



FIRST YEAR STUDENTS EXPECTATIONS AND PREPAREDNESS IN UNIVERSITY

BushraNaoreen, Assistant Professor (Edu), GC University Faisalabad, Pakistan

Bnaoreen.gcu@gmail.com

ShamaielaMehboob Ali Farooqi, Lecturer (Edu), GC University Faisalabad, Pakistan

Noor Muhammad, Assistant Professor (Edu. Adjunct), University of Agricultural Faisalabad, Toba Tek Singh Campus, Noorasif490@gmail.com

SaminaKosar, M.Phil Scholar, GC University Faisalabad

Abstract- Purpose of this study was to know the “First Year Students Expectations and Preparedness in University” whereas some other demographic variable of the study were Institution status, programs, faculty and gender. The study was descriptive in nature. The population of study comprised of students at three universities faculty of Social sciences and Physical sciences. The sample of the study was 174 male and 147 female students. Questionnaire was developed by the researcher to conduct the study. The questionnaire was comprised of 41 items having 10 factors. After collecting the data, the data analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). Descriptive statistics was used for the description of trends in data. Independent sample t- test, and Pearson’s correlation were used to identify the perception of the respondents about First Year Students Expectations and Preparedness in the University. The findings of the study show that student’s readiness and expectations involvement has greater impact.

Keywords: Students, expectations, preparedness, university

I. INTRODUCTION

The world is kept on changing and new procedures and techniques take place in every career. Students want to investigate their expectations and preparedness of the quality of their learning experience and the academic standards of their chosen programs of study. Student expectations and preparedness of University may have an impact on the way they learn and their success and satisfaction within higher education. This recent situations provides illustrative examples of the issues affecting of student expectations and preparedness of regarding quality and standards in the first year of a funding model in District Faisalabad significantly different both to that in existence in previous years and to that operated in the other countries. These expectations may not be realistic and if the higher education institutions aren’t aware of, nor address students’ expectations, they will not be in a position to respond to them accordingly (Voss, Gruber, & Szmigin, 2007 Voss, Gruber & Szmigin (2007).

Students are the most challenging element in education. In a classroom, all students’ expectations are not same. They have different expectations, abilities, capabilities etc. Students’ expectations and preparedness are widely debated issues in higher education institutions worldwide. Student under-preparedness has become a dominant learning-related cause of the poor performance patterns in higher education, which is largely blamed on systemic faults of the University sector Bekhradnia (2013).

Students want to expect their learning environment to meet clear benchmarks across four areas: instrumental (computers and physical spaces); organizational (timetabling and course structure); interpersonal (staff support and engagement); and academic (lecturers’ knowledge and attitude towards students). Facilities and resources are central; if the institution is unable to effectively provide the environment in which the student can learn, it appears to be seen as failing in its mandate. Coates (2005).

Students are rapidly through back negatively on failures to get their expectations and preparedness. From one side to the other all subjects of study, the genuine purpose for students entering in higher education is to make better their future prospects and as a pathway for career intensify. Students want institutions to offer adjuration and guidance to help them in progressing their employability for next coming careers within and further their formal course. Students’ speak of needing to go further their degree to get the art and experience they would need for employment, highlighting the importance of extra-curricular activities, internships and work placement chances Gibbs (2012).

Students expect more relation with staff, both within the classroom chops and yonder. To students, troth is a mean of all students having chances to capture with course and institutional-based exercises, rather

than in a “representational” context. Students’ views employ more of “a partnership of aims” rather than “a partnership of means” with staff at a affiliate level, showing great sense of collaboration with staff, rather than large-scale, high-level partnership work.

It is probably that students’ expectations and preparedness are effect of their tactics, presence as well as their likelihood to drop out and around about security (Lobo & Gurney, 2014).These expectations were answered to in the form of the tutorial programs for the year, and the students’ satisfaction with the tutorial programs was observed and check through attendance and formal modification systems.

Long, Ferrier &Heagney(2006) explained that university plays a vital role in the life of students in higher education. University is a big jump for students because it is an overwhelm change. The life of the university is compound. Students must create the often encounter values related with their recent academic, family and social responsibilities in order to complete their university studies successfully and aggressively, while continue a life style that well pleased their personal and social requirements.

Students must get chances in university programs for dissimilar origins (Batchelor, 2006; Briggs, 2006) and their basis for including, or deductions, their studies are embarrassing (Zepke, 2006). The atmosphere of university is totally different for students. While these things are not basically negative in nature, students are lead to studying feelings separately in campus. Students expect that all staff and visitors are treated with students with courtesy and respect.

There is occasionally important difference between the students expectations and institutions are get together to offer. It comes into view because students have impractical expectations of what will appear during their time at university, it may also appear because lack of conception related with the information releasedby the institution about its environment or because the institution is directly un-acknowledged of students’ expectations. University service and teachers providers may make incorrect expectations about students’ requirements, as university move to provide information to students based on the institutional expectations not those of the student (Pithers& Holland 2006).

Student’s expectations have firm up effect on student arrangements and reservation (Longden, 2006). Institutions that are enhance in influencing student reservation grade need to approach the consequence from several directions. One of these is to apply better alignment between student expectations and the reality of first year expertise. This alignment is facilitated by either changing student’s expectations and to better match the reality of the university experience or by the institution changing some of its approaches to student’s commitment to better match the student’s requirements.

The university education has been found to be related range with students’ values and expectations about their programmed of study (Telford & Masson, 2005). Students expectations are affected by the type of university and the course they are studying, as they seek to range their course with “their perceived abilities, interests and personalities” (Byrne et al., 2012, p. 136).

Objectives of the Study

Objectives of the study were to:

1. find out the level of first year students expectations
2. study the level of first year students preparedness
3. investigate the effect of gender on students expectations and preparedness
4. correlate the relationship between students expectations and preparedness

II. METHOD

This research intends to discuss first year student’s expectations and preparedness in universities. This research was quantitative by nature. In this research the data were collected from 321 students of three public universities of district Faisalabad. In this research students were selected from two faculties: Social Sciences and Physical Sciences.Questionnaire was used as the tool to collect data. Questionnaire was comprised of 41 items on students’ readiness and expectations. Distribution of sample is as under:

Table 1

Distribution of sample on the basis of characteristics of sample

Characteristics	N=321
Universities	
Government Collage University Faisalabad	107 (33.3%)
University of Education Faisalabad	104(32.4%)
University of Agriculture Faisalabad	110(34.3%)
Faculty	
Social Sciences	155(48.3%)
Physical Sciences	166(51.7%)

Gender

Male	174(54.2%)
Female	147(45.8%)

The table 1 shows the descriptive analysis of sample on the basis of their characteristics for example, institution, faculty, gender and universities. The students belonged to Government University Faisalabad (107), University of Agriculture Faisalabad (110) and University of Education (104) Faisalabad. There were 45 % male and 54.2% female. Numbers of students were almost equal from two faculties.

III. FINDINGS

Table.2**Descriptive on Students' Expectations in university**

<i>Variables</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Expectations of research	321	2.80	.67
Expectations of Teachers	321	2.78	.66
Expectations of Students	321	2.81	.62
Expectations of University	321	2.84	.55
Expectations of similarity	321	2.63	.64
Expectations of time management	321	2.83	.63

Table 2 interprets the mean and SD values of all factors of first year student's expectations at university. The highest mean value of all these factors is ($M=2.84, SD=.55$) and the lowest value is ($M=2.63, SD=.64$).

Table.3**Descriptive on Students' Preparedness in university**

<i>Variables</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Readiness of information processing	321	2.90	.56
Readiness for collaborative learning	321	2.99	.66
Readiness for Teachers	321	3.04	.64
Readiness for time management	321	3.06	.58

Table 3 demonstrates the mean and SD values of all factors of first year student's preparedness/Readiness at university. The highest mean value of all these factors is ($M=3.06, SD=.58$) and the lowest value is ($M=2.90, SD=.56$).

Table 4**Gender Wise Differences on First year Students' Expectations in universities**

<i>Variables</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>sig</i>
Expectation of Research	Male	174	2.88	.69	319	2.21	.02*
	Female	147	2.71	.63			
Expectation of Teachers	Male	174	2.75	.76	319	-.79	.43
	Female	147	2.81	.52			
Expectation of Students	Male	174	2.81	.68	319	.20	.83
	Female	147	2.80	.55			

Expectation of university	Male	174	2.86	.60	319	.98	.32
	Female	147	2.80	.49			
Expectation of Similarity	Male	174	2.57	.69	319	.82	.04*
	Female	147	2.71	.58			
Expectation of time management	Male	174	2.86	.66	319		.41
	Female	147	2.80	.60			

This above table 4 explores that independent sample t-test was applied and the p-value of these factors 'Expectation of Research and Expectation of Similarity were significant at the level of .05. It means that the female and male students have mean differences in this 'Expectation Research' factor of the first year students' expectation in universities. But there were no significant difference among these factors Expectation of Teacher, Expectation of Students, Expectation of University and Expectation of time management. Hence, all of these factors have equal variances assumed between male and female mean scores because p-value was >.05 at significant level.

Table 5
Gender Wise Differences on the First year Students' Preparedness/Readiness in universities

Variables	Gender	N	M	SD	df	T	sig
Readiness for information process	Male	174	2.91	.60	319	.24	.80
	Female	147	2.89	.52			
Readiness for collaborative learning	Male	174	2.98	.69	319	.49	.61
	Female						
Readiness for Teachers	Male	147	3.01	.62	319	1.31	.18
	Female						
Readiness for Time management		174	3.09	.66	319	1.22	.22
	Male	147	2.99	.60			
	Female	147	3.02	.59			

Table 5 elaborates that independent sample t-test was used and value of this test showed that there was no significant difference in between male and female scores on these factors 'Readiness for information process, Readiness for collaborative Learning, Readiness for Teachers and Time management factors of the first year students' preparedness factors at universities. Hence, all of these factors have equal variances assumed between male and female mean score because p-value was $>.05$ at significant level.

Table 6
Faculty Wise Differences on the First year Students' Expectations in universities

Variables	Faculty	N	M	SD	df	T	sig
Expectation Research	Physical sciences	166	2.76	.67	319	-1.21	.22
	Social sciences	155	2.85	.66			
Expectation of Teachers	Physical sciences	166	2.78	.62	319	.01	.98
	Social sciences	155	2.78	.71			
Expectation of Students	Physical sciences	166	2.81	.64	319	1.83	.85
	Social sciences	155	2.80	.61			
Expectation of university	Physical sciences	166	2.84	.53	319	-.02	.98
	Social sciences	155	2.84	.58			
Expectation of Similarity	Physical sciences	166	2.66	.60	319	.85	.39
	Social sciences	155	2.60	.69			
Expectation of time management	Physical sciences	166	2.85	.60	319	.36	.71
	Social sciences	155	2.82	.67			

This above table 6 highlights the independent sample t-test was applied. There was mean insignificant difference between social sciences and physical sciences students' mean score on these factors 'Expectation of Research, Expectation of time management, Expectation of Teacher, Expectation of Students, Expectation of University and Expectation of Similarity 'first year students' expectation in universities'. It clears that the Social sciences and Physical sciences students have equality in mean score and also p-values were $>.05$ at significant level.

Table 7
Faculty Wise Differences on the First year Students' Preparedness/Readiness

Variables	Faculty	N	M	SD	df	T	sig
Readiness for information process	Physical sciences	166	2.89	.53	319	-.34	.73
	Social sciences	155	2.91	.60			
Readiness for collaborative	Physical	166	2.93	.64	319	-1.67	.09

learning	sciences						
Readiness for Teachers	Social sciences	155	3.06	.68	319	-1.06	.29
	Physical sciences	166	3.01	.61			
Readiness for Time management	Social sciences	155	3.08	.67	319	-1.72	.08
	Physical sciences	166	3.01	.58			
	Social sciences	155	3.12	.58			

Table 7 illustrates that independent sample t-test was used and value of this test showed that there was mean insignificant difference in between Physical sciences and Social sciences mean score on these 'Readiness for information process, Readiness for collaborative, Readiness for Teachers and Readiness for time management factors. Because in all these above mentioned factors of the first year students' preparedness at universities both faculty students (Physical sciences, Social sciences) have same mean scores and there p-values were >.05 at significant level.

Table 8
Correlation between Expectations and Readiness of first year students' expectations and preparedness in university

		Expectations	Readiness
First year students' expectation and preparedness factors at universities	R	1	.64**
	p		.00
	N	321	

Pearson correlation was applied to find relationship of 'Expectation' and 'Readiness' of first year students. As the result showed that there was significant positive and strong relationship between 'Expectation' and 'Readiness' as the (r=.64, p=.00).

IV. DISCUSSION

Results of the study show students' expectations and preparedness in university. Student's expectations and preparedness cannot fulfill according to their requirements. They do not express their ideas and knowledge due to their hesitation. The result is helped with the findings of Rausch and Hamilton (2006). In this research gender effects on students' expectations male students have more expectations as contrast to female students (expectations of research and expectations of similarity).

Female students have less interest in research activities, research projects, their senior work, their self-research work, previous tests, previous assignments and previous education. It seems that male and female students haven't same expectations of universities.

According to results of gender have effects on student's preparedness. Male and female students' have same opinions in their preparedness in university. It means male and female students of first year have same interest in preparedness such as ready to work in groups, good working effectively, confidential work, confidential discussion, to convey teacher message, understanding teacher's explanations etc. Morrow & Ackermann (2012) concluded that male and female students want to work together to gain their goals and objectives in the university. They want to apply collaborative strategies for the development of their skills and learning abilities.

According to this research faculty of physical science and social science have same opinion on student's expectations. The faculty of physical science and social science have same results on student's preparedness.

V. CONCLUSION

The current study investigated the first year students' expectations and preparedness in university and population of this research consisted on first year students at university level. The indicators of this research were related to first year students' expectations and preparedness at university. For this research study primary source of data was used and sample of 321 university students including 147 female and 174 male students were selected. Female and male students have mean differences in their 'Expectations of Research and Expectation of Time Management factors of the first year students' expectation in universities. In Expectation of Research factor male have high mean score then female first year students' expectation. And also in Expectation of Time Management factor male have high mean score then female first year students' expectation. Faculty Wise comparison among first year students' expectations analysis shows that there was a mean significant difference between the factors of Expectation of Research, Expectation of Teacher, Expectation of Students, Expectation of University, Expectation of Similarity, Expectations of time management.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

Following recommendations were made on the basis of the results of this research.

1. This research has provided good standards of first year student expectations and preparedness in university.
2. The administration of university should be providing good environment for students in which they express and share their ideas, knowledge and feelings without any hesitations.
3. University should be provided good chances to develop their confidence level and provided curricular and co-curricular activities for students. University also should be provided all facilities according to the requirement of student level such as free internet, pure water, good items of food, library etc.
4. University should be provided good opportunities of scholarship and internship for students so that they can get more education according to their wishes.
5. University should also be provided able and trained lecturers for students. Teachers should have to communicate their lectures in easy and simple words because students can easily understand and give them good responses.
6. Teachers should understand the temperament, problems and expressions of students and manage them in a good way. Students should also follow the rules and regulations of the university.

REFERENCES

1. Byrne, M. and Flood, B. (2005), "A study of accounting students' motives, expectations and preparedness for higher education", *Journal of Further and Higher Education*.
2. Batchelor, D. (2006). Becoming what you want to be. *London Review of Education*, 4 (3), 225-238.
3. Bekhradnia, B.(2013).The academic experience of students in English universities 2013 report.London: HEPI.
4. Coates, H. (2005).The value of Student Engagement for Higher Education Quality Assurance.*Quality in Higher Education*, 11(1), pp. 25-36.
5. Gibbs, G. (2010). *Dimensions of quality*. York: Higher Education Academy.
6. Long, M., Ferrier, F., &Heagney, M. (2006). Stay, play or give it away? Students continuing, changing or leaving university study in their first year.Department Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.
7. Lobo, A., & Gurney, L. (2014). What did they expect? Exploring a link between students' expectations, attendance and attrition on English language enhancement courses.*Journal of Further and Higher Education*
8. Longden, B. (2006). An Institutional Response to Changing Student Expectations and their Impact on Retention Rates.*Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 28(2), 173-187.
9. Abbas, F., Jalil, M. K., Zaki, H. N. &Irfan, F. (2020). Implicit measure of language attitude: study of Punjabi native speakers by using matched guise technique. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 13 (1), 194-206.

11. Ahmed, S., Abbas, F., Jalil, M. K. & Ahmad, M. (2019) Language Anxiety as a Detrimental Factor in English Language Learning: A Survey of Religious Madaris. *Al Qalam*, 24 (2), 346-363.
12. Abbas, F. & Iqbal, Z. (2018). Language Attitude of the Pakistani Youth towards English, Urdu and Punjabi: A Comparative Study. *Pakistan Journal of Distance and Online Learning*, 4 (1), 199-214.
13. Pithers, B. & Holland, T. (2006). Student Expectations and the Effect of Experience. Australian Association for Research in Education Conference, Adelaide, Australia.
14. Telford, R., & Masson, R. (2005). The congruence of quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance Education*.
15. Voss, R., Gruber, T., & Szmigin, I. (2007). Service quality in higher education: The role of student expectations. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(9), 949-959.
16. Zepke, N. (2006). Being learner centered: one way to improve student retention? *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(5), 587-600.