Semester evaluations, Study Board for Cross-Cultural Studies, Fall 2022

Tourism - Copenhagen

64 students out of 111 (response rate of 58%) filled out the questionnaire. 43 from 7th semester and 21 from 9th semester. A note in that respect is that it is not possible to distinguish 7th sem. respondents from 9th sem. respondents (where they are not taking classes or involved in in-house activities), which makes conclusions somewhat vague. At times, the number of respondents is also very low, which means that valid conclusions cannot be made.

Three of the respondents did a university transfer and eleven did an internship in Denmark or abroad, which means that not all 9th sem. Respondents indicated either of the two. This means that these statistics cannot be considered fully reliable.

A majority (42%) of the respondents indicate to have spent between 30-40 or 40 hours or more on their studies, equivalent to full time or more. A total of 57% of the respondents indicate less time spent, which is high in comparison to other years. It needs to be noted though that it is not possible to separate 7th and 9th sem., which makes it impossible to see the context around these responses. 87% of the respondents assess their own work efforts to be satisfactory or above, but a few comments suggest that balancing part time work and study activities is challenging some students, which could also be related to the drop in hours spent on studies. It is important to note though that the programme is full time.

The respondents generally state to be well-informed of coherence between study activities in the semester (75%) and the academic outcome of attending the programme was rated ‘very big’ (16%) ‘big’ (44%) or ‘average’ (33%), and 7% indicate a small academic outcome.

In relation to specific competences obtained or improved, ‘critical thinking that challenge established ideas, generate new ideas and create creative solutions to topical tourism issues’ scored highest (65%), although other competencies also score relatively high. Teamwork is assessed relatively positive, but comments reveal some challenges in perceived work efforts and discipline between group members. This may need some attention in project writing activities in the future.

49% of the respondents indicated to have worked with an external collaborator during project work. Again, this is one of the places that it is difficult to assess what this actually means, since both 9th sem. internship students as well as other students doing ordinary project writing and study activities are impossible to distinguish, which means that it becomes difficult to conclude much on this basis. However, it is considered positive that students collaborate externally.
86% of the respondents indicate that they have felt well informed about practical issues, which is considered a high percentage of the students. The physical environment was overall assessed to be satisfactory, with a few negative comments about air quality in the class room. The facilities for socializing were assessed positively by 67% of the respondents, and 16% states not to be satisfied (16% ‘do not know’), but only very few comments were made about this point, which did not specify any potential improvements on this.

Overall, 91% indicate a satisfactory study community and 86% state to be thriving in the programme. Only one qualitative comment was made about struggles with research methodologies, which is understandable on 7th semester. One respondent directly indicates not to be thriving and 12% indicates ‘neither agree/disagree’, which is not a clear response and therefore could indicate some hesitation to this question, which is of course something to pay attention to.