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METHOD AND PROCEDURE
METHOD AND PROCEDURE

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The present problem is entitled as:

‘EVALUATION OF GUIDANCE SERVICES AT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING IN ETHIOPIA’.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The present study involves ‘Summative Evaluation’. It is intended to evaluate the effectiveness of guidance services in Institutions of Higher Learning in Ethiopia in the light of criteria formulated to evaluate in the study and the objective of organizing guidance services in Institutions of Higher Learning in Ethiopia. The purpose is to find out the nature of services provided and their strengths and weaknesses with a view to improve upon the present situation. An evaluation of ‘Guidance Program in General’ and the evaluation of ‘Specific Guidance Services’ i.e., appraisal, information, counselling, placement, follow-up, and research and evaluation would be carried out separately.

Descriptive Survey Method was followed to conduct the study, which involved collection of data through administering various tools and techniques such as (i) questionnaire (ii) interview schedules and (iii) checklist.

The study was designed to collect data from the Policy Makers, Benefactors and Beneficiaries (Details in FIG.4.1). Criteria for the selection of different evaluators have been explained under ‘Sample for the Study’ (p. 100). Data was to be collected from Federal and Regional government owned Institutions of Higher Learning as well as ‘Ranked Good’ and ‘Ranked Average’ Institutions of Higher Learning in Ethiopia.
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The statistical design involved adding up the frequencies of positive responses, calculating percentages and finding out the significance of difference between percentages.

FIG. 4.1: DESIGN OF THE PRESENT STUDY

DESIGN

POLICY MAKERS  |  BENEFACTORS  |  BENEFICIARIES

Ministry of Education Officials  |  Guidance Administrators Teachers Students

HYPOTHESES

The following hypotheses were formulated to be tested in the study.

I. ‘Guidance Programme in General’ is not being carried out effectively in Institutions of Higher Learning in Ethiopia as evaluated by students (Beneficiaries), guidance workers, administrators & teachers (Benefactors) and Ministry of Education Officials (Policy Makers).

II. ‘Specific Guidance Services’ such as appraisal, information, counselling, placement, follow-up, and research and evaluation services are not being carried out effectively in Institutions of Higher Learning in Ethiopia as evaluated by students (Beneficiaries), guidance workers, administrators & teachers...
(Benefactors) and Ministry of Education Officials (Policy Makers).

III. No significant differentials would be there in the Implementation of ‘Guidance Programme in General’ in Federal and Regional Institutions of Higher Learning as evaluated by students (Beneficiaries).

IV. No significant differentials would be there in the Implementation of ‘Guidance Programme in General’ in Federal and Regional Institutions of Higher Learning as evaluated by guidance workers, administrators & teachers (Benefactors) and Ministry of Education Officials (Policy Makers).

V. No significant differentials would be there in the Implementation of ‘Guidance Programme in General’ in ‘Ranked Good’ and ‘Ranked Average’ Institutions of Higher Learning as evaluated by students (Beneficiaries).

VI. No significant differentials would be there in the Implementation of ‘Guidance Programme in General’ in ‘Ranked Good’ and ‘Ranked Average’ Institutions of Higher Learning as evaluated by guidance workers, administrators & teachers (Benefactors) and Ministry of Education Officials (Policy Makers).

VII. No significant differentials would be there in the Implementation of ‘Specific Guidance Services’ such as appraisal, information, counselling, placement, follow-up, and research and evaluation services in Federal and Regional Institutions of Higher Learning as evaluated by students (Beneficiaries), guidance workers, administrators & teachers...
(Benefactors) and Ministry of Education Officials (Policy Makers).

VIII. No significant differentials would be there in the Implementation of ‘Specific Guidance Services’ such as appraisal, information, counselling, placement, follow-up, and research and evaluation services in ‘Ranked Good’ and ‘Ranked Average’ Institutions of Higher Learning as evaluated by students (Beneficiaries), guidance workers, administrators & teachers (Benefactors) and Ministry of Education Officials (Policy Makers).

FIG. 4.2. SAMPLE [INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING]

TOTAL SAMPLE (N=20)

Federal Institutions of Higher Learning (N=10)

Regional Institutions of Higher Learning (N= 10)

 Ranked Good (N=5)  Ranked Average (N=5)

 Ranked Good (N=5)  Ranked Average (N=5)

SAMPLE

Criteria for the Selection of Sample

Ten state owned Federal Institutions of Higher Learning (five ‘Ranked Good’ and five ‘Ranked Average’ by the Ministry of Education) having guidance programme were purposefully selected. Similarly, ten government owned Regional Institutions of Higher Learning (five ‘Ranked
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Good' and five 'Ranked Average' by the Ministry of Education) having guidance programme were deliberately selected. Thus, a total of twenty Institutions of Higher Learning were participated in the study (FIG. 4.1).

Further twenty students from each Institution of Higher Learning included in the study were selected randomly.

Administrators and guidance workers of all Institutions of Higher Learning covered in the study were purposefully selected as respondents. In case of teachers, only two senior teachers were selected deliberately from each Institution of Higher Learning included in the study. Ministry of Education Officials were also selected purposefully.

FIG. 4.3: SAMPLE RESPONDENTS

TOTAL SAMPLE (N=502)

POLICY MAKERS BENEFACCTORS BENEFICIARIES

Ministry of Education Officials (N=2) Guidance workers (N=40) Administrators (N=40) Teachers (N=40) Students (N=400)

The sample taken for the study is presented in FIG.4.2. The sample for the study include: (i) 400 students belonging to 20 Institutions of Higher Learning were included. (ii) 20 guidance workers working in the Institutions of Higher Learning covered by the study were taken, (iii) 40 Administrators (20 Administrative Officers and 20 Dean of Students) in the Institutions of Higher Learning covered by the study were taken; (iv) 2 teachers from each Institution of Higher Learning were
included; and (v) two Ministry of Education Officials were participated in the study.

TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES USED

The present study was conducted with the help of 3 questionnaires, 5 interview schedules and one checklist. All the instruments employed in the present study were adopted from Kohli & Kaur (1991) with minor modifications. All were constructed in English.

QUESTIONNAIRE

The present study included 3 questionnaires i.e., for (i) students (ii) guidance workers, administrators and teachers, and (iii) Ministry of education officials (Appendix 1, 2, and 3). Separate questionnaires were constructed for each of the above-mentioned groups of the samples because of their different roles in the functioning of guidance programme. The students are the beneficiaries; guidance workers, administrators and teachers are the organizers and operators of the institutions guidance programme and Ministry of Education Officials guide and supervise guidance programmes.

Questionnaire for Students

The questionnaire for students consisted of the following two parts:

- Part A - consisted of 19 items. The items included in it were meant to evaluate the ‘guidance programme in general.’
- Part B - consisted of 21 items related to various guidance services i.e., appraisal, information, and counselling and placement services.

Out of the total 40 items 37 were closed questions, one multiple choice and two open ended including the last item where by the students
were required to give suggestions for further improvement of the guidance programs. Five control questions were also included to provide a cross check to see whether the information collected was correct or not.

**Questionnaire for Guidance Workers*, Administrators **
& Teachers

The questionnaire for administrators, guidance workers and teachers consisted of the following three parts:-

- Part A - contained 10 items. These were related to the functioning of the 'Guidance Program in general'.
- Part B - consisted of 27 items related to ‘Specific Guidance Services’ i.e., appraisal, information, counselling, placement and follow-up services.
- Part C - composed of 8 items related to research and evaluation service.

The last two questions were related to various difficulties faced by administrators, guidance workers and teachers in the implementation of the guidance programme and their suggestions for further improvement.

Of all the items in the questionnaire 30 items were in the form of closed questions with three category responses of ‘Yes’, ‘No’ or ‘Not sure’. Four questions focused on supplying information; six multiple choice items were included where by they were to check on correct answer out of four or five options and one open category question for giving suggestions was included at the end.

---

* The term ‘guidance worker’ as used in the present study means the guidance and counselling officer in the institution.

** The term ‘administrator’ implies the administrative Officer and Dean of Students of the institution.
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Questionnaire for Ministry of Education Officials in charge of guidance programme

The questionnaire consisted of three parts:

- **Part A** - consisted of 7 items with regard to the functioning of 'Guidance Programme in general'.
- **Part B** - included 19 items relate to appraisal, information, and counselling and placement services.
- **Part C** - consisted of 8 items regarding research and evaluation service.

The questionnaire included 28 ‘closed’ and three multiple-choice items and, two items were required to give specific information. The last question was of ‘open category’ requiring the respondents to give their suggestions for further improvement of the programme.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

Interview schedules were also administered for students, administrators, guidance workers, teachers and Ministry of Education Officials to supplement data obtained through questionnaires.

The interview schedules for students, guidance workers, administrators, teachers and Ministry of Education officials had 20, 22, 17, 23 and 5 items respectively (Appendix, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8).

CHECKLIST

To facilitate recording of observation by the investigator and fill up gaps left by the questionnaires and interview schedules checklist was used (Appendix - 9). It was constructed mainly to record the presence or absence of certain essential observable external elements of guidance programmes in the institutions under study. Some of the items were included just to provide a check to the answers given to those items in
the questionnaires by students, administrators, guidance workers and instructors. It consisted of 29 items.

**PROCEDURE OF DATA COLLECTION: ADMINISTRATION OF QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEW SCHEDULES**

The administration of questionnaires and interview schedules was conducted as follows:

**Administration of Questionnaire and Interview schedule to Ministry of Education Officials in charge of guidance programme**

Ministry of Education Officials (at Federal and Regional levels) in charge of guidance programme at both secondary and tertiary level were contacted at their offices. Data regarding the number of Institutions of Higher Learning having guidance programme were obtained. An interview was conducted with a focus on the items included in the schedule meant for that purpose. Interview helped in obtaining information regarding actual functioning of the guidance programmes and the difficulties faced by them in implementing the programmes. After that they were given the questionnaire to fill. They were fully cooperative and provided all the required information.

**Administration of Questionnaire and Interview Schedule to Administrators, Guidance Workers and Teachers**

For the collection of the data, the investigator personally visited all the Institutions of Higher Learning covered by the study. Interviews were conducted with Administrators, Guidance Workers and two of the Teachers separately in each of the selected Institutions of Higher Learning on the basis of the interview schedules meant for that purpose. They were also given questionnaire to fill. Almost all the personnel filled and returned the questionnaire.
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**Administration of Questionnaire and Interview Schedule for Students**

With the permission of the head of the Institutions of Higher Learning a group of three students from each selected institution were contacted. First of all, in order to establish rapport with selected students the purpose of the present study were explained to them. Then the questionnaires were distributed. The students were first asked to fill in the columns giving their particulars like name, year level, age, sex, etc. The instructions given at the top of the questionnaire were read out by the investigator and students were also asked to read them carefully. Then the investigator read out the first question and explained it and they were asked to give answer in the appropriate column. The students were assured that their answers would be kept confidential and would not be exposed to anyone.

Out of the group of students who filled the questionnaire, three students were taken to separate room and interviewed individually on the basis of the items included in the interview schedule meant for students. In this way, three students from each selected Institutions of Higher Learning were interviewed.

**USE OF CHECK LIST BY THE INVESTIGATOR**

The investigator recorded his observation of the actual conditions with regard to the functioning of the guidance programmes in each of the Institutions of Higher Learning under study on the basis of items included in the checklist.

**STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**

For the scoring purpose frequencies with respect to each item of the questionnaires in three category responses of 'yes', 'no' and 'not sure' were counted.
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Similarly the scoring of the interview schedules was done by adding up the frequencies of positive and negative responses.

In order to arrive at meaningful conclusions the frequencies with regard to each item were added up separately for the sample drawn from state owned Federal and Regional Institutions of Higher Learning, which were further divided into ‘Ranked Good’ and ‘Ranked Average’. The frequencies were converted into percentages. Then the significance of differences between percentages was calculated with the help of the following formula:

\[
P^* = \frac{N_1 P_1 + N_2 P_2}{N_1 + N_2}
\]

\[
Q^* = 1 - P
\]

\[
\sigma D%^{***} = \sigma P_1 - \sigma P_2 = \frac{\sqrt{PQ(\frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2})}}{N_1 N_2}
\]

\[
CR^{***} = \frac{(P_1 - P_2)}{\sigma P_1 \cdot \sigma P_2}
\]

Further more, in the present study graphic representations were also used.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The data have been analysed and interpreted in light of the objectives of organizing guidance programme in Institutions of Higher Learning in Ethiopia and the criteria formulated by the present investigator for evaluation purpose.

---

\*P = The proportion of population cases in one of the categories
\*Q = The proportion of population cases in the other categories
***σD% = Percentage Difference
****CR = Critical Ratio/ f_{statistical}
OBJECTIVES OF ORGANIZING GUIDANCE PROGRAMME

Broad Objectives of organizing guidance programme at tertiary level education in Ethiopia as stated by Ministry of Education Officials in charge of guidance programmes at both secondary and tertiary levels include:

(i) To assist the students to make adjustment to the life in Institutions of Higher Learning and help them in solving their personal and educational problems.

(ii) To assist students in their personal, social, educational, career and life planning development.

(iii) To help students in understanding their strengths, weakness, interests, values, potentialities and limitations.

(iv) To assist students to reach their full personal and academic potentials.

(v) To help students make realistic choices.

(vi) Help students to acquire a better understanding of the world of work.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION FOR THE PRESENT STUDY

The basis on which the success or failure of a programme or activity is finally determined is known as criteria. Since the present work involves a survey type status study, criteria have been formulated for evaluation purposes. These have been formulated keeping in view the essential characteristics of a good guidance programme and the objectives and requirements of organizing a minimum guidance programme at Institutions of Higher Learning in Ethiopia as stated by
Ministry of Education officials. In the present study the following criteria were used for evaluation of 'Guidance Program in General' and 'Specific Guidance services':

'GUIDANCE PROGRAM IN GENERAL'

- Is guidance and counselling a regular feature of the institutions’ educational programme?
- Do the institution provide various guidance services?
- Is there an adequate budget to support the guidance programme?
- Is there a provision for at least one guidance worker in every institution?
- Does the guidance programme enjoy full administrative support and co-operation on the part of teachers in organizing & implementing it?
- Are the students fully aware of the utility of the guidance programme?
- To what extent have students actually been benefited from the guidance programme?
- Are the guidance personnel had some specialized training in guidance and counselling?

- Are adequate facilities provided to guidance workers for carrying out guidance duties like relaxation in teaching work load, provision of periods for guidance purpose, extra remunerations etc.?

- Have adequate arrangements be made for in-service training/orientation of guidance workers in institutions of higher learning?
‘SPECIFIC GUIDANCE SERVICES’

Appraisal Service

- Do the institutions follow systematic procedure for obtaining appraisal data about each student?
- Are Cumulative Records maintained for all students?
- Are the Cumulative Records comprehensive?
- Are the record cards easily accessible for all teachers and properly utilized by them?
- Are the psychological tests made available and administered by the guidance workers and the results interpreted to students.

Information Services

- Is educational and occupational information provided for students?
- Are there provisions made for proper filing system and display of material on bulletin boards?
- Are there provisions made for suitable place and time provided for dissemination of information?
- Are the students informed about the institutions’ offerings about opportunities for job and further study?
- Are provisions made for career talks and conferences, field trips, screening of films and filmstrips, career clubs, etc. for informing and stimulating students towards wise career choice?
- To what extents do the guidance workers and students utilize the information effectively?

Counselling Service

- Are adequate facilities and conditions provided for counselling including separate place, privacy, accessibility of guidance workers to students, availability of time etc.?
- Are the guidance personnel professionally well equipped?
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What is the nature of counselling service provided?

How effectively are the appraisal data used for counselling purpose?

Are referral agencies available?

Placement Service

What is the nature of placement service provided?

Are students helped to choose courses of studies according to their mental abilities, interests, aptitudes as well as their future career plan?

Are students helped to make realistic educational and career choice and plan?

Are students helped in any way to get part-time jobs?

Follow-up Service

Do the institution authorities maintain contact with ex-students through forming Alumni Associations?

Are there provisions made for undertaking follow-up of university and college leavers and those who had been given intensive remedial help?

To what extent does the university and college authorities make use of information obtained through follow-up studies to improve upon the guidance programme?

Research and Evaluation Service

Do the guidance personnel undertake any research project in educational, vocational or personal guidance fields?

Have the guidance personnel ever attempted to evaluate the functioning of guidance services?
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➢ Have the findings of research and evaluation ever been utilized for improving the programme?

The data regarding the evaluation of guidance services in Institutions of Higher learning in Ethiopia are analysed in four different chapters. While Chapter - 5 deals with the interpretation of data regarding the evaluation of ‘Guidance Program in General’, Chapter - 6 contains the analysis and interpretation of data regarding evaluation of ‘Specific Guidance Services’ i.e., Appraisal, Information, Counselling, Placement, Follow-up and Research and Evaluation Services. Chapter - 7 enumerates the difficulties faced by the different evaluators in the implementation of the guidance and counselling programme and the suggestions given by them for improving the programme. Chapter - 8 contains the investigator’s observations and suggestions for the effective functioning of the guidance services.

DELIMITATION OF THE PRESENT STUDY

The present study has been delimited in respect of the following:

1. The evaluative study focused on guidance services provided at Federal and Regional Institutions of Higher Learning accredited by the Ministry of Education.

2. Only Institutions of Higher Learning ‘Ranked Good’ and ‘Ranked Average’ by the Ministry of Education and that have established guidance programme were selected.

3. Only state owned Federal and Regional Institutions of Higher Learning were selected.
4. For the purpose of collection of the data from the teachers, only two senior teachers were taken from each of the Institutions of Higher Learning included in the study.

5. Interviews were conducted with only three students from each of the Institutions of Higher Learning under study.
### TABLE OF CODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of terms</th>
<th>Codes Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>FD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked Good</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked Average</td>
<td>RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Ranked Good</td>
<td>FD&lt;sub&gt;RG&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Ranked Average</td>
<td>FD&lt;sub&gt;RA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Ranked Good</td>
<td>RE&lt;sub&gt;RG&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Ranked Average</td>
<td>RE&lt;sub&gt;RA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample Federal</td>
<td>FD&lt;sub&gt;TS&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample Regional</td>
<td>RE&lt;sub&gt;TS&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample Ranked Good</td>
<td>TS&lt;sub&gt;RG&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample Ranked Average</td>
<td>TS&lt;sub&gt;RA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>TS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>