

Singapore Management University Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University

Research Collection Lee Kong Chian School Of
Business

Lee Kong Chian School of Business

2005

The Perceptions of Students Outside the United States on Cases versus Lectures

G.W. KESTER

R.A. DEAN

David K. DING

Singapore Management University, davidding@smu.edu.sg

S.A. HOOVER

M. SKULLY

Follow this and additional works at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/lkcsb_research

Part of the [Business Commons](#), and the [Education Commons](#)

Citation

KESTER, G.W.; DEAN, R.A.; DING, David K.; HOOVER, S.A.; and SKULLY, M.. The Perceptions of Students Outside the United States on Cases versus Lectures. (2005). *Journal of the Academy of Business Education*. 6, 1-21. Research Collection Lee Kong Chian School Of Business.

Available at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/lkcsb_research/3603

This Journal Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Lee Kong Chian School of Business at Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Collection Lee Kong Chian School Of Business by an authorized administrator of Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. For more information, please email libIR@smu.edu.sg.

The Perceptions of Students Outside the United States on Cases versus Lectures

George W. Kester, Washington and Lee University
Roger A. Dean, Washington and Lee University
David K. Y. Ding, Nanyang Technological University
Scott A. Hoover, Washington and Lee University
Michael Skully, Monash University

This paper reports the results of a survey of postgraduate students at the University of Ljubljana in Slovenia, the University of Melbourne in Australia, Monash University in Australia, Nanyang Technological University in Singapore, and the National University of Ireland, Galway regarding their perceptions of cases versus lectures. The respondents to our survey to prefer lectures in introductory courses and cases when used to supplement lectures or used in advanced upper level courses. They agree that cases are an effective way to provide them with an organizational context that enhances their understanding of the subject matter and how it relates to and is applied in the “real world.” They were neutral regarding several issues related to grading classroom participation. The results of the surveys are generally consistent among the five universities surveyed and quite similar to the results of Kester, Hoover and McGoun’s (2004) survey of undergraduate students in the United States. Our hypothesis that students whose native language is not English have a stronger preference for lectures over cases is not supported by the results of our surveys.

INTRODUCTION

Teaching finance and other business-related subject poses the continuous challenge of linking the myriad of theories, conceptual models, and analytical techniques to actual practice in the “real world.” Many students lack the organizational frame of reference needed to understand and appreciate the relevance and context within which the subject matter applies.

It is also challenging to teach finance in ways that foster the development of analytical and evaluative skills rather than simply memorizing solutions to textbook problems. Many financial management textbooks (and related test banks) are more often than not oriented toward rote memorization of terms, concepts, and predictable end-of-chapter problems. Technically-oriented students, who are quite adept in filling in the blanks of problems that specify the input and decision variables, often fall short of gaining the skills needed to solve the unstructured problems faced in the actual practice of financial and business management. As a result, many students fail to gain situation problem formulation skills.

To overcome the tendency of textbooks to treat finance in an overly mechanical or theoretical manner and to place finance in its corporate context, many instructors utilize the case method, either to supplement lectures or as the basis for a separate course devoted entirely to cases. The benefits of the case method as a pedagogical tool have been described by Blevins (1980), Cossaboom (1976), Gittman, Lewis and Yates (1987), Kester (1989), Klein and Belt (1996), Merry (1967), O’Dell (1976), Roulac (1975), Shapiro (1975), Simon (1979), Singhvi and Desal (1977), Springate (1974), Trahan (1993), Viscone and Aragon (1978), and numerous

others.

Cases help students develop skills in problem identification, situation analysis, evaluation of alternatives, and decision-making in ways that simply cannot result from the lecture method of instruction. Indeed, one might argue that courses in finance should consist entirely of cases. However, as pointed out by Kalogeras (1976), a second argument against a case-only course is that cases can be quite inefficient in terms of transmitting factual information. A typical 90-minute discussion of a case may cover only one finance topic, albeit more effectively with more retention than a one-sided lecture. The ability to cover the same breadth of topics encompassed by typical finance textbooks would not be possible in a single semester, case-only course. Therefore, if one of the course objectives is to provide a broad survey of the course subject matter, it is more efficient to present lectures in the course.

Although lectures may be more efficient in transmitting knowledge, they encourage students to merely accumulate facts and principles. Lectures are not particularly effective in helping students deal with the unstructured problems they will face in the real world. Roulac (1975, p. 63) argues that lectures also “suggest more precision and knowledge than really exists.” He argues that the case method encourages situational decision-making rather than the mere accumulation of facts and principles. However, as previously pointed out, cases can be quite inefficient and time-consuming.

Combining cases and lectures into a single course may combine the best of both worlds. The integration of cases with lectures is advocated by Trahan (1993, p. 19), who argues that “an integrated approach that draws upon the strengths of each method may be superior to either of the methods individually.” He suggests an approach in which a case is typically covered during the same lecture when the material is covered or during the one immediately following. He argues that a benefit of keeping the case very close to the lecture allows students to apply the new theory and see its relevance immediately.

Students find cases to be an enjoyable, change-of-pace experience. They also perceive cases as providing more “real world” approach to understanding and applying the concepts, models, and theories of finance. However, these reactions are admittedly anecdotal, based upon informal student feedback and comments on teaching evaluations. In order to more objectively assess student views on the benefits of cases versus lectures, Kester, Hoover and McGoun (2004) developed a survey questionnaire that they administered to upper-level (senior) undergraduate accounting and management majors at Washington and Lee University and Bucknell University. In varying degrees, all of these students have experienced both lectures and cases in their classes.

The students responding to their survey generally preferred lectures in introductory courses and cases when used to supplement lectures or used in advanced upper level courses. They strongly agreed that cases are an effective way to provide them with an organizational context that enhances their understanding of the subject matter and how it relates to and is applied in the “real world.” They were neutral regarding most issues related to grading classroom participation in case discussions.

As reported in this paper, we have extended Kester, Hoover and McGoun’s research and examine the views of students outside the United States. Specifically, we have surveyed postgraduate students at the University of Ljubljana in Slovenia, the University of Melbourne in Australia, Monash University in Australia, Nanyang Technological University in Singapore, and the National University of Ireland, Galway. (We plan to extend this paper shortly by adding survey results from the University of the South Pacific in the Fiji Islands and Monash South Africa).

The language of instruction in each of the universities surveyed is English. Yet, as will be reported in the next section, English is the native language of only 35.7 percent of the respondents. In this research project, we are especially interested in the view students whose native language is not English – the other 64.5 percent of the respondents. We hypothesized that students whose native language is not English may prefer lectures over cases. Class discussions of cases tend to be less organized and hence more difficult to follow by students whose native language is not English, especially in classes comprised of students from many different countries who speak with many different accents. The secondary and undergraduate education of many of respondents, especially those from Asian countries, is oriented toward lectures and rote memorization rather than class discussion and the types of unstructured problems presented in good cases. Classroom participation and debate (and in a language other than their own) is a new experience for these students. Therefore, they tend to be quite reluctant to speak in class. Over 60 percent of the respondents are from Asian countries.

THE SURVEY

To assess views of students outside the United States on the benefits of cases versus lectures, we used a questionnaire (Exhibit 1) consisting of five informational questions and 19 closed end statements. We used the same 19 closed-end statements as Kester, Hoover and McGoun (2004). The respondents are asked to indicate their level of agreement with each of the 19 closed-end statements based upon a seven-point scale: -3 = strongly disagree, -2 = moderately disagree, -1 = slightly disagree, 0 = no opinion, +1 = slightly agree, +2 = moderately agree, and +3 = strongly agree. The questionnaire, which does not ask respondents to identify themselves, ends with an open-end question soliciting other comments from the respondents.

THE RESULTS

The surveys were administered in two ways. At the University of Ljubljana, University of Melbourne, Monash University, and the National University of Ireland, Galway, the questionnaires were distributed and collected in class. At Nanyang Technological University, they were distributed and received via e-mail. A total of 356 questionnaires were returned.

Part I – Information Questions

The distribution of responses by university was as follows:

University:	
Monash University	108
National University of Ireland	90
University of Melbourne	69
Nanyang Technological University	63
University of Ljubljana	<u>26</u>
Total	356

The distribution of responses according to the students' experience with cases, as measured by the estimated number of cases all courses taken, was as follows:

Case experience:	
None	12
A few cases (1-5 cases)	97
Moderate (6-10 cases)	98
Significant (11-20 cases)	61
Extensive (over 20 cases)	<u>85</u>
Total	356

Clearly, the vast majority of the responding students had significant experience with cases, with 41 percent reporting that they had more than 10 cases in all of their courses.

The distribution of responses by major were as follows:

Major:	
Accounting	37
Management	60
Finance	194
Marketing	13
Other	50
More than one	<u>2</u>
Total	356

The majority of our respondents were finance students. This probably reflects the fact four of the five authors of this paper are finance professors and distributed the questionnaires in their classes.

The distribution by native countries of the respondents was as follows:

Native Country:	
Peoples Republic of China	108
Ireland	88
Singapore	29
Indonesia	21
Malaysia	20
Slovenia	20
India	15
Australia	9
Thailand	8
Bangladesh	5
Croatia	5
Other	<u>28</u>
Total	356

Of the 108 respondents from the Peoples Republic of China, nine were from Hong Kong. The countries included in "Other" are Argentina, Bangladesh, Canada, East Timor, France, Germany, Kenya, Macedonia, Mauritius, Norway, Pakistan, Russia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Taiwan, Trinidad and Vietnam. It is interesting to note that even though 177 (49.7

percent) of the responses were from students at two Australian universities, Monash University and the University of Melbourne, only nine respondents (2.5 percent) from these two Australian Universities listed Australia as their native country and only 23 respondents (13 percent) listed English as their native language. These percentages reveal the truly international composition of these universities' student bodies, at least at the postgraduate business level.

The distribution of the results according to the native languages was as follows:

Native Language:	
English	127
Chinese	121
Bahasa Indonesia	20
Slovenian	20
Hindi	13
Irish	10
Thai	8
Bahasa Malay	6
Bengali	5
Croatian	5
Other	<u>21</u>
Total	356

As previously mentioned, English is the native language of 35.7 percent of the respondents. Chinese, which includes Mandarin, Cantonese, and various other dialects, is the native language of 34 percent of the respondents. The languages included in "Other" are Dinka, French, Gujarati, Macedonian, Norwegian, Portuguese, Punjabi, Russian, Sinhalese, Spanish, Tamil, Urdu and Vietnamese.

Part II – Lectures Versus Cases (Closed-End Statements)

Table 1 contains summary statistics on the responses to the closed-end statements (identified later by "S"). They are subdivided by major (university) and native language (English and Non-English).

- - - Insert Table 1 about here - - -

Whereas students agreed that cases provide a better approach for learning advanced material (S17), they agreed that lectures provide a better approach for learning introductory material (S15). They also mildly agreed that introductory courses based upon lectures provide better preparation for upper level courses (S18).

Students had the strongest level of agreement that cases provide a more "real world" understanding (S5). They also agreed that cases provide an organizational context that enhances understanding (S1) of the subject matter and mildly agreed that they wish more cases were used in their courses (S13). However, they also agreed that it takes more time to prepare for cases than lectures (S8).

Students mildly disagreed with the statement that cases are a disorganized and an inefficient way to learn the subject matter of the course (S3). In fact, students agreed with the

statement that cases help students learn a broader set of material (S14). The responses to the latter two statements (S3 and S14) were somewhat surprising to the authors who agree with Kalogeras (1976) that, despite the benefits of cases, they are an inefficient way to cover a broad range of course material. Indeed, students were neutral regarding lectures being a more efficient way to learn the subject matter (S2). They were also neutral regarding the statement that lectures help students learn a broader set of material (S16).

One of the difficulties in teaching cases is grading classroom participation. Many professors are simply uncomfortable grading participation, which is inherently subjective. Others point out that there are students who have an excellent understanding of the subject matter, but are not comfortable participating in class.² Nonetheless, as Hensen, Kennett, and Kennedy (2003, p. 251) point out, “it is only through active student participation that learning will occur using the case method.” Statement 10 and its subparts in our questionnaire address these issues. Interestingly, students were neutral regarding being uncomfortable with classroom participation being graded in cases courses (S10). They were also neutral about participation grades being too subjective (S10a) and being uncomfortable participating in class (S10b). Similarly, no strong views were reflected in the response to the statement that classroom participation grades do not measure their knowledge of the subject (S10c). However, students agreed that some students dominate classroom discussions (S10d).

The remaining statements resulted in generally neutral results, without strong agreement or disagreement. Students were neutral regarding their agreement with the statements that case preparation (S6) and discussions (S7) can be frustrating because it is difficult to know how to get started and because cases never seem to end with the “right” answer, respectively. Students were neutral regarding the difficulty in comparing cases versus lectures because the professors are different (S9), whether lectures are usually more enjoyable than case discussions (S4), whether they learn more from cases than lectures (S11), and whether courses based primarily on lectures are easier than courses based on cases (S12). They were also neutral regarding which method they preferred (S19).

In terms of the statements that elicited agreement and disagreement, it is interesting to note the results of our survey, for all respondents, are virtually identical to Kester, Hoover and McGoun’s survey of undergraduate students in the United States. The only exceptions were statements S4 and S13. U.S. undergraduates were neutral regarding whether lectures are usually more enjoyable than case discussions (S4) whereas the postgraduate students outside the U.S. slightly disagree with this statement. Undergraduate students were also neutral whether more cases should be used in their courses (S13), whereas the postgraduate students outside the U.S. slightly agreed with this statement.

The data shown in Table 1 reveals that the results were generally consistent among the five universities surveyed. There were a few noteworthy exceptions. Most students were neutral regarding the statement that case discussions are frustrating and never seem to end with the “right” answer (S7). Students at the University of Ljubljana, however, disagreed with this statement. Students at the University of Ljubljana also disagreed with the statements that lectures are usually more enjoyable than case discussions (S4), whereas the other respondents were neutral regarding this statement. There were other less noteworthy differences among the different universities. For example, see the responses to statements S2, S3, S11, S13, S16 and S19. Reviewing the results in Table 1 for all the statements, it would appear that students at the University of Ljubljana have the strongest preference for cases; students at Monash University have the least preference for cases. Any attempt to explain these differences would be mere

speculation.

With respect to differences between students whose native language is English and those whose native language is not English, the results for most of the statements were similar. Both groups of students were neutral regarding being uncomfortable with classroom participation being graded in cases courses (S10). Both groups were also neutral about participation grades being too subjective (S10a) and being uncomfortable participating in class (10b). Whereas students whose native language is not English mildly agreed with the statement that classroom participation grades do not accurately measure their knowledge of the subject matter (10c), students whose native language is not English were neutral regarding this statement. Both groups agreed that some students dominate classroom discussions (S10d), with students whose native language is English expressing the stronger level of agreement. Although these results are consistent with Kester, Hoover and McGoun's (2004) findings for undergraduate students in the U.S., we expected that students whose native language is not English to express greater discomfort with grading classroom participation. This turned out not to be the case.

Again, based upon our previously stated hypothesis that students whose native language is not English may have a stronger preference for lectures over cases, we found the results for statements S4 and S13 to be interesting. Students whose native language is English mildly disagreed with the statement that lectures are more enjoyable than case discussions (S4). Students whose native language is not English were neutral regarding this statement.

Students whose native language is not English mildly agreed with the statement that more cases should be used in their course (S13). Students whose native language is English were neutral regarding this statement.

Therefore, our hypothesis that students whose native language is not English may have a stronger preference for lectures over cases is not supported by the results of our surveys.

LIMITATIONS

The same limitations that applied to Kester, Hoover and McGoun's (2004) survey of undergraduate students in the U.S. applies to the surveys reported in this paper. Despite the fact that students were neutral regarding the difficulty in comparing cases and lectures due to differences in professors (S9), we believe that question of whether cases or lectures are best for learning often does depend on the professor. It also depends on the nature and goals of the course. Unfortunately, we could hold neither the professor nor the course constant. The students responding to our survey have experienced cases in different countries in different universities and in different courses taught by different professors. This is certainly an inherent limitation that should be kept in mind when drawing conclusions from our results.

Another limitation relates to what is meant by the word "learning." How should different teaching methods be evaluated and what frame of reference did the respondents to our survey have for answering the various questions? For example, statement S16 in Part II asserts that "Lectures provided a better approach for learning introductory material" and statement S18 asserts that "Cases provide a better approach for learning advanced material." The student respondents may have interpreted "a better approach for learning" in terms of facts and technical skills acquired in a course, whereas professors may interpret "a better approach for learning" in terms of improved conceptual understanding and critical thinking skills.

In their responses to S15, S17 and 18, we do not really know how students differentiated introductory and upper level courses. For example, is financial accounting an introductory

course that prepares students for the upper level managerial finance course, or is managerial finance an introductory course that prepares students for the upper level investments or corporate strategy course? If financial accounting is perceived as the introductory course, how many of the respondents really used cases in it?

Because students expressed a preference for cases in advanced upper level courses and lectures of introductory courses, there may be a “pooling effect” for many of the questions. For example, since students expressed a preference for lectures in introductory courses and cases in advanced courses, questions that do not differentiate on that basis are subject to interpretation by students. For example, S4 states that "Lectures are usually more enjoyable than case discussion." Students may agree with that statement for an introductory course but disagree for an advanced course.

CONCLUDING COMMENT

Although the student perceptions regarding question of whether cases versus lectures depends on the professor and what is meant by “a better approach for learning” and “introductory” versus “upper level” courses, it would appear from the results of our survey that students tend to prefer lectures in introductory courses and cases when used to supplement lectures or used in advanced upper level courses. Students agree that cases are an effective way to provide them with an organizational context that enhances their understanding of the subject matter and how it relates to and is applied in the “real world.”

The respondents to our survey were neutral regarding several issues related to grading classroom participation. Apparently, the concerns regarding the requirement for and subjective nature of grading classroom participation sometimes expressed by professors are not shared by the students responding to our survey. However, they agreed that some students dominate classroom discussions. Professors should guard against allowing a few students to dominate case discussions at the learning (and perhaps participation grade) expense of other students.

The results of the surveys are generally consistent five universities surveyed and virtually identical to the results of Kester, Hoover and McGoun’s (2004) survey of undergraduate students in the United States.

Our hypothesis that students whose native language is not English have a stronger preference for lectures over cases is not supported by the results of our surveys.

ENDNOTES

¹ This implies that lectures and cases are somehow on opposite poles, which is not necessarily true. Cases can be used to present theories and techniques and lectures can be used to illustrate applications. Cases can also be placed before related lectures in order to provide students with a context within which theories and models can be placed. This reversal of the typical sequence of lectures and cases is advocated by Springate (1974).

² These concerns with the case method are frequently expressed by professors during case method teaching workshops led by one of the authors of this paper.

TABLE 1: STUDENT RESPONSES TO PART II - LECTURES VERSUS CASES

<i>Statement</i>	<i>Level of Agreement</i>			<i>Mean</i>	<i>Respondents</i>	
	<i>Disagreement (-3,-2)</i>	<i>(-1,0,+1)</i>	<i>Agreement (+2,+3)</i>			
1. Cases provide an organizational context that enhances understanding of the subject matter of the course.	2.81%	23.60%	73.60%	1.87	All Students	
	0.93%	40.74%	58.33%	2.47	Monash University	
	7.25%	20.29%	72.46%	1.68	University of Melbourne	
	0.00%	11.54%	88.46%	2.35	University of Ljubljana	
	6.35%	14.29%	79.37%	1.90	Nanyang Tech. University	
	0.00%	15.56%	84.44%	2.27	National Univ. of Ireland	
	4.37%	24.89%	70.74%	1.71	Non-English	
	0.00%	21.26%	78.74%	2.13	Native Language - English	
	2. Lectures are a more efficient way than cases to learn the subject matter of the course.	17.70%	54.21%	28.09%	0.24	All Students
		7.41%	56.48%	36.11%	0.72	Monash University
20.29%		49.28%	30.43%	0.16	University of Melbourne	
46.15%		46.15%	7.69%	-1.08	University of Ljubljana	
19.05%		60.32%	20.63%	0.10	Nanyang Tech. University	
18.89%		53.33%	27.78%	0.19	National Univ. of Ireland	
18.78%		52.84%	28.38%	0.20	Non-English	
15.75%		56.69%	27.56%	0.31	Native Language - English	
3. Case discussions are a disorganized and an inefficient way to learn the subject matter of the course.		53.93%	39.33%	6.74%	-1.27	All Students
		33.33%	56.48%	10.19%	-0.66	Monash University
	69.57%	26.09%	4.35%	-1.72	University of Melbourne	
	76.92%	19.23%	3.85%	-1.88	University of Ljubljana	
	55.56%	39.68%	4.76%	-1.35	Nanyang Tech. University	
	58.89%	34.44%	6.67%	-1.41	National Univ. of Ireland	
	55.02%	37.99%	6.99%	-1.30	Non-English	
	51.97%	41.73%	6.30%	-1.21	Native Language - English	

TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

<i>Statement</i>	<i>Level of Agreement</i>			<i>Mean</i>	<i>Respondents</i>
	<i>Disagreement (-3,-2)</i>	<i>(-1,0,+1)</i>	<i>Agreement (+2,+3)</i>		
4. Lectures are usually more enjoyable than case discussions.	37.08%	50.84%	12.08%	-0.81	All Students
	14.81%	65.74%	19.44%	-0.03	Monash University
	52.17%	37.68%	10.14%	-1.19	University of Melbourne
	61.54%	38.46%	0.00%	-1.81	University of Ljubljana
	36.51%	53.97%	9.52%	-0.87	Nanyang Tech. University
	45.56%	44.44%	10.00%	-1.11	National Univ. of Ireland
	34.50%	51.09%	14.41%	-0.65	Non-English
	41.73%	50.39%	7.87%	-1.09	Native Language - English
5. Cases provide a more “real world” understanding of the subject matter of the course.	0.56%	17.98%	81.46%	2.19	All Students
	0.00%	29.63%	70.37%	1.88	Monash University
	2.90%	8.70%	88.41%	2.35	University of Melbourne
	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	2.73	University of Ljubljana
	0.00%	12.70%	87.30%	2.35	Nanyang Tech. University
	0.00%	20.00%	80.00%	2.16	National Univ.of Ireland
	0.87%	17.47%	81.66%	2.21	Non-English
	0.00%	18.90%	81.10%	2.15	Native Language - English
6. Case preparation can be frustrating; it is difficult to know how to get started.	13.48%	51.40%	35.11%	0.67	All Students
	10.19%	50.00%	39.81%	0.81	Monash University
	10.14%	50.72%	39.13%	0.80	University of Melbourne
	11.54%	57.69%	30.77%	0.88	University of Ljubljana
	30.16%	41.27%	28.57%	0.02	Nanyang Tech. University
	8.89%	58.89%	32.22%	0.79	National Univ. of Ireland
	15.28%	47.16%	37.55%	0.66	Non-English
	10.24%	59.06%	30.71%	0.68	Native Language - English

TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

<i>Statement</i>	<i>Level of Agreement</i>			<i>Mean</i>	<i>Respondents</i>
	<i>Disagreement (-3,-2)</i>	<i>(-1,0,+1)</i>	<i>Agreement (+2,+3)</i>		
7. Case discussions are frustrating; they never seem to end with the "right" answer.	26.40%	51.97%	21.63%	-0.05	All Students
	13.89%	50.93%	35.19%	0.48	Monash University
	34.78%	40.58%	24.64%	0.01	University of Melbourne
	61.54%	34.62%	3.85%	-1.50	University of Ljubljana
	30.16%	57.14%	12.70%	-0.38	Nanyang Tech. University
	22.22%	63.33%	14.44%	-0.10	National Univ. of Ireland
	27.95%	46.29%	25.76%	0.03	Non-English
	23.62%	62.20%	14.17%	-0.20	Native Language - English
8. It takes more time to prepare for case discussions than lectures.	3.37%	29.49%	67.13%	1.78	All Students
	1.85%	35.19%	62.96%	1.69	Monash University
	1.45%	30.43%	68.12%	1.87	University of Melbourne
	0.00%	15.38%	84.62%	2.35	University of Ljubljana
	1.59%	17.46%	80.95%	2.08	Nanyang Tech. University
	8.89%	34.44%	56.67%	1.39	National Univ. of Ireland
	2.62%	30.13%	67.25%	1.82	Non-English
	4.72%	28.35%	66.93%	1.67	Native Language - English
9. It is difficult to compare cases versus lectures because the professors are different.	16.01%	58.15%	25.84%	0.33	All Students
	7.41%	61.11%	31.48%	0.69	Monash University
	21.74%	53.62%	24.64%	0.09	University of Melbourne
	26.92%	50.00%	23.08%	-0.04	University of Ljubljana
	22.22%	52.38%	25.40%	0.29	Nanyang Tech. University
	14.44%	64.44%	21.11%	0.20	National Univ. of Ireland
	17.47%	55.90%	26.64%	0.31	Non-English
	13.39%	62.20%	24.41%	0.34	Native Language - English

TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

<i>Statement</i>	<i>Level of Agreement</i>			<i>Mean</i>	<i>Respondents</i>
	<i>Disagreement (-3,-2)</i>	<i>(-1,0,+1)</i>	<i>Agreement (+2,+3)</i>		
10. I am uncomfortable with classroom participation being graded in case courses.	20.79%	60.96%	18.26%	-0.04	All Students
	10.19%	69.44%	20.37%	0.21	Monash University
	20.29%	63.77%	15.94%	-0.06	University of Melbourne
	53.85%	34.62%	11.54%	-1.00	University of Ljubljana
	38.10%	52.38%	9.52%	-0.48	Nanyang Tech. University
	12.22%	62.22%	25.56%	0.28	National Univ. of Ireland
	23.58%	61.57%	14.85%	-0.17	Non-English
	15.75%	59.84%	24.41%	0.20	Native Language - English
a. It is too subjective.	11.55%	65.63%	22.82%	0.41	All Students
	4.67%	71.03%	24.30%	0.53	University of Melbourne
	17.39%	66.67%	15.94%	0.14	Melbourne
	23.08%	57.69%	19.23%	0.15	University of Ljubljana
	14.29%	63.49%	22.22%	0.33	Nanyang Tech. University
	10.00%	62.22%	27.78%	0.53	National Univ. of Ireland
	14.47%	65.79%	19.74%	0.25	Non-English
	6.30%	65.35%	28.35%	0.65	Native Language - English
b. I am not comfortable participating in class.	36.24%	51.12%	12.64%	-0.62	All Students
	24.07%	63.89%	12.04%	-0.35	Monash University
	49.28%	43.48%	7.25%	-1.06	University of Melbourne
	38.46%	42.31%	19.23%	-0.65	University of Ljubljana
	46.03%	42.86%	11.11%	-0.83	Nanyang Tech. University
	33.33%	50.00%	16.67%	-0.34	National Univ. of Ireland
	35.81%	52.40%	11.79%	-0.63	Non-English
	37.01%	48.82%	14.17%	-0.52	Native Language - English

TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

<i>Statement</i>	<i>Level of Agreement</i>			<i>Mean</i>	<i>Respondents</i>
	<i>Disagreement (-3,-2)</i>	<i>(-1,0,+1)</i>	<i>Agreement (+2,+3)</i>		
c. Classroom participation grades do not accurately measure my knowledge of the subject matter.	13.20%	49.44%	37.36%	0.81	All Students
	12.96%	55.56%	31.48%	0.65	Monash University
	14.49%	56.52%	28.99%	0.59	University of Melbourne
	15.38%	46.15%	38.46%	0.77	University of Ljubljana
	12.70%	58.73%	28.57%	0.62	Nanyang Tech. University
	12.22%	31.11%	56.67%	1.23	National Univ. of Ireland
	13.97%	55.46%	30.57%	0.65	Non-English
	11.81%	38.58%	49.61%	1.04	Native Language - English
d. Some students dominate classroom discussions.	5.34%	33.43%	61.24%	1.61	All Students
	4.63%	41.67%	53.70%	1.38	Monash University
	7.25%	33.33%	59.42%	1.43	University of Melbourne
	7.69%	19.23%	73.08%	1.58	University of Ljubljana
	4.76%	39.68%	55.56%	1.37	Nanyang Tech. University
	4.44%	23.33%	72.22%	1.92	National Univ. of Ireland
	6.99%	38.43%	54.59%	1.31	Non-English
	2.36%	24.41%	73.23%	1.94	Native Language - English
11. I learn more from cases than lectures.	7.58%	57.58%	34.83%	0.76	All Students
	10.19%	71.30%	18.52%	0.27	Monash University
	2.90%	44.93%	52.17%	1.29	University of Melbourne
	0.00%	42.31%	57.69%	1.58	University of Ljubljana
	7.94%	52.38%	39.68%	0.94	Nanyang Tech. University
	10.00%	58.89%	31.11%	0.56	National Univ. of Ireland
	6.99%	58.08%	34.93%	0.79	Non-English
	8.66%	56.69%	34.65%	0.69	Native Language - English

TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

<i>Statement</i>	<i>Level of Agreement</i>			<i>Mean</i>	<i>Respondents</i>	
	<i>Disagreement (-3,-2)</i>	<i>(-1,0,+1)</i>	<i>Agreement (+2,+3)</i>			
12. Courses based primarily on lectures are easier than courses based primarily on cases	10.39%	56.46%	33.15%	0.63	All Students	
	5.56%	60.19%	34.26%	0.86	Monash University	
	15.94%	52.17%	31.88%	0.35	University of Melbourne	
	15.38%	61.54%	23.08%	0.31	University of Ljubljana	
	9.52%	57.14%	33.33%	0.76	Nanyang Tech. University	
	11.11%	53.33%	35.56%	0.52	National Univ. of Ireland	
	9.61%	57.21%	33.19%	0.69	Non-English	
	11.81%	55.12%	33.07%	0.49	Native Language - English	
	13. I wish more cases were used in my accounting and management courses	5.34%	53.09%	41.57%	1.06	All Students
		4.63%	65.74%	29.63%	0.79	Monash University
1.45%		30.43%	68.12%	1.83	University of Melbourne	
3.85%		23.08%	73.08%	1.73	University of Ljubljana	
1.59%		60.32%	38.10%	1.08	Nanyang Tech. University	
12.22%		58.89%	28.89%	0.53	National Univ. of Ireland	
3.49%		49.34%	47.16%	1.28	Non-English	
8.66%		59.84%	31.50%	0.63	Native Language - English	
14. Courses based upon cases help students to learn a broader set of material		1.97%	36.80%	61.24%	1.63	All Students
		1.85%	52.78%	45.37%	1.27	Monash University
	1.45%	18.84%	79.71%	1.97	University of Melbourne	
	0.00%	19.23%	80.77%	2.23	University of Ljubljana	
	3.17%	26.98%	69.84%	1.92	Nanyang Tech. University	
	2.22%	43.33%	54.44%	1.36	National Univ. of Ireland	
	1.31%	34.06%	64.63%	1.74	Non-English	
	3.15%	41.73%	55.12%	1.38	Native Language - English	

TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

<i>Statement</i>	<i>Level of Agreement</i>			<i>Mean</i>	<i>Respondents</i>
	<i>Disagreement (-3,-2)</i>	<i>(-1,0,+1)</i>	<i>Agreement (+2,+3)</i>		
15. Lectures provide a better approach for learning introductory material	1.69%	37.08%	61.24%	1.70	All Students
	0.93%	47.22%	51.85%	1.52	Monash University
	2.90%	33.33%	63.77%	1.62	University of Melbourne
	3.85%	23.08%	73.08%	1.88	University of Ljubljana
	1.59%	26.98%	71.43%	1.92	Nanyang Tech. University
	1.11%	38.89%	60.00%	1.70	National Univ. of Ireland
	2.18%	36.24%	61.57%	1.66	Non-English
	0.79%	38.58%	60.63%	1.72	Native Language - English
16. Courses based upon lectures help students learn a broader set of material.	10.11%	60.11%	29.78%	0.44	All Students
	1.85%	60.19%	37.96%	1.07	Monash University
	15.94%	53.62%	30.43%	0.28	University of Melbourne
	38.46%	46.15%	15.38%	-0.85	University of Ljubljana
	11.11%	61.90%	26.98%	0.19	Nanyang Tech. University
	6.67%	67.78%	25.56%	0.33	National Univ. of Ireland
	12.23%	55.46%	32.31%	0.52	Non-English
	6.30%	68.50%	25.20%	0.29	Native Language - English
17. Cases provide a better approach for learning advanced material.	2.53%	36.52%	60.96%	1.63	All Students
	0.93%	49.07%	50.00%	1.42	Monash University
	2.90%	24.64%	72.46%	1.81	University of Melbourne
	3.85%	23.08%	73.08%	2.00	University of Ljubljana
	1.59%	28.57%	69.84%	1.94	Nanyang Tech. University
	4.44%	40.00%	55.56%	1.36	National Univ. of Ireland
	1.75%	36.68%	61.57%	1.68	Non-English
	3.94%	36.22%	59.84%	1.49	Native Language - English

TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

<i>Statement</i>	<i>Level of Agreement</i>			<i>Mean</i>	<i>Respondents</i>	
	<i>Disagreement (-3,-2)</i>	<i>(-1,0,+1)</i>	<i>Agreement (+2,+3)</i>			
18. Introductory courses based upon lectures provide better preparation for upper level courses	1.97%	47.75%	50.28%	1.43	All Students	
	1.85%	48.15%	50.00%	1.43	Monash University	
	4.35%	31.88%	63.77%	1.59	University of Melbourne	
	0.00%	57.69%	42.31%	1.31	University of Ljubljana	
	0.00%	50.79%	49.21%	1.43	Nanyang Tech. University	
	2.22%	54.44%	43.33%	1.27	National Univ.of Ireland	
	1.75%	45.41%	52.84%	1.48	Non-English	
	2.36%	51.97%	45.67%	1.28	Native Language - English	
	19. All things considered, I prefer lectures to cases	23.60%	58.15%	18.26%	-0.16	All Students
		9.26%	63.89%	26.85%	0.60	Monash University
37.68%		49.28%	13.04%	-0.75	University of Melbourne	
57.69%		38.46%	3.85%	-1.46	University of Ljubljana	
26.98%		66.67%	6.35%	-0.63	Nanyang Tech. University	
17.78%		57.78%	24.44%	0.11	National Univ. of Ireland	
24.89%		55.90%	19.21%	-0.15	Non-English	
21.26%		62.20%	16.54%	-0.17	Native Language - English	

APPENDIX SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I – Information Questions

1. My experience with cases (total number in all of my courses) is (check one):

- (a) None _____
- (b) A few cases (1-5 cases) _____
- (c) Moderate (6-10 cases) _____
- (d) Significant (11-20 cases) _____
- (e) Extensive (more than 20 cases) _____

2. I am (check one) an undergraduate student _____ postgraduate student _____

3. My major is (check one):

- (a) Accounting _____
- (b) Management _____
- (c) Finance _____
- (d) Marketing _____
- (e) Other (please specify) _____

4. My native country is _____

5. My native language is _____

PART II – Lectures Versus Cases

Please indicate your level of general agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements related to cases and lectures by circling the number corresponding to your answer.

<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Moderately Disagree</i>	<i>Slightly Disagree</i>	<i>No Opinion</i>	<i>Slightly Agree</i>	<i>Moderately Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|
| 1. Cases provide an organizational context than enhances understanding of the subject matter of the courses. | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 |
| 2. Lectures are a more efficient way than cases to learn the subject matter of the course. | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 |
| 3. Case discussions are a disorganized and inefficient way to learn the subject matter of the course. | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 |
| 4. Lectures are usually more enjoyable than case discussions. | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 |
| 5. Cases provide a more “real world” understanding of the subject matter of the course. | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 |
| 6. Case preparation can be frustrating; it is difficult to know how to get started. | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 |

7. Case discussions are frustrating; they never seem to end with the “right” answer.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
8. It takes more time to prepare for case discussions than lectures.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
9. It is difficult to compare cases versus lectures because the professors are different.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
10. I am uncomfortable with classroom participation being graded in case courses.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
a. It is too subjective.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
b. I am not comfortable participating in class.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
c. Classroom participation grades do not accurately measure my knowledge of the subject matter.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
d. Some students dominate classroom discussions.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
11. I learn more from cases than lectures.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
12. Courses based primarily on lectures are easier than courses based primarily on cases.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
13. I wish more cases were used in my accounting and management courses.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
14. Courses based upon cases help students to learn a broader set of material	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
15. Lectures provide a better approach for learning introductory material	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
16. Courses based upon lectures help students learn a broader set of material	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
17. Cases provide a better approach for learning advanced material	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
18. Introductory courses based upon lectures provide better preparation for upper level courses	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
19. All things considered, I prefer lectures to cases	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3

PART III – Other Comments

REFERENCES

- Blevins, Dallas R. "A Students Guide to the Case Method," *Journal of Financial Education*, 9 (Fall 1980), 66-73.
- Cossaboom, Roger A. "A Technique to Generalize Learning in Case Courses," *Journal of Financial Education*, 5 (Fall 1976), 65-68.
- Gitman, Lawrence J., William F. Lewis, and Rebecca M. J. Yates. "An Approach for Assessing, Selecting and Using Finance Cases," *Journal of Financial Education*, 16 (Fall 1987), 56-64.
- Henson, S. W., P. A. Kennett and K. N. Kennedy. "Web-Based Cases in Strategic Marketing," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 25 (December 2003), 250-259.
- Kalogeras, Gus. "In Defense of the Lecture Method of Instruction," *Journal of Financial Education*, 5 (Fall 1976), 45-47.
- Kester, George W., "A Group Project Approach to Teaching Finance Cases," *Journal of Financial Education*, 18 (Fall 1989), 38-42.
- Kester, George W., Scott A. Hoover, and Elton G. McGoun, "Cases versus Lectures: Undergraduate Student Perspectives," presented at the 2004 Financial Education Association 2004 Annual Meeting, Orlando, April 2004.
- Klein, Dan, and Brian Belt. "Prospecting for Finance Cases? Consider These Issues and Aids," *Journal of Financial Education*, 22 (Spring 1996), 30-36.
- Merry, Robert W. *The Usefulness of the Case Method for Training in Administration* (Boston Massachusetts, 1967), Intercollegiate Case Clearing House.
- O'Dell, William F. *And Once Again . . . The Case Method Revisited* (Boston Massachusetts, 1976), Intercollegiate Case Clearing House.
- Roulac, Stephen E. "The Use of the Case Method in Financial Education," *Journal of Financial Education*, 4 (Fall 1975), 63-71.
- Shapiro, Benson P. *An Introduction to the Case Method* (Boston, Massachusetts, 1976), Intercollegiate Case Clearing House.
- Simon, Simon M. "The Case Method Approach to Teaching Decision Making and Analysis," *Journal of Financial Education*, 8 (Fall 1979), 63-70.
- Singhvi, Surendra S., and Harsha B. Desai. "An Overview of the Case Method of Instruction," *Journal of Financial Education*, 6 (Fall 1977), 70-74.

Springate, David. "The Advantages of Early Student Exposure to Cases in Finance," *Journal of Financial Education*, 3 (Fall 1974), 73-75.

Trahan, Emery A. "Bridging the Theory-Practice Gap: An Integrated Case-Study Approach," *Financial Practice and Education*, 3 (Fall 1993), 19-22.

Viscione, Jerry A., and George Aragon. "The Case Method in Undergraduate Finance," *Journal of Financial Education*, 7 (Fall 1978), 49-52.