Hello everyone!

Welcome from our final presentation for Python Programming course at Parami University.

My teammate [May Shin Thant](mailto:mayshinthant@parami.edu.mm)and I will present the insights and observations we got after processing the Python course evaluation dataset.

–

We’ll talk about

the background of the dataset,

result of exploring the data with data visualization,

along with the insights and observations of the data.

Finally, we’ll end the presentation with the conclusion we made based on the findings.

–

The data collected from the survey are data on

students’ understanding on the course contents,

their learning experience and satisfaction level on the course, and

their perception on the instructors’ effectiveness.

Based on the data we’re given, this analysis focuses on the students’ knowledge on the subject and their satisfaction after joining the course.

So, ***the questions are*** - did they really understand the course and were they satisfied with the course?

—

The dataset have 5 focus areas, which can be categorized as

student demography,

student self evaluation,

instructors’ skills and responsiveness,

their satisfaction level, and

their perception on course structure.

Looking at the students’ demography,

11 students,

Age ranges from 16 - 20 y.o.

Their attendance is 88-100 so we can assume they’re good students who care about their learning.

—

Q1.

In this slide, we’ll look if the students thought the course was challenging and did they perform well.

In Fig.2, 63.6% of the students responded the course was challenging, which is almost two-thirds of them.

On the contrary, in Fig.1, only 27.3% of them are positive about their performance.

And, 36.4% of them are neutral which adds up to 63.7% for the responses on performance. Thus, almost two-thirds of the students are at least not negative on their performance although only a third of them are positive about their performance.

So, in Fig.3, to judge the overall mean of their performance and the course challenge,

look at the left side of the Fig., the mean for the responses about good performance is at 3 which is neutral and on the other hand, the mean for the course challenge level is at the highest number 5.

So, we can conclude that although the course was challenging, the students could maintain their performance.

—

Q2.

In Fig. 2, in both responses for effort and preparation, 8 out of 11 students (72.72%) chose 4 and 5 respectively, which means almost two thirds of them are positive that they gave effort and consistent preparation for the course and half of those 8 students strongly agree about their good effort and preparation.

Fig. 1, is supporting that, since the means for their effort and preparation are at 4, which is on a higher end of the spectrum.

And, as we can see, the box at the right side of the figure being heavily on the higher side of the spectrum, it is saying that many of the students did consistent preparation for the course.

Q3.

In Fig.2, The average study hours is 8.10 hours and it ranges from 3 hours to 15 hours.

In Fig.1, we can see only 4 out of 11 students (only a third of them) study for 8 hours or longer than 8 hours.

Overall looking at the average, they spent a good amount of study hours.

In accordance with their study hours, remember they had an attendance rate of 88-100 so we can say they were serious with their study.

In our next slide we’ll look into more about how the study hours differ based on their reason for joining the course.

Q4.

What are the differences in study hours and the preparedness based on the reason for joining the course.

Both in study hours and preparedness, the students who joined the course based on their interest are the highest.

Looking at the fig.1, the students joined the course to take the opportunity, followed as a second.

Students with the reason ‘degree requirement’ are the least in study hours but second in preparedness for class.

Although students with the reason ‘To take opportunity’ are the second in study hours, they are the minimum in preparation. (Anomaly).

This is the average of the study hours and preparation level based on their reasons for joining the course. So, we’ll see if the students with longer study hours will do more preparation than the others in the next slide.

Q5.

We know the students’ study hours range between 3 to 15 hours.

Let’s look at the preparedness levels based on the different study hours range.

Does longer study hours mean more preparation done by the students?

As a baseline, we see no negatives in preparation level.

Let’s look at the figure starting from the left hand side.

We see around 3 to 5.4 study hours as our first study hours range. And their preparation level is near 4.5 which is pretty high compared with their study hours.

In contrast, we can see the study hours range next to it are longer than the current study hours but their preparation level is the lowest amongst others.

So, comparing these two hours range and their preparedness, longer study hours does not mean strong preparation for the course. To look at the students’ effort and seriousness for the course, we cannot look at the study hours alone.

To be confident about that claim, let’s look at the dots we highlighted with the arrows.

Those two study hours range from 10-15 hours but their preparation level is much lower than those with shorter study hours.

More study hours does not show a higher level of consistent preparation than those with lower study hours and so we cannot measure if they consistently study for the course with their study hours alone.

So, we’ll look into the performance of the students with study hours and preparation level. in the next slide

Let me call my teammate May Shin Thant to take the floor.