectiveness of Copilot, an AI tool, in aiding literary analysis within literature classes. The information collected will investigate how students or instructors perceive Copilot's influence on tasks like understanding themes, identifying literary devices, or constructing arguments, ultimately gauging its impact on learning.

**Thank you for participating in this survey.**

### **Section 1: Demographics**

1. Level :

.....

- Experience with AI Tools:

- a) None
- b) Minimal
- c) Moderate
- d) Extensive

### **Section 2: General Attitudes towards AI in Education**

1. Do you believe AI can enhance the learning experience in literature classes?

- a) Yes

- b) No
- c) Not Sure

1. What types of tasks do you use AI tools for in literature classes?

- a) Text analysis
- b) Writing assistance
- c) Research

3. Are you comfortable using AI tools for academic purposes?

- a) Very Comfortable
- b) Somewhat Comfortable
- c) Neutral
- d) Somewhat Uncomfortable
- e) Very Uncomfortable

4. Would you recommend the use of AI tools in literature classes to others?

- a) Definitely not
- b) Probably not
- c) Not sure
- d) Probably yes
- e) Definitely yes

5. What advantages and disadvantages have you experienced while using AI? Tools in your literature classes?

### **Section 3: Impact of AI on Literary Analysis Skills**

1. Have you used AI tools for literary analysis before?

- a) Yes
- b) No

2. How often do you use AI tools for literary analysis?

- a) Rarely
- b) Sometimes
- c) Often
- d) Always

3. Has using AI tools improved your ability to perform literary analysis?

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

4. Do you think AI tools can replace traditional methods in literary analysis?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Not Sure

5. What benefits have you observed from using AI in literature classes?

.....

6. Have you encountered any challenges when using AI tools for literary analysis?

If yes, please describe.

.....

.....

#### **Section 4: Effectiveness of AI as a Computational Tool**

1. Do you find AI effective in making literary analysis more efficient?

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree

- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

2. Do AI tools help you understand the thematic elements of literary texts better?

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

3. Do you believe AI tools provide deeper insights into literary texts compared to traditional methods?

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

4. Has the integration of AI tools in your literature classes improved the quality of literary analysis?

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

5. In your opinion, what improvements could be made to AI tools to support literary analysis in EFL classes better?

.....

.....

**Section 5: Experience with Copilot**

1. Have you previously heard of Copilot?
  - a) Yes
  - b) No
2. Have you ever used Copilot for any purpose?
  - a) Yes
  - b) No
3. Have you ever used Copilot for literary analysis tasks?
  - a) Yes
  - b) No
4. Briefly describe your experience level using Copilot
  - d) Beginner
  - e) Intermediate
  - f) Advanced

**Section 6: Contribution of Copilot to Literary Understanding**

1. To what extent do you believe Copilot can help understand literary themes?
  - a) Not at all helpful
  - b) Extremely helpful
2. How effective do you think Copilot identifies literary devices (e.g., metaphors, similes)?
  - a) Not at all effective

b) Extremely effective

3. How well do you think Copilot assists in constructing arguments for literary analysis essays?

a) Not helpful at all

b) Very helpful

4. How likely will you recommend using Copilot for literary analysis tasks?

a) Not likely at all

b) Extremely Likely

5. Do you consider Copilot to be a transformative tool in literary education?

a) Strongly Agree

b) Agree

c) Neutral

d) Disagree

e) Strongly Disagree

6. Should Copilot be integrated into the curriculum for literature classes?

a) Yes

b) No

c) Not Sure

7. How has the use of Copilot influenced your approach to literary analysis?

## Appendix 5

**The Fifth Questionnaire** “*An Investigation of Aspects Hindering the Implication of Blended Learning in EFL Class - Case study Second Year LMD Students in English Department of Amar Thelidji University of Laghouat*”  
**Students’ Questionnaire**

- **Your Age :**
- **Gender : male**  **female**

### **Language Attitude Questionnaire**

	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Undecided</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
I enjoy lessons on computer.					
I think it takes a long time to finish when I use computer.					
I can learn more from computers than books.					
I believe it is very important to me to learn using a computer.					
I enjoyed the other English classes that I have taken.					
I enjoy speaking English in the class.					
I enjoy practicing my English online with people from all over the world.					
I enjoy writing in English.					
I enjoy blogging in English.					
I enjoy reading on the internet.					
I enjoy reading in English on the internet.					
The classic techniques in teaching EFL are efficient.					
The classic techniques in teaching EFL are boring.					
I enjoy learning through music and movies.					
The use of technology can save time.					

### **A Blended Learning Activity Questionnaire**

	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Undecided</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
I enjoy lessons on the computer.					
I have used virtual communities before and I have enjoyed it.					
Working and collaborating with others is interesting.					
It would be beneficial to talk with other language learners and native speakers of English.					
I prefer using a textbook than talking in the class.					
I prefer using a textbook and working alone than collaborating with others.					
I think it is difficult to work with others collaboratively online.					

## Résumé

La qualité des questionnaires utilisés dans les recherches étudiantes est essentielle pour garantir la fiabilité et la validité des résultats obtenus. Cette étude examine les questionnaires conçus par des étudiants en linguistique appliquée, en se concentrant particulièrement sur la clarté, la pertinence, la neutralité du langage, la cohérence logique, les échelles et les formats, ainsi que la fiabilité et la validité. En analysant plusieurs questionnaires réels réalisés par des étudiants en master à l'Université Amar Telidji de Laghouat, l'étude a identifié des problèmes fréquents tels que le manque de précision, les questions ambiguës ou orientées, et des échelles mal construites. Afin de combler l'écart entre théorie et pratique, ce travail propose un cadre structuré en six étapes pour aider les chercheurs novices à concevoir des questionnaires plus efficaces et précis, améliorant ainsi la qualité des données et la crédibilité des résultats de recherche.

## المخلص

تلعب جودة الاستبيانات المستخدمة في البحوث الجامعية دورًا مهمًا في تحديد مصداقية وصحة نتائج البحث. تبحث هذه الدراسة في جودة الاستبيانات التي يصممها طلبة تخصص اللسانيات التطبيقية، ركزت هذه الدراسة على الوضوح، والملاءمة، وحيادية الصياغة، والتسلسل المنطقي، ونوعية المقاييس والصيغ المستخدمة، بالإضافة إلى الموثوقية والصلاحية. من خلال تحليل عدد من الاستبيانات الحقيقية التي أعدها طلبة الماستر في جامعة عمار تليجي بالأغواط، كشفت الدراسة عن مشكلات متكررة مثل الغموض في الأسئلة المصاغة، والأسئلة المركبة أو التوجيهية، ومشاكل في المقاييس المستخدمة. لسد الفجوة بين النظرية والتطبيق، اقترحت الدراسة إطارًا عمليًا من ست خطوات لمساعدة الباحثين المبتدئين على تصميم استبيانات واضحة وفعّالة، مما يساهم في تحسين جودة البيانات وتعزيز مصداقية نتائج البحث.