

# An Assessment of Challenges and Prospects of Freshman Students Orientation for Department Choice: The Case of Jimma University

Tadesse Regassa<sup>1,\*</sup>, Worku Fentie<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Educational Planning and Management Director, Institute of Teacher Education Jimma, Ethiopia

<sup>2</sup>Department of Teacher Education Lecturer, Institute of Education Jimma University Jimma, Ethiopia

**Abstract** The purpose of the study was to assess the nature of orientation given for admission of freshman students with particular emphasis to the then Education Faculty and Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Jimma University. Besides, factors that affect the process negatively were also dimension of the study. To this end, descriptive research method was employed. The study population was second and third year students of the two colleges and then departments' heads; the instruments used to collect data were questionnaire (students), interview schedule (departments' heads) and observation of an orientation held at the beginning of 2009. The data tallied and tabulated were analyzed using descriptive statistics. As the result, what was found is that the orientation given to students seems to be advertisements in the intention to win as many students as possible which is attributed to absence of well-established rules and regulations coupled with lack of a structure which administers and controls the process. So, establishing rules and regulations for admission and orientation at college /university level and placing a structure that administers the entire process with responsibility and accountability is believed to substantially alleviate the problems prevailing.

**Keywords** Nature of Orientation, Admission of Freshman Students, Orientation, Advertisement, Practical Orientation Observation

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Background

As a matter of fact, when students enter university, they are supposed to choose their departments. To this end, departments' representatives give orientation for admission about their respective departments.

Representatives are expected to brief students in the most crucial areas of the discipline. Among most important, for example, the type of courses given, the nature of those courses and expected students' background (in terms of knowledge, skills and experiences) and the likely career they will have as a result (excluding Education Faculty graduates by then in most cases) are some.

The orientation provision is so crucial in that the vast majority of the new entrants are so young with limited experience but variety of interests. They may not be in a position to pick out departments that suit them best on the basis of their academic background and the occupations they want to join.

In this regard, in our University, particularly, in the then Faculty of Education and Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, orientation is given year to year. But, from experience, in these faculties, so far, the orientations have had a tendency to be a platform of competition for more number of students and unnecessary advertisement of departments. They were mis-leading and deceptive. Some department representatives used to boast that their department is superior in all respects and graduates are 'fresh cakes' in the market that their job seeking task is much simpler. This doesn't seem orientation. Rather, it is preaching that misunderstands and neglects the primary objective of orientation. As it distorts or misuse the aim of orientation, it will have a devastating consequence on students' academic life and the world of work. Further, this in turn can cause wastage of education.

### 1.2. Statement of the Problem

Freshman students' orientation for admission prior to department choice is believed to be helpful in their academic life and world of work. Well oriented students can make wise decisions.

They can choose departments that suit them best in fulfilling short and long-term aspirations. Their success is highly dependent upon the decisions they make at this particular moment. In relation to this, Aggarwal (2004) says

\* Corresponding author:

regassa2007@yahoo.com (Tadesse Regassa)

Published online at <http://journal.sapub.org/edu>

Copyright © 2013 Scientific & Academic Publishing. All Rights Reserved



admission to higher education should be linked to talent and aptitude, and also promote the right of the individual to life long learning or to study to the highest extent he is capable. There fore, in this respect, the responsibility of department representatives who deliver the orientation is very high.

However, the orientations used to be given in the past are not the type they had to be. They are kind of orientations that may hamper students' academic achievement and their world of work and violates professional ethics as well. They may even go to the extent of causing wastage in education. On the whole, it is not fair. Nevertheless, the extent this problem (practice) has affected students' academic life and whether or not this situation is recognized as a problem by stake holders and whether those who give the orientation do this from sheer miss-understanding of the objective of orientation hasn't been researched. All these points triggered interest on the part of the researchers to make investigation on the prevalence and causes of the problem and to find out some possible solutions for suggestion.

### 1.3. Objective of the Study

The practice of orienting students before they choose departments is to enable students make informed- decisions. As opposed to this, forgetting the objective of orientation, departments' representatives deliver information that doesn't help students choose appropriate departments or field of study. One way or another, this brings about bad consequences. So, the research had the following objectives to attain:

#### 1.3.1. General Objective

- To enable departments representatives give appropriate orientations that help students choose appropriate departments on the basis of their background and interest.

#### 1.3.2. Specific Objectives

- To uncover the causes of the problem in relation to students orientation.
- To make awareness among stakeholders about the importance of appropriate orientation for admission provision.
- To sensitize decision-makers reverse the situation.
- To be sure whether the problem is prevailing.

### 1.4. Research Questions

In order to attain the aforementioned objectives, the following basic questions need to be answered:

- Are the orientations being given fair?
- Why are the orientations being given unfair (if they are?)
- Are the orientations mis-leading students?

### 1.5. Significance of the Study

The outcome of the study has a lot to do. It shows whether the orientations being given are helpful to students make wise decisions in their choice. And the factors that negatively affect the orientation provision could be revealed so that

some corrective measures can be made. Over all, showing the status of the orientation provision in the aspects discussed earlier and to sensitize all the stake holders to take measures to reverse the unnecessary practices in relation to provision of orientations are the benefits of stakeholders.

### 1.6. Scope of the Study

The study was undertaken in Jimma University. The then Faculty of Education and Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities are those included in the study.

The study assessed the nature of orientations provided ahead of department choice and the factors that negatively affect the orientations given to students.

### 1.7. Limitation of the Study

During the time of undertaking the research, the most challenging problem was unavailability of related literature and absence of research findings on related problems.

The study has taken much more time than expected due to some problems which were beyond the control of the researchers. Further, more faculties (even a university or two) could have been included. But due to financial and time constraints the researchers were forced to limit its scope as explained above and extended the schedule that might have an impact on the quality and reliability of the research outcome.

### 1.8. Operational Definition of Terms

#### 1.8.1. Orientation

It is the process in which departments representatives give short speech about their respective departments. In the process they are to deliver all the necessary information about the department so that the fresh man students benefit from it by making informed-decision. In this regard, those who give the orientation have to inform the students the specific knowledge and skills their departments require to succeed. Beside this, it is important to note that inclination to study in the departments is essential. Then, it is more likely that the students choose the 'right' departments.

#### 1.8.2. Fair Orientation

It is referring to the status of the orientation given .It is meant the orientation to be given must be free from personal bias of the individuals who give the orientations. Representatives have the responsibility to give genuine information about their departments. They need to explicitly inform the students about the peculiar educational background the students need to have to join each and every department. It is meant not to use the time to advertise about departments to summon as many students as possible personal/department benefit.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1. The Nature of Orientation for Admission



A faculty or department, from experience, has responsibility to give orientation of guidance and pre-entry information for admission of new students. A student comes to an institution with a set of expectations concerning the way they will be treated, what they will have to learn and the environment in which they will learn it. Many come with career aspirations, therefore, the general objective of orientation for admission must be in such a way that it enables new entrants in faculties, schools or institutions make informed choices. They come with different educational and socio-economic backgrounds and different psychological make-ups. So that there is no question that, their stream choices are highly affected by this. The orientation must be providing support to make them feel welcomed members of the academic community. This situation makes the role of a well-thought orientation imperative. Orientation for admission needs to be fair. Admission of this nature provides equal opportunity for all entrants to join departments they want on the basis of their ability and aspirations (Schwartz, 2004). Given this condition, the chance to demonstrate abilities and performing to ones potential is most likely on the part of the students. Orientation must be a type that shows the necessary skills and knowledge background a student needs to have to join a field of study. Success and performing to one's potential is dependent upon one's background, experience and aspiration.

To this end, the fairness of orientation, which can be achieved through establishing procedures and criteria at institute level, is unquestionable.

Applicants should be selected on merit. This could mean admitting applicants with the highest in examination or it could mean taking a more holistic view of an applicant's achievement and potential, looking as an individual taking into all relevant factors including background. ([www.admissions.review.org.uk](http://www.admissions.review.org.uk)). Although the interpretation of merit is a matter for individual institutions, each institutions interpretation of merit should be made explicit in its admission policy (ibid).

According to Schwartz (2004), the principles of fair orientation for admissions include transparency; minimal dropout and professionalism of the processes are the most important among the many.

The experience of higher institutions in some countries tells us this. For example, in Aberdeen University, students choose departments and admitted after receiving the necessary advice and guidance by a centrally based organ called SRAS. The centre gives orientation for each degree which is represented by a selector and each has executive power to act on behalf of the university (<http://www.phd.stu.se>). The practice extends to the extent of exchange of students between universities and colleges of Canada and USA on the basis of suitability of those institutions for individual students. The process involves at least two members of the institutions' staff who will have received instructions, advice and guidance in respect of orientations and admissions procedures. This enables the

institution to assure itself that balanced and independent admission decisions be made. This is exemplary. An orienteer (who represents a department in our case), needs to be neutral so that, she/he briefs the new students with the necessary advice and guidance in relation to the disciplines. Orientation of students for admission is not an advertisement. Then, students make wise decisions: they choose the departments they fit best. If it is not so, it is unethical and the consequence would be catastrophic. It will not enable to match the right students with the right departments either. It may go to the extent causing wastage of education, as scholars call it.

To avoid this, Abeya, 2008; highlighted, institutions need to have clear rules and regulations for admissions. Once this is established, we minimize the chance to mislead students to join "wrong departments" in the pretext of orientation for admission.

The underlying rationale of orientation is helping students enter fields that fit them best on the basis of their background and interest. In so doing, training programs become successful. As a guarantee of this, faculties (universities in general) need to have rules and regulations that ensure orientations are given in line with department, faculty or university objectives. Such a practice bears the desired fruit and makes a difference in the success of programmes and in the lives of beneficiaries in general [1].

## 2.2. The Essence of Orientation for Admission

Basically, orientation for admission is a task underway to make students' expectations compatible with what they experience in actuality in universities. According to Billing (1997:125 in Forrester, 2004:3), new students are often disorient when they arrive at university and required to adapt socially and intellectually. According to a research (Ulster, 2002), the lack of compatibility between what a student expects and what a university provides makes students leave universities, i.e., lack of preparedness among students.

Providing students with a more comprehensive and integral introduction to their studies helps alleviate potential anxieties, enabling students to make early connections with their courses /departments and progress successfully with their studies. It would seem that how students are introduced is vital if successful progression and completion is to be assured (Ludwig-Hardman and Dunlup, 2003 in Forrester, 2004:3).

When we overview our orientation in view of this finding, it is going to be a centre of worry. Orientation sessions have been advertisements, an advertisement to summon many students to a department. Overall, in the past, it has been believed to be unethical, unprofessional and misleading.

Instead, those who give the orientation should have informed their informants about the necessary preparation or background students should have to join a department an orienteer represents. They need to do this for the benefit of all stakeholders. That is why in orientation for admission there must be an emphasis on the provision of an adequate bridge between students' prior experience, expectations and



those traits which is believed to be desirable in tertiary education (ibid).

According to some research findings, the quality of orientation for admission increases student's integration into and commitment to the institution and its goals and thereby influences student performance and retention (Rivis, 1977; Carter and. McNeil, 1998; Frame, 2001 et al in Forrester, 2004:3).

In principle, orientation for admission is given on the assumption that departments absorb fit students that every student admitted is academically capable of completing the qualification for which they are enrolled. So, one can imagine the consequences of failure of orientations to serve their purposes. As some studies noted, students' retention is promoted by ensuring compatibility between student expectation and their actual experience. It is important; therefore, that contact with students prior to entry conveys a realistic view of the department experience and brings quality.

### 3. Research Design

#### 3.1. Study Population

The target population of the study was both students and departments' heads (departments' representatives) of the then Education Faculty and Social Sciences and Humanities Faculty of Jimma University.

Specifically, second and third year students and departments' heads of the two faculties were sources of data. The assumption is that while senior students had enough experiences of the effects of orientation than junior students, departments' representatives, too, had the proximity to the issue understudy and gave orientation at least once or more.

#### 3.2. Sampling

##### Sample Size

The number of students' samples and departments' representatives from the two faculties is as follows: Students in Education Faculty, of the eleven departments' students, four departments from which 30% of students (both second year and third year students) and from faculty of social sciences and humanities, of the four departments, two departments of which 30% of the students were taken.

##### Sampling Techniques

The sampling techniques employed to pick up representative sample departments from the faculties were simple random sampling and purposive sampling to Faculty of Education and Faculty of Social sciences and Humanities respectively. From the chosen departments, sample students were taken using stratified sampling and simple random sampling.

With Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, ignoring departments that had no senior students (second and third year students), only two departments, i.e. Psychology and Sociology were taken. Because to see the nature of the

orientations given and its effect on students, second and third year students of these departments had the upper hand in experience to tell than other departments students with limited experience. But with regard to Education Faculty, all departments considered because all of them had senior students. Then, 30% of the students from the selected departments were taken in each batch. This is done in such a way that lists of students of the two batches were taken from the departments and those students who are numbered odd in their respective lists taken representatives.

As to departments' representatives, 50% of them considered in both cases. And while education faculty interviewees were chosen on availability basis, those from the other faculty were taken and interviewed purposively.

#### 3.3. Method

The method used to carry out this research work was descriptive as it enables to describe what is actually happening or happened.

##### Instruments

The necessary data from respondents were collected through questionnaire, observation and interview. While questionnaire was used for students' respondents, department heads were interviewed. The heads were, also, observed while they were giving orientation.

As to departments' representatives, 50% of them considered in both cases. And while education faculty interviewees were chosen on availability basis, those from the other faculty were taken and interviewed purposively.

The raw data collected from the respondents were surveyed for omissions and errors of responses. Then, the data represented by symbols for further analysis. Being represented by symbols, the data reduced and classified so that they were made to give (show) relationships or meaning. Finally, the data were tabulated so that they were found to be convenient for the application of appropriate statistical methods. The statistical methods employed were descriptive statistics.

#### 3.4. Ethical Consideration

Prior to the commencement of the research task formally, the researchers obtained a formal recommendation letter from the University, then departments heads in the two faculties consulted and a thorough discussion about the research, the participants and the way it is conducted held.

Explaining the objective of the research, its significance to stakeholders and promising confidentiality when necessary, it was promised the heads' and the sampled students' consent were asked and those who weren't not voluntary excluded from the target population.

In the end, the research outcome communicated to the research populations and faculty members.

#### 3.5. Method of Data Presentation and Discussion

The raw data collected from the respondents were surveyed for omissions and errors of responses. Then, the



The statistical methods employed were descriptive statistics.

### 4.1. Presentation

To this end, questionnaire, interview and observation were instruments used to collect data.

Of the respondents, 36(90%) responded that the orientation given is a well-thought one, the remaining 4(10%)

As the fulfillment of students department choice following the orientation, 23(67.6%) and 5(14.7%) responded that they got their first and second choice respectively. Other two groups of 2(5.8%) students in order responded that they got their third and fourth choices.

Item no.	Responses			Remark
	yes	No	Total	
1	36(90%)	4(10%)	40(%)	

Item no	responses			Remark
	yes	no	total	
2	25(62.5%)	15(37.5%)	40(100%)	

Item no	Responses					Remark
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	neither	
4	23(67.6%)	5(14.7%)	2(5.8%)	2(5.8%)	-----	

[illegible]



On the orientation given, 2(16.6%) of the orienters talked about the staff profile in the department, the curriculum designed by the department, and about having a PhD holder who is the College Dean. Here, the structure of the departments, the seniority of the academic staff (in teaching and research), and what looks like being graduates of the departments are the most stressed or important topics of the orientation. 1(8.3%) of the orientation giving team stressed the importance of students interest as basic to choose departments. Others, 5(41.6%) departments' representatives gave orientations that remind students to choose their respective departments on the basis of their background.

Expected career aspirations and prospect job opportunity were considered by 1(8.3%) of the team each respectively. While nature of courses in the department is mentioned as important consideration to choose departments by 5(41.6%) of the team, the majority of the representatives, i.e. 7 (58.3 %), was defining what the department is all about, expressing the degree of success the recent graduates ,in the department, have enjoyed in securing jobs.

Two departments had no representatives; while the other 2(16.6%) departments' orientation was in Afan Oromo – which the observer couldn't comment on due to language barrier.

#### 4.1.2. Factors that Affect the Orientations Given

**Table 5.** On factors that affect the orientation given/presence of orientation for admission policy

Departments	Responses								
	Q1			Q2			Q4		
	Yes	No	Don't know	Yes	No	Don't know	yes	No	Don't know
Amharic			√	√				√	
Pedagogy		√			√			√	
English		√			√			√	
Psychology		√			√			√	
Geography			√		√			√	
Government and Development		√			√			√	
History			√		√			√	
Math's	√			√				√	
<b>Total</b>	<b>1(12.5%)</b>	<b>4(50%)</b>	<b>3(37.5%)</b>	<b>2(25%)</b>	<b>6(75%)</b>	<b>—</b>		<b>8(100%)</b>	

**Table 6.** Criteria used by departments to admit students (interview of department heads)

Departments	Criteria									
	Transcript	GPA	Sex	Interest (choice)	Entrance exam	MoE fixed	Registrar fixed	Regional background	No criteria	Lang. Capability
Amharic	√	√								
Pedagogy		√	√					√		
English		√		√						
Psychology		√		√						
Geography		√		√						
Gov.&Dev.						√	√			
History		√	√	√						√
Math									√	
<b>Total</b>	<b>1(12.5%)</b>	<b>6(75%)</b>	<b>2(25%)</b>	<b>4(50%)</b>	<b>----- --</b>	<b>1(12.5%)</b>	<b>1(12.5%)</b>	<b>1(12.5%)</b>	<b>1(12.5%)</b>	<b>1(12.5%)</b>



The above table is on whether admission policies, procedures for complaints and appeals, and structure across college/university for orientation and admission are present respectively (instructors' respondents).

Of the instructors, only 1 (12.5%) said that there is admission policy. While half of the respondents 4(50%) responded that there are no admission policies, the remaining 3(37.5%) respondents claim that they don't know whether there are. These respondents are (were) departments heads who at least once or more gave orientation to help students choose appropriate departments.

On the other hand, it is only 2(25%) of the respondents that said there are procedures for handling complaints and appeals. But the majority i.e. 6(75%) responded that there are no procedures for handling complaints and appeals.

Besides, on the presence of a structure which administers and stands responsible for admission orientation undertakings, all i.e. 8 (100%) of the respondents replied that there is nobody, in structure, solely responsible to administer orientation provision and accountable for any malpractice in the process.

#### 4.1.3. Criteria Used by Departments to Admit Students

**N.B.** Sports science department used entrance exam to screen students.

While 2(25%) of respondents said that they consider sex to choose students, 4(50%) responded that they take students choice/interests to admit. But, the vast majority of respondents, i.e., 8(75%) replied GPA is the criterion they use to choose/admit students. Transcript, regional background and language capability are said to be the criteria by 1(12.5%) each. While 1(12.5%) of respondents claim that their students are assigned by the MoE and the Registrar office each, 1 (12.5%) respondent said that there are no criteria used to screen students.

## 4.2. Discussion

On the nature of the orientation, the vast majority of students believe that the orientation was a well-thought one. And that seems to be the reason that many of students think they are/were influenced much by it for good. The data show that the number of students who got their first choice is by far greater than the sum total of students who got their second, third and fourth choice.

Though, overall, the data show many students got their first and second choice in order because they were well-informed, one might say. But there is something interesting. The students might got their choices but that doesn't mean those who got their first and second choice are the students that suit the departments they join best. Secondly, the content of the orientation given by representatives considerably differs from department to department. And the parameters used by different departments vary to some degree. If this is the case, what the respondents say seem to be unreliable that the orientation given to them was a well-thought one. Besides, though departments' representatives mentioned a number of criteria

that are used to choose students in their respective departments, the experience (especially, the observation of the orientation) of the researchers' contradict this. Even though there had been some who were concerned of students background experience, interest, potential etc. to mention during the orientation, majority departments' heads and instructors worry was the number / quantity of students who join their departments. That is why the majority of representatives' topics of discussion were advertisements. Talking about the title of the college's dean who belongs to the department, the number of staff with PhD and master's degree and the job prospects of graduates, to some degree, might be important to mention. But, in contrast to indicating the necessary inputs students need to have to join a department, it is far less important to the purpose.

According to scholars, orientation of this nature is unfair. An orientation for admission needs to be fair. Such orientation provides equal opportunity for all entrants to join departments on the basis of their ability and aspirations (Schwartz, 2004). Given this condition, the chance to demonstrate abilities and performing to one's potential is most likely (ibid). Besides, providing students with a more comprehensive and integral introduction to their studies helps alleviate potential anxieties, enabling students to make early connections with their courses /departments and progress successfully with their studies. It would seem that how students are introduced is vital if successful progression and completion is to be assured (Ludwig-Hardman and Dunlup, 2003 in Forrester, 2004:3). In this regard, what is clearly observed is that different departments said they use different parameters to admit students. Few have nothing. There was only one department which tried to use a holistic approach to admit students. i.e, in addition to interest, as the representative disclosed, the department was keen to apply entrance exam to screen students. One thing undeniable is that each department could set extra (apart from the ones at college/university level if available) parameters on the basis of the nature of the department (courses given). But it doesn't necessarily mean that each department will have a complete different admission rules and procedures.

However, the criteria used by departments in the two colleges are inconsistent. Example, some use transcript, regional background, sex, language proficiency or GPA. Yet, no one seems to substantiate why some parameters are preferred to others. Or on what basis the parameters are set. For example, some departments use sex and regional background. May be, this is to adhere to the Government's policy of affirmative action and favoring the underprivileged regions. If this is the case, what about the other departments? What is peculiar to the departments that use from those which don't use? So why are they considered by few and ignored by many departments? As long as there might be students who choose the departments that don't apply the above criteria as parameters, the students who come from regions that seek special attention would be neglected. Above all, it shows the inconsistency of the practice between and within colleges. Equally, important the majority of



departments' representatives said GPA is the main criterion in addition to others while a department used transcript to choose students. Transcript, if used for reliability, might not be more than the National Examination result at grade 12. Some departments said that they see English proficiency. But, as long as, the researchers' experience, no department can come out with evidence that shows it practices it. If this means looking at the students' English grade at national examination, it may not necessarily show who the student is. Still, there are departments which take students who choose their departments without criteria set. This is done in the intention to intake as many students as possible. It is a practice that undermines the importance of students' background characteristics which have a bearing on their success rate and quality of education.

On the other hand, when we see the availability of necessary documents on orientation for admission at college /university level, there is none. There was only one respondent who claimed there is policy. Other departments representatives, either they are sure there are no or they don't know whether there are. In both cases what one can see is that there are no rules and regulations that guide the process. But the respondents are (were) departments heads who at least once or more gave orientation to help students choose departments.

With no admission policies, according to the majority of respondents, as indicated, it is difficult to give orientation. To give orientation for admission there must be ground rules and principles by which it is governed. As a result, there will be consistency between the orientations given by different orientators from time to time. There must also be procedures for handling complaints and appeals. Otherwise, there will be every chance of orientation to be advertisement in the intention to attract more students as well as handling same complaints and appeal differently. And the likelihood of complaints and appeals rises.

Individual complaints and appeals in the colleges were used to be entertained on individual interest basis of departments' heads or college deans. And the solutions given to same cases were said to be different. There is no structure responsible to orientation for admission and accountable for any malpractice and wrong doings. Such practice is liable to bias, nepotism and subjectivity.

This is true in the past a department head is the one who gives orientation by default. If he is unable to, he delegates with no rules and regulations to follow. But, the experience of the well advanced nations is different. Success and performing to one's potential is dependent on one's background, experience and aspiration. To this end, the fairness of orientation which can be achieved through establishing principles and criteria at institute level is unquestionable. Applicants should be selected on merit basis. This could mean admitting students with the highest in examination result or it could mean taking a more holistic view of an applicant's achievement and potential, looking at an individual taking into account all relevant factors

including background( [www.admissionsreview.org](http://www.admissionsreview.org) .UK -2010).

Although the interpretation of merit is a matter for individual institutions interpretations, each institution's interpretation of merit should be made explicit in its admission policy (ibid).

In confirmation of the above scholars' idea, Abeya [1] indicated that institutions need to have clear rules and regulations for admission. Once this is established, the room to mislead students in name of orientation will be minimal.

## 5. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendation

### 5.1. Summary

The study was aimed to assess the nature of orientation of freshman students for admission and factors contributing to the malpractice in the process. To this end, descriptive research method was employed. The research questions tried to answer to achieve the objective are:

- Are the orientations given fair?
- Why are the orientations given unfair (if they are)?
- Are the orientations misleading students?

The study populations were students and departments heads of the then Faculty of Education and the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities. The data collecting instruments used are questionnaire, interview and orientation observation. While questionnaire was administered to students, then departments' heads were interviewed and observed while they were giving observation at students cafeteria Hall.

Students' respondents in an overwhelming majority replied that the orientation they underwent was a well –thought one which influenced them make decisions for good. Departments' heads interview showed that different departments used different criteria to admit students. A department head replied that students for the department were assigned by the MoE. Another department head also said the department had no specific criteria set rather it admits all that apply.

Of the criteria mentioned by departments heads include sex, regional background, GPA, transcript, English language proficiency, interest/ choice and entrance exam are some. Of all the criteria, GPA stood first being used by 75% of the respondents. Others including transcript, regional background and English language proficiency are mentioned as criteria by 2.5% of the respondents each. But another 2.5% respondents replied that there are no criteria used rather admit all those who apply.

But, during the orientation the representatives focus points were staff profile, interest of students, background of students, career prospects, job opportunity, nature of courses given and advertisement-like explanations used in the intention of attracting more students and structure of departments. Of all these, the most stressed point by the



58.3 % of those who gave the orientation was the degree of success recent graduates of the departments have enjoyed. Background of students and nature of courses given in the departments appear second equally by 41.5%. However, a department expressed to admit students on interest basis and entrance examination.

#### 5.1.1. Fairness of the Orientation Given

Students' respondents in an overwhelming majority replied that the orientation they underwent was a well-thought one which influenced them make decisions for good. Departments' heads interview showed that different departments used different criteria to admit students. A department head replied that students for the department were assigned by the MoE. Another department head also said the department had no specific criteria set rather it admits all that apply.

Of the criteria mentioned by departments heads include sex, regional background, GPA, transcript, English language proficiency, interest/ choice and entrance exam are some. Of all the criteria, GPA stood first being used by 75% of the respondents. Others including transcript, regional background and English language proficiency are mentioned as criteria by 2.5% of the respondents each. But another 2.5% respondents replied that there are no criteria used rather admit all those who apply.

But, during the orientation the representatives focus points were staff profile, interest of students, background of students, career prospects, job opportunity, nature of courses given and advertisement-like explanations used in the intention of attracting more students and structure of departments. Of all these, the most stressed point by the 58.3 % of those who gave the orientation was the degree of success recent graduates of the departments have enjoyed. Background of students and nature of courses given in the departments appear second equally by 41.5%. However, a department expressed to admit students on interest basis and entrance examination.

#### 5.2. Conclusions

Based on the findings, the following conclusions are made.

- The orientations given for admission are not fair.
- The orientations given are misleading students.
- The contributing factors for the orientations to be unfair are absence of well established and recognized admission rules and regulations at college /university level by which the overall process and those who give the orientation are governed.
- The other factor is absence of a structure solely responsible to administer and control the process.

#### 5.3. Recommendations

Based on the conclusions made, the following recommendations are suggested.

In relation to orientation irregularities:

- Establishing well-documented rules and regulation by which the overall processes and activities governed at college/university level may alleviate the problem substantially.
- The University/colleges may delegate to a structure from the management that solely heads the process with responsibility and accountability.
- Departments need to set official criteria by which they admit students apart from the one at college/ university level.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, we would like to thank our University for its financial aid to the research undertaking.

We also extend our thanks to those who cooperated to deliver the necessary data.

## Appendix -A

### Questionnaire

The questionnaire is designed to collect data on the over all process of orientation provision for admission of freshman students. Therefore, you are kindly requested to give genuine responses for each item.

Thank you.

Personal information;

Department: -----

Year/area: -----

Sex : -----

**Instruction:** answer the objective questions by encircling the letter of your choice and writing short responses for those open-ended.

1. Was the orientation for department choice a well-thought one?

A. yes                      B. No.

2. Has the orientation influenced your choice?

A. yes                      B. No.

3. The influence of the orientation for you was:

A. negative                B. positive

4. If your response to item no 3 is positive, which of your choice is fulfilled?

A. First                    B. second                C. third

D. fourth                E. none

5. If you joined the department you wanted to, how much did the orientation help you in your decision?

A. highly                B. not significant        C. not sure

6. Why did you join the department you are in?

A. Because you are assigned to.

B. Because you chose it to join.

7. If you are in a department you chose to join, what was the reason you got your choice?

A. Because you have good background.

B. Because you have good result.

C. Because you think of good job opportunity prospect.

8. Is your grade, so far, good?



A. Yes B. no

9. If your response to item no 8 is 'yes', what is the reason do you think?

A. Because you joined the department you chose to.

B. Because you studied very hard.

If any other, specify: -----

10. If your response to item number '8' is 'no', why?

-----

11. Generally, to what extent the orientation given by departments' representatives is helping students to make wise decisions?

A. very high B. high C. not sure to label

12. Do you think that this kind of orientation should continue? Why?

-----

13. What other areas should be treated in the provision of orientation besides what you have experienced?

-----

## Appendix –B

### Interview schedule to departments' representatives (Education Faculty).

1. Are there admission policies and guidelines?
2. Are there procedures for complaints and appeals?
3. Is training and induction given on orientation for admission given to the staff that gives orientation?
4. Is there a line of responsibility across college/university for orientation to admission?
5. Are students admitted on the basis of merit?
6. What is/are the criterion/criteria of admission?
7. Are there resources allocated for admission orientation?
8. Is there a structure in place that administers and responsible for orientation and admission?
9. Are there do's and don't do's for orientation providers?

10. Do the orientations given match the objectives of orientation?

## REFERENCES

- [1] Abaya Geleta (2008). Strengthening the Capacity of Jimma Teachers' College to Become a centre of Excellence in Adult and Non-Formal Education: Feasible interventions against the Key Challenges. Jimma Teachers' College Research and Publication Office. Jimma.
- [2] Best, W. John et. al., (2003). Research in Education (9th Edition). Pearson Prentice Hall NY.
- [3] Glatthorn, Allan and Joyner Randy L. (2005) : Writing the Winning Thesis or Dissertation : A Step-by -Step Guide (2nd. ed ) . Corwin Press .
- [4] IIZ/DVV East Africa Regional Office (2004). Training for Adult and Non-formal Education: The Case of Jimma Teachers' College. IIZ/DVV Addis Ababa.
- [5] Kelly, A. (1977). The Curriculum: Theory and Practice. Harper and Row. London.
- [6] Kyriacou, Chris (2001). Essential Teaching skills (2nd Edition ). Nelson Thomas Ltd. Cheltenham.
- [7] MoE.(1994). Education and Training Policy of Ethiopia. MoE Addis Ababa
- [8] Tyson, Shaun, et. al., (1997). Human Resources Management. Butterworth. H. Great Britain.
- [9] UNESCO (1997). Fifth International Conference on Adult Education. UNESCO, Hamburg.
- [10] Watson David et al. (2005). Managing Institutional Self Study. MPG Books Ltd. Cornwall.
- [11] Youngman, F. (2005). "Making a Difference: Development Agendas and the Training of Adult Educators". IIZ/DVV, No. 55.