An Exploratory Study of Students' Expectations of Different Academic Programs: English language-related programs as a case study

Abdulmuhsen Ayedh Alqahtani

Dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
In
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

Richard Salmon, Chair
David Alexander, Committee Member
Jim Fortune, Committee Member
Sedki Riad, Committee Member

February 9, 2007
Blacksburg, Virginia
Keywords: students' expectations, programs of study

2007, Abdulmushen A. Alqahtani

An Exploratory Study of Students' Expectations of Different Academic Programs: English language-related programs as a case study

Abdulmuhsen A. Alqahtani

(ABSTRACT)

This study aimed at investigating the differences in expectations between students with respect to their chosen programs between two English degree programs (Arts and Education). Eight research questions were formulated to pursue the purpose of this study. Three hundred and fifty-one students of English from the College of Education and the Faculty of Arts constituted the sample. The data were collected randomly through the use of survey questionnaire and were analyzed with the use of SPSS v11.0. Frequencies and percentage distributions as well as two independent-samples t-test statistical procedures were used to analyze the collected data.

In general, the results showed that students' expectations played an important role in students' choice of the preferred program of study with respect to English language programs. Based on a given context, students were found to hold what could be termed '*global*' expectations where students show similar expectations and '*program-related*' expectations. One main conclusion drawn from this study was that students' expectations were vital in students' decision to invest in continued participating in education. Students were significantly statistically differentiated as a function of different expectations, particularly economic expectations. However, expectations were not just confined to pecuniary benefits; students tended to value the non-pecuniary benefits as well. Hence, students, along with their expectations should be included in evaluating or revising the academic programs instead of relying thoroughly on signals coming from the labor market and employers. Implications for educational policies and recommendations for future research were included as well.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Praise be first to Allah who bestowed upon me and favors that he granted unto me. I would like to thank my family members starting with my parents, who always prayed for me and supported me. I thank my sincere wife who always tried her best to make study life a beautiful experience. Also, I thank my siblings, relatives, friends for their support during my study.

Next, I would like to thank Prof. Jasem Al-Hamdan, Chair of Educational Administration and Planning Department at Kuwait University, my Committee Members starting with my advisor, Prof. Richard Salmon as well as Prof Alexander, Prof. Fortune, and Prof. Sedki, who were always available when I needed them and always encouraged me and supported me as I completed this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF TABLES

Chapter I: Introduction

The literature on human capital, which is conceptualized as the relationship between human capital investments (i.e., education, time, or effort) and different benefits, assumes that the returns on different kinds of schooling are, among other things, key factors in the demand for schooling (Becker, 1964). Students are consistently concerned with what the likely opportunity cost is before they decide whether or not to continue participating in education. The opportunity cost is generally defined as the value of what is foregone in order to have something else (Levin & McEwan, 2000). Psacharopuolos (2006) observed that

> By virtue of not working for four years, the university student incurs an indirect cost in terms of forgone earnings equal to what secondary school graduates of the same age are earnings in the labor market … at the same time, the university student incurs a direct cost equal to any tuition and incidental expanses he/she is paying associated to his/her studies. (p. 5)

Consequently, human capital theory assumes that prospective students are aware of what can be expected from the program they choose to study.

Demand for education is a kind of human capital investment because it confers benefits on individuals, enterprises, and societies as a whole. These benefits can take two forms:

1. Economic returns that accrue in the form of additional earnings, productivity, and economic growth (Becker, 1964; Blaug, 1990; Schultz, 1963). Education contributes directly to the growth of national income by improving skills, productive capacities, faster rates of innovation, and the creation of social capital for individuals and societies (Psacharopoulos, 2000; Williams, 2001; Woodhall, 1998).

2. Non-economic returns that can cover a wide range of benefits. Examples of these non-economic benefits are greater social cohesion, better quality of life such as better health, better family and parenting, better citizenship, better leisure and life styles, better lifelong attitudes, and so on (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2001).

In McMahon's (2006) terminology, the non-economic returns on education are those non-market benefits that "result from the use of the capital human investment during non-labor-market hours" (p. 4). Based on these benefits of education, Kuwait's public education enrolment at all levels has increased remarkably over time (Ministry of Education, 2004), and public expenditures on education have also accordingly increased. This quantitative expansion of education in Kuwait has put added financial burden on the government. Specifically, the decision to invest in education, whether by expanding facilities or by improving efficiency, requires considerable outlay by the government, and these costs become more important as they take away funds from other areas of potential economic and social investment such as health or housing (Almigadi, 2001). Consequently, the most crucial questions facing planners in Kuwait at present concern the content of schooling at all levels: what does the educational system produce now and what should the education system produce in order to respond to the changing world?

Kuwait, at the turn of the new millennium, has witnessed changes in the labor market and social conditions, both of which have led to another perspective on education—its utilitarian aspect. For instance, the government has set up an academic committee to revise admission policies in the higher education sector and the academic programs offered in higher education ("Lajnat muraje't," 2004); with the result that officials believe that some programs could be temporarily frozen or merged

with other related ones. The officially-announced ratio of students' choice of programs to the labor market needs of those programs or sectors necessitates an examination of students' expectations of investing in a given program (Kuwait News Agency, 2005).

Language-related programs are among those that have undergone close examination of content and delivery methods. In Kuwait, there are currently two types of programs related to teaching English: liberal arts-oriented program and education-oriented program (Nawfl & Alhindi, 2001). The former focuses on English through the cultural content of the language such as literature and language itself whereas the latter emphasizes the notion of job-oriented language arts for Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL).

Equally important is the decision taken by individuals to pursue education. The personal cost to individuals from continued involvement in education, for example in meeting academic requirements and deferred entry into the labor market, are reflected in short-term costs to both individuals and societies. Furthermore, the educational choices, such as the type of institution or program chosen, that individuals make when deciding to pursue education have a long-term cost to both individuals and societies (Woodhall, 1998). Therefore, individuals are important stakeholders to be considered in any educational policy studies.

Statement of the Problem

Since the decision to go to college and other related decisions, such as which degree and program to choose, made by students in Kuwait are among 'noncompulsory decisions' that mark the transitions of adolescents from childhood to early adulthood, this study proposes to survey the role of existing students' expectations in the choice of which program of study to follow. In other words, how do students of the different academic programs of English, namely liberal arts and

education, at Kuwait University differ in their economic and non-economic expectations of these given programs? This research problem is guided by the four subproblems:

1. How do students of the different academic programs of English at Kuwait University differ in their motivation for investing in higher education, their career intentions, and their choice of program?
2. How do students of the different academic programs of English at Kuwait University differ in their opinions of the graduate labor market?
3. How do students of the different academic programs of English at Kuwait University differ in their perceptions of future employers' expectations?
4. How do students of the different academic programs of English at Kuwait University differ in their aspirations for career development and long term life goals?

Justification for the Study

The justification for the present study is reflected in both future practice and research. With respect to future research, it is anticipated that the findings of this study will contribute to the body of knowledge related to students' expectations of continued education. Equally important, students' expectations were shown to be closely linked to such outcomes variables as job satisfaction and degree of efficiency (Purcell & Pitcher, 1996).

In terms of future practice, the results of this study are helpful to practicing administrators in three ways. First, in line with previous research, Kuwaiti students are presumed to base their decisions to pursue their education in different programs of study on some kind of rational expectations. Hence, the results further validate or refute previous research on students' expectations about enrollment in a specific

program of study. While much of the research on students' expectations has been carried out in other countries (e.g., UK, USA and Hong Kong) this study attempted to draw comparisons to the findings in previous studies. Second, it answers the question of what variables contribute to the overall students' expectations in respect to their educational choices. To date no study has been focused on Kuwaiti students' expectations prior to choosing a specific academic program. Thus, this study is the first to examine what variables constitute Kuwaiti students' expectations with respect to the different English language programs. Third, it assists current and future administrators in making decisions regarding admission polices and in evaluating existing programs in attempts to overcome imbalances that exist amongst students, the labor market and academia. Many governmental committees, including committees set up by Kuwait University, attempt to provide justifications for their practices concerning student enrollment, such as temporary freezing some programs or merging others to be in one program (e.g., instead of having two types of English language programs, education and liberal-arts based programs, we can have an interdisciplinary program of both) but many are unsure of the benefits of addressing the issue from students' point of view besides other views (Lajnat muraje't aqsam aljami'a, 2004). Thus, the information obtained from this study could provide educational planners with data to be used to communicate with prospective students and to give a better understating of what expectations they have prior to entering college.

Finally, secondary students making college enrollment decisions might also benefit from this study. The results will provide these students with a better understanding of how systematically they can examine their expectations about a specific program of study as they enter college. Students might use the results to assess their won expectations.

Assumptions of the Study

This study is based on the following assumptions:

1. Students are rational when they decide to follow a specific program of study. Therefore, they have predetermined their expectations about their chosen programs (Psacharopoulos, 2000).
2. It is believed that, while making decisions about investing in higher education, individuals think in terms of the relations between the opportunity cost and the long-term economic and non-economic benefits that education will bring them, rather than the overall social effects.
3. Based on equality of educational opportunity, Kuwait University will continue providing free education and let individuals choose their own preferred programs of studies.
4. All students who constitute the population of the study are assumed to meet the academic requirements for enrollment in their programs. For example, it is believed that the participants of the study are already competent in different terms, particularly language proficiency.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to test the theory of human capital investment in education that relates students' expectations of higher education to the programs they choose to follow. The focus of this study is to examine the expectations of students of English at the College of Education and Faculty of Arts about their respective programs.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

For the purpose of this study, there are four descriptive questions and four inferential questions. The four descriptive questions are:

1. How do students of English at the College of Education and the Faculty of Arts rate on motivations for investing in higher education, their career intentions, and their choice of program?
2. How do students of English at the College of Education and the Faculty of Arts rate on opinions regarding the graduate labor market?
3. How do students of English at the College of Education and the Faculty of Arts rate perceptions of future employers' expectations?
4. How do students of English at the College of Education and the Faculty of Arts rate on their aspirations for career development and long term life goals?

The four inferential questions are:

5. Do students of English at the College of Education differ in their motivations for investing in higher education, their career intentions, and their choice of program from the students of English at the Faculty of Arts?
6. Do students of English at the College of Education differ in their opinions regarding the graduate labor market from the students of English at the Faculty of Arts?
7. Do students of English at the College of Education differ in their perceptions of future employers' expectations from students of English at the Faculty of Arts?
8. Do students of English at the College of Education differ in their aspirations for career development and long term life goals from students of English at the Faculty of Arts?

The published literature indicates that the there is a relationship between students' expectations of the program and what they choose when deciding to

continue participation in educations (Dominitz & Manski, 1996; Williams, 2001). Hence, based on the above questions, the research hypotheses are:

H1-a: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their hedonistic motivations for investing in higher education, their career intentions, and their choice of program from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

H1-b: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their pragmatic motivations for investing in higher education, their career intentions, and their choice of program from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

H1-c: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their fatalistic motivations for investing in higher education, their career intentions, and their choice of program from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

H2: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their opinions regarding the knowledge and skills required by the graduate labor market from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

H3: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their perceptions of future employers' expectations from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

H4-a: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their aspirations for career development from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

H4-b: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their long term life goals from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

The null hypotheses pertaining to the above research hypotheses to be tested are that the two study samples came from the same population. In other words, the two populations, from which the two samples were drawn, are identical.

Study Delimitation and Limitations

Initially, this study confines itself to surveying students of English in the College of Education and the Faculty of Arts at Kuwait University. Other higher education institutions or even other disciplines such as Arabic or History that have the same status of being offered in the same two colleges at the same time were not included in the study. Thus, any generalizations from the samples are to be *only* to populations of which the samples are presumably 'representative' (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991).

Despite the fact that the present study will contribute important findings to the literature, there are some limitations that are, indeed, generally inherited in behavioral sciences and in survey research in particular. First, the design is cross-sectional rather longitudinal. The use of a cross-sectional method does not allow making casual statements about the findings. Second, as with any study in which only self-reported data are used, there are problems derived from memory restrictions and perceptions differences. That is, the meanings defined by the researcher may differ from those of the participants. As such, the conclusions drawn from this study are my own, and the findings from this study cannot be generalized to populations other than the ones that were studied.

Definitions and Terms

Leedy and Ormord (2005) state that a valid definition contains three parts: "(a) the *term* to be defined; (b) the *genre*… to which the concept being defined belongs; and (c) the *differentia*, the specific characteristics… that distinguish the concept being

defined from all other member of the general classification" (p.56). Based on these criteria, this study includes some terms that need defining pursuant to its purpose:

Program of study: "a planned series of experiences in a particular range of subjects or skills, offered by institutions and undertaken by one or more learners" (Aggarwal & Thakur, 2003, p.20). In the present context, it is the type of the course that students choose to complete their degrees in English language. They are the language-based and liberal arts-based programs.

Students of English at the College of Education: students who are preparing to be teachers of English as a Foreign Language (language-based program).

Students of English at the Faculty of Arts: students who study English for its own sake (liberal arts-based program).

Economic expectations: the pecuniary-related returns to education such as salaries that students expect after graduation or acquiring skills to improve the economic status.

Non-economic expectations: the non pecuniary-related returns to education such as job satisfaction, better lifelong attitudes and so on, that students expect after graduation.

Hedonistic Motivation: refers to intrinsic interest or enjoyment in the participant.

Pragmatic Motivation: refers to choosing a specific program of study for vocational and longer-term reasons.

Fatalistic Motivation: refers to students who embark on their program of study by default, because they could not get into the program they preferred

Chapter Summary

As an introduction to this study, several topics were presented, including: (a) the statement of the problem; (b) importance of the study; (c) assumptions of the study; (d) purpose of the study; (e) research questions and hypotheses; (f) delimitation and limitations of the study; (g) definitions and terms; and (h) the chapter summary. In chapter II, the review of the relevant literature is detailed.

Chapter II: Review of the Literature

In the previous chapter the following were introduced: an examination of the problem and the purpose of the present study- the economic and non-economic expectations of students of English at the College of Education and the Faculty of Arts about their respective programs pursuant to human capital theory. To clarify this problem in depth, the present chapter is divided into two main parts: contextual background and theoretical background. The former gives an overview of the State of Kuwait and its people, status of English education in Kuwait, and higher education in Kuwait, namely the College of Education and the Faculty of Arts at Kuwait University. The nature of these schools should be described in order to uncover the differences between them. The theoretical background presents students' expectations as a research subject, including the concept of human capital theory. This chapter aims at a better understanding of the whole picture of this study.

Before going further into this chapter, it is worthwhile mentioning the question posted by Leedy and Ormord (2005): when do researchers know that they have completed the review of the literature? According to Leedy and Ormord (2005) "in theory, the answer might be 'Never.' The best advice … is this: *Look for repetitive patterns in the materials you are finding and reading* [italics in the source] … eventually you familiar arguments … and findings will start to appear" (p. 76). When researchers are no longer encountering new arguments (i.e., same key authors and studies cited over and over), then they may be reasonably familiar with the critical issues in the relevant literature. This is the strategy used in this chapter.

Contextual Background

Overview of Kuwait. Kuwait is a constitutional state in southwestern Asia, located at the upper angle of the Arabian Gulf (Ministry of Information, 2002) and is a small country; its area is only 17,818 sq. km. (i.e., 6,880 sq. mi.). In 2001, Kuwait had an estimated population of 2,041,961: approximately 45% are native Kuwaitis, while 55% are foreign residents (Ministry of Information, 2002). Islam is the official religion. Non-Muslims who live in Kuwait are, however, free to practice their own religions within the law. Petroleum is the main, or even the sole, economic product, and it has made Kuwait a classic welfare country. Due to the massive revenues gained from petroleum, Kuwait has become a tax-free country where education, health, housing, and other public services, such as building roads, are free.

The United Nations development programs concerning Governance in the Arab Region have indicated that the human capital rate has increased over the years (United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], 2002). It is worth mentioning that the UNDP, in its Human Development Report in 1990, introduced the concept of the Human Development Index (HDI) which is a measurement of human progress. By combining indicators of real purchasing power, education, and health, the HDI provides a more comprehensive measure of development than does the GNP alone. Ratings for the HDI are the following: values between 0.1 – 0.499 imply low human development, values between 0.5 – 0.799 imply medium human development, and values between 0.8 – 0.999 imply high human development. As shown in Table 1, there is a steady increase in HDI in Kuwait (see also El Touny, 2002).

Table 1

Human Dvelopment Indx (HDI) in Kuwait for Selected Years

Year	Human Development Index
2003	0.844
2002	0.838
2000	0.837
1995	0.813
1985	0.78
1980	0.777
1975	0.763

Brief History of Education in Kuwait. Oil profits have allowed Kuwait to build a broad based educational system; the literacy rate is 93% (Ministry of Education, 2004). Early in the 20th century, there were few educational facilities open to the public. Primarily, there were a small number Quranic schools, called *Al-Katatib*, in which reading, writing, and some arithmetic were taught. As there was no public financing of education, some wealthy people funded education, such as building facilities, sponsoring teachers, and the like. However, as a result of the discovery of oil in the 1930s, Kuwait was ready to witness a tremendous transformation of almost all aspects of socioeconomic and political life (Al-Misnad, 1985).

Kuwait looks very different now from what it did in the aftermath of the Second World War. One of the most dramatic developments has taken place in the educational system. Like other developing countries, Kuwait's major motive for this development in education was developing its own human resources in order to be

fully independent from the colonial powers of that time (Al-Misnad, 1985). Kuwait, in contrast to most poor countries in the third world, has employed the financial resources that were produced from the enormous rise in state revenues to carry out ambitious plans to promote public education. To emphasize its significance, the Constitution of 1962 stipulates that education, including higher education, is assured and promoted by the state, thus reflecting the belief that education is a fundamental right of all citizens (Ministry of Information, 2002).

The philosophic frame of the national vision of education revolved around continuous development of human capital through educating the young and their parents and helping them become prepared for the challenges of the future (Ministry of Education, 2004). This vision is translated into an overall strategic objective-visualizing the future and envisaging what the citizen's character should be like in order to cope with this future image, with its spiritual, mental, cultural, psychological, social, and technological dimensions, while preserving the national identity.

The Kuwaiti educational ladder is composed of three basic levels: (a) 6-year elementary; (b) 4-year intermediate; and (c) 3-year secondary. Also, preschools are available for 4-6 year-old children, although attendance in not mandatory. Should they meet the standards, students can continue to higher education after they complete their basic education (Ministry of Education, 2004).

Public expenditure at all levels of education includes both capital expenditure (spending on construction, renovation, major repairs and purchase of heavy equipment or vehicles) and current expenditure (spending on goods and services that are consumed within the current year and would need to be renewed the following year). It covers such outlay/costs as staff salaries and benefits, contracted or purchased services, books and teaching materials, welfare services, furniture and

equipment, minor repairs, fuel, insurance, rents, telecommunications, and travel (United Nations Development Programme, 2002). Financing of education is a reflection of the fiscal status of the country, but there are always increases in current costs as a result of increasing enrollment (AlMijadi, 2001).

Higher Education in Kuwait. There are two higher education institutions in Kuwait: Kuwait University and the Public Authority for Applied Education and Training (PAAET). These two institutions contribute to achieving the ultimate goal of the Kuwaiti educational system - building a well-balanced citizen who can advance the welfare of the country and humanity (Nawfl & Alhindi, 2001). Since the focus of this study is Kuwait University, it is imperative to elaborate a bit more about it, with special reference to the College of Education and the Faculty of Arts.

Kuwait University was established in October 1966, five years after Kuwait became an independent state. It started with the Colleges of Science, Arts and Education, and the Women's College, with 418 students on roll and 31 faculty members. By 1999/2000, the number of students had increased to 19,001 with a proportionate increase in faculty that reached 1,042. Despite this expansion, the university budget, which was KD 117,111,000 for the fiscal year 1998/1999, declined to KD 106,689,000 for the following year, illustrating that higher education, as a public good, is again exposed to the heights and valleys in the fiscal status of the government (Kuwait University, 2006).

Institutional expansion proceeded rapidly, and within a year of its establishment two additional Colleges—Law and Shari'a (Islamic Laws), and Commerce, Economics and Political Science (presently the College of Business Administration) were inaugurated following the issuance of a decree by Amir of Kuwait, His Highness Sheikh Sabah Al-salem Al-Sabah, on April 1, 1967. Subsequent Amiri Decrees led to

intense institutional development resulting in the emergence of new colleges and departments: the College of Medicine on July 3, 1973; the College of Engineering and Petroleum on December 4, 1974; Inauguration the College of Graduate Studies in 1977; the College of Education on May 17, 1980 (until then the Department of Education at the College of Arts, with classes starting in 1981/1982); the College of Allied Health Sciences and Nursing on June 22, 1982; the College of Pharmacy in February 1996; the College of Dentistry in May 1996.

Presently, Kuwait University offers 65 academic programs through its 12 colleges: (a) Administrative Sciences; (b) Education; (c) Arts; (d) Engineering and Petroleum; (e) Allied Health Sciences, (f) Law; (g) Shari'a and Islamic Studies; (h) Social Sciences; (i) Medicine; (j) Sciences; (k) Women's College; and (l) Graduate Studies. The number of registered students has already reached 18,436 in undergraduate programs, with an additional 565 students pursuing graduate studies. By 1999/2000, the university had 2,914 alumni (Kuwait University, 2006). For the purpose of this study, the focus was on two colleges: Arts and Education.

The College of Education, which was founded in the early 1980s, started with the enrollment of 339 students. Its establishment was a response to a long standing need for a national workforce in the field of education (College of Education, 2005). Its mandate is to prepare qualified teachers who are able to satisfy the national demand for education, and optimization of the teaching workforce. The college is organized into several academic departments, technical centers, and specialized units. Its major departments are Curricula & Teaching Methods, Educational Psychology, Education Foundations, and Educational Administration and Planning. In addition, there are two

technical centers for Educational Technology, and Student Teacher Internship, while the specialized units are Psychological Counseling and Academic Activities.

The college offers programs at three levels: undergraduate level, postgraduate diploma, and graduate studies. Its undergraduate programs consist of courses for preparing kindergarten, primary, middle, and high teachers respectively in such various areas and subjects as English, Arabic, Geography, History, Physics, and Biology. The postgraduate diploma is in Education, Psychological Counseling, or Special Education, while the graduate program offers Master's in Curricula & Teaching Methods, Education Foundation, Educational Administration, and School Counseling (College of Education, 2005/2006).

The pronounced aims of the College of Education are (College of Education, 2005/2006):

- To provide highly qualified manpower needed in the educational field.
- To develop awareness of the importance of practical educational research and the application of its results to solve field problems.
- To meet the needs of society in the field of educational services and other areas of social activities related to education.

These aims are clearly reflected in the plans of study (known locally as major sheets) of the programs offered. To successfully complete any program, students have to complete 132 credit hours, 45-48 of which are for the 'occupational preparation courses' category that is designed to help prepare students for teaching careers, and 63 of which are allocated for the content knowledge of each program or what is labeled the 'content knowledge courses' category (College of Education, 2003/2004).

The course requirements for the English language program include content knowledge courses that reflect the applied side of language. Applied linguistics, Discourse Analysis, Second Language Acquisition, Principles of Translation, translation courses at three levels, Principles of Rephrasing and Paraphrasing, Advanced Conversation, Introduction to Literature, English Language Usage, and Dramatics are examples of the 'content knowledge' category. On the other hand, 'occupational preparation' includes courses such as Computers in Education, Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL I and TEFL II) Measurement and Evaluation, and Educational Psychology.

The Faculty of Arts, on the other hand, was among the earliest faculties to be established at Kuwait University in 1966, opening the doors for students to pursue higher education programs conducive to the developmental needs of the modern emerging civic society. It is currently composed of 5 departments: Arabic Language and Literature, English language and literature, History, Philosophy, and Mass Communication. The Faculty of Arts, through its teaching, research and service to the community, reaffirms the traditional role of a university, namely the pursuit of human knowledge in its various forms and manifestations. At the same time, the Faculty advocates the modern role of the university, namely, to engage in collaborative links with industry and society and recognizes the need for its graduates to build up their expertise so as to be able to contribute fully and effectively to national needs and development (Faculty of Arts, 2003/2004).

The different disciplines which are represented in the Faculty of Arts aim to produce well-rounded graduates who:

- have developed cognitive and analytical skills through the study of various human disciplines in a cross-cultural manner;
- are aware of the wider perspectives and relationships between contiguous areas of knowledge, so that they can develop into confident, creative and incisive thinkers; and
- are aware of the practical applications and orientations of their knowledge within societal and national contexts, while appreciating different points of views.

Based on these objectives, what does it mean to be a student of English in the Faculty of Arts? It means that the English program is primarily focused on developing knowledge about particular cultural forms and histories: its purposes is to involve the student in the revision of existing knowledge through the value it attributes to informed and educated *individual* opinion. The individual view has to be backed up by knowledge, by sophisticated creativity which, in turn, is capable of re-organizing existing knowledge in new and unexpected combinations, of seeing the relative merits of opposing or contesting arguments, or by an understanding of the deep complexity of language itself in many different forms, historical or contemporary. To this end, this kind of program is taught and assessed in such a way as to give high priority and visibility to individual understanding (El-Sayed, 1995). Is this paradigm reflected in the English language and literature curricula?

The course requirements for the English Language and Literature program in the Faculty of Arts are designed within this paradigm. Hence, the majority of required

courses are basically cross-cultural and critical-thinking based courses. Courses pertaining to Western literature are more overtly so than is the English Language program offered through the College of Education. Comparative Literature, Feminist Studies, Human Rights, American Literature (e.g., 19 century, modern, novel… etc.), British Literature (Victorian, colonial… etc.), Drama, Novel, Shakespearian Studies, Theoretical Linguistics, Selected Readings in Latin Literature, Critical Theory, and Expository Writing are examples of the courses offered (Faculty of Arts, 2003/2004; 2005/2005). In addition, students take another four courses in a second foreign language such as French, German, or Hebrew. Moreover, unlike in the College of Education, students in the Faculty of Arts also take a minor, such as Psychology or Political Sciences, that is designed, specifically, to accomplish the aims of liberal arts studies, e.g. developing free and critical thinkers. The rationale behind this is to prepare students who are equipped with the appropriate moral and spiritual values and leadership qualities (Faculty of Arts, 2005/2006) to advance their societies and humanity. The jobs open to graduates in English Language and Literature are typically in such fields as translation, interpreting, teaching, and mass communication editing. However, does the status of English in Kuwait matters all this English education?

Status of English in Kuwait. Any literate person on the face of the globe knows that s/he is deprived if s/he does not know English. Based on the notion that knowing English is a necessity for 'modernization,' English has become the dominant foreign language in the non-English speaking world, including Kuwait. It is the foreign language for diplomacy, electronics, and science, and it has entered the areas of international business and advertising, of radio, television, and film. Since English has become the most important international language and is associated with economic

development and technological advancement, developing countries such as Kuwait have accepted its use and learning as a fact of life (Crystal, 1997).

The way in which English is taught and/or learned in the Arab World, has undergone many changes in recent years. However, the implementation of English in the public school systems is not new, given the colonial pasts of the countries in this region. Evidently, this factor has contributed to the region's exposure to foreign languages including English (Mubarak, Kazem, & Rasheed, 1990). Politics and international business have encouraged people in the Arab World to use foreign languages to communicate with the rest of the world.

Some Arab countries tend to start English as early as kindergarten, while others, such as Saudi Arabia, chose to introduce it at a later stage (e.g., middle school). In addition, political, social, and economic factors play a major role in promoting not only English in public (i.e., state) schools, but also, though to a lesser extent, other languages such as French and German, which are taught along with English (Mubarak, 1999).

In the Arab World, except for former French colonies, English is the first non-native language taught in public school systems. Previous research in different parts of the world reported a positive correlation between foreign people's enthusiasm for learning English and their orientation toward modernization (Crystal, 1997). Moreover, it is suggested that the spread of English in the developing world could be expected to continue as a function of Anglo-American domination in technology, trade and the global mass media (Crystal, 1997).

The English language is highly visible in the Kuwaiti landscape. For first time visitors, advertisements and street and shops signs are often bilingual in Arabic and English, and graffiti may also be found in English. Although Arabic is the dominant

language in Kuwait, there is an increasing number of job vacancies requiring proficiency in English. Knowledge of English is essential in the business sector, banking, technological companies, and the oil industry (El-Sayed, 1995).

English also continues to be widely used in the media in Kuwait. English can be found in foreign publications, and on radio and TV (local or satellite). Books and videos in English are readily available, and two daily newspapers (e.g., Kuwait Times) and several weeklies (e.g., Al-Boom) are published in English. Kuwait FM radio (Channel 2) broadcasts mainly in English with two hours each for Urdu and Farsi. Both British and American cultural agencies (e.g., the British Council and Amideast) have invested considerable time and personnel in increasing the presence of English in Kuwait.

The Kuwaiti government has realized this new global status of English and has accordingly undertaken various initiatives which support the development of English, particularly in the educational system. Although English has never been the medium of instruction at any school in Kuwait (except in a few English or American private schools), it is currently taught in all government schools and also in religious institutions (e.g., the Institute for Islamic Studies) as a foreign language. In the past, the teaching of English in government schools began at fifth grade and continued until the end of twelfth grade. Many private schools introduced English at first grade, and even at the kindergarten stage (4-6 years old). As early as 1993, however, the government introduced English from first grade in all schools across Kuwait. Students are now able to study English for twelve years at school (as is the case with Arabic).

English language teaching is designed to fulfill the following cluster of objectives as stated by the Ministry of Education (1999/2000):

- developing the learner's proficiency in understanding and using the language in spoken and written form.
- improving the learner's competence so that they can communicate in those situations where they have to use English.
- enabling the learner to become well informed about the life and culture of the countries that use English as a means of expression.

Kuwait Labor Market. Because of the interdependence between the educational outcomes and the world of employment, it is important to give some thought to the structure of employment in the context of Kuwaiti society. Like other Gulf countries, the Kuwaiti labor market has been facing four main challenges since the early 1990s (Nawfl & Alhindi, 2001). These four challenges can be classified into information-based and structure-based challenges. In the first category, the major challenge is the lack of reliable demographic projections that reflect the changes in the social structure even though the steady rise in the number of individuals participating in education is dramatic (Kuwait News Agency, 2005). The second challenge is that reliable indicators of employers' demand for graduates of different disciplines are difficult to ascertain.

With respect to the structure-based challenges, the prominent one is: are the nature and content of education to be determined by the labor market, or should these be determined by the academic system itself? (Nawfl & Alhindi, 2001). This question is a recurrent question and has not been settled yet. Second, as in most developing countries and Europe, the public sector still employs a high percentage of labor in Kuwait. The government's ownership of almost all the main income resources and

industry makes the public sector absorb almost 93 percent of the Kuwaiti total labor force in (Arab Planning Institute, 2002; El Touny, 2002). This concentration of Kuwaiti manpower in the public sector makes the Non-Kuwaiti manpower constitute the backbone of the labor force in the private sector (Ministry of Planning, 2005). Several factors have contributed to these four challenges (Arab Planning Institute, 2002; El Touny, 2002).

El Touny (2002) reviewed the evolution of the Kuwaiti economy and tried to analyze human capital and labor policies and their impact on socio-economic development. What he observed to be certain characteristics are unique to Kuwait, and probably to other similar countries in the Gulf region, can be summarized as follows:

- the Kuwaiti economy depends on oil as a major - or even the only - source of revenue.
- there is low production capacity in all non-oil producing sectors.
- the dependence on oil revenues had a negative effect on the consumption patterns of citizens and led to a distorted demographic and labor force structure.
- the Kuwaiti government has adopted employment and wage policies by which it aims to redistribute oil wealth among Kuwaitis.
- distortion has occurred in the relationship between human capital productivity and wages as a result of the adopted policies.
- the Kuwaiti educational sector is lagging behind due to the present incompatibility between the educational system and the labor market.

- female participation in economic activities reached 6% in 2000 due to their registration in higher-educational studies.
- unskilled labor represented 57% of the total expatriate workers in 2000, more than half of whom belong to primary education and below, and one third to middle education and below.

These characteristics and related challenges have contributed to an increase in unemployment (see Table 2; see also Ministry of Planning, 2005; Mubarak, 1999). It should be noted that these percentages represent the labor force that is without jobs, mainly in the public sector. Indeed, a few cases are documented as Kuwaiti job-seekers in the private sector where non-Kuwaitis represent the majority of the labor force (Ministry of Planning, 2005).

Table 2

Unemployment Rate in Kuwait for Selected Years

Year	%
1996	1.8
2003	2.1
2004	2.2

In an attempt to overcome this problem, the Kuwait government initiated plans known as 'restructuring manpower' during the mid 1990s (Nawfl & Alhindi, 2001). These plans largely are intended to lessen dependency on the public sector and create a kind of balance between labor market segments. That is, through plans such as "Kuwaitization," the government helps people invest their human capital in private

sectors, so they can avoid unemployment and find suitable jobs as soon as they finish their education.

The many attempts by the government to cure labor market decline, such as allaying unemployment, rectifying the mismatch between the labor market and educational output, and restructuring labor segments, indicate that the government still acts as the main stakeholder of educational planning. Educational policy makers are also working with statistical indices to produce their own initiatives. This strategy, in fact, mirrors only one side of the whole picture. The other stakeholders who really contribute to any situation, either positively or negatively, are the students. Since they have control over their educational choices, what students think when making any relevant decision, is important. As it is not unusual to find students to be in error with respect to their investment decision concerning continued participation in education, there is a chance to provide more accurate information through a national network. Accordingly, the emphasis of this study is not on what education in Kuwait is about, what policies are, or how the policies are made, but on what Kuwaiti students to perceive that they will gain from different programs of study. This perspective focuses on the user side rather than concentrating on how the policy makers work and what the education providers intend to achieve.

Theoretical Background

First, it is necessary to examine how established the topic of students' expectations is as a research subject. As stated earlier, the concept of human capital, which conceptualizes a relationship between human capital investments (i.e., education, time, and effort) and diverse benefits, assumes that the expected benefits of education are key factors in the demand for 'investment in education' (Becker, 1964; Cohn &

Geske, 1990). A considerable number of previous research studies indicated that prospective students have a good understanding of what benefits they can expect from their chosen program of study after graduation, and these expectations tend to be reasonably accurate (Woodhall, 1998). Hence, this trend of research has been recognized as a relevant topic in the field of the economics of education (Mace, 2000; McMahon, 1981, 1987; Oki, 2001; Psacharopoulos & Sanyal, 1981, 1982; Purcell & Pitcher, 1996). In this section, and for the purpose of this study, themes relevant to the concept of human capital, and students' expectation are discussed.

Human Capital Theory. Adam Smith, in 1779, acknowledged that labor markets, education, and economic growth are interrelated. However, considering an educated man as a sort of expensive machine, which was as important as any other factor of production, constitutes the basis of classical analysis of the human capital concept (Quiggin, 1999). Alexander and Salmon (1995) noted the following:

> Schultz observed that the classical economists had "put us on the wrong road" of economic thought…what Schultz observed was the heterogeneity of capital, and he saw that the individual human was a form of capital that could be developed. Schultz's important contribution was the assertion that *skills* and *knowledge* [italics added] are a form of capital. (p. 49)

Human capital theory officially entered the mainstream of educational literature, or even launched the new field of the economics of education, when Theodore Schultz delivered his speech, 'Investment in Human Capital,' to the American Economic Association in 1960. He emphasized that we mistakenly perceive human capital to be consumption, but, in fact, it is an investment. That is, educational expenditures are no longer thought of as consumption expenditures, but rather as an investment, because

what we, as individuals and societies, will gain is far greater what we spend at present. What does it mean to invest in one's human capital?

In a broad sense, the students' motives for continued participation in education are associated with human capital theory. According to Blaug (1976, 1985), the hard core of human capital theory is that individuals who decide to continue participating in education consider themselves as assets and expect that receiving further education will help them to gain multifaceted benefits other than present enjoyment of being involved in education. This process of 'trading off' costs of education, such as a sacrifice of current income, for future benefits indicates that students are rational in their decisions pertaining to continued participation in education (Schultz, 1963; for a recent discussion on the value of the stock of human capital, see also Psacharopoulos, 2006, pp. 9-11).

The concept of human capital has, therefore, two implications for the economics of education. First, people, through education, become more productive in the labor market, which helps to explain economic growth. Second, students have certain motivations for choosing certain type of education and/or certain levels of education. The main theme of this line of research is to study students' expectations of the economic and non-economic benefits of education. This is basically related to the second implication--students' motivations for continued participation in a specific program at a specific level. For three decades, however, some governments in different parts of the world have sought to reduce spending on education as a proportion of the gross national product (GNP). In order to justify this trend, other economic models of education such as screening, the production function, and public choice models have caused the human capital model to fall from favor in relation to

educational policy. Among the alternatives, the 'screening hypothesis' is a widely accepted model for educational planning.

Although the 'screening hypothesis' model accepts that part of the human capital proposition that the more educated earn more, it asserts that this is because the more educated sector of society possess greater innate productive skills, and this is why they are more productive and are better compensated. All that education does is to identify for the employer those with greater natural abilities, hence the name-'screening hypothesis.' Countries such as Australia and New Zealand have made the 'screening hypothesis' model the dominating catalyst in their educational planning for the last decade (Quiggin, 1999). Nonetheless, use of the screening hypothesis may mean that higher education is simply "an expensive filter to identify the more able, rather than leading to higher productivity" (Psacharopoulos, 2006, p. 6).

Human capital theorists stress that relating education to purely materialistic gains has distorted the multifaceted value of education (e.g., Psacharopoulos , 2000, 2006; Psacharopoulos & Sanyal, 1981, 1982; Woodhall, 1998). In narrow versions of human capital theory, skills and knowledge are instrumentally perceived, insofar as they raise individuals' productivity, and hence, other thing being equal, increase their lifetime earnings. In contrast, the human capital model may be interpreted more broadly so as we can see the overall picture. Learning should not be limited to how much it contributes to higher market earnings (McMahon, 2006). A knowledge of and capacity to appreciate world cultures, for example, provides a future benefit not reflected in market earnings. However, "because monetary returns are easy to measure, most empirical studies have focused on monetary returns rather than on broader definitions of the benefits of education" (Quiggin, 1999, p. 131).

The notable contribution of the human capital model is the emphasis on the importance of non-economic considerations in addition to the economic ones. Non-economic benefits, though not bearing direct monetary value, significantly but indirectly raise the ability and productivity of individuals and thus enable them to generate higher lifelong economic benefits. Hence, monetary and non-monetary returns to education are complementary, not exclusive. According to McMahon (2006), the "non-market benefits are often reported without removing the effects of increased earnings due to education… for example, education contributes to increased longevity, but part of this is due to the earnings that enable purchase of better health care and better diet" (p. 4). Beginning from this point, it is logical to discuss the concept human capital from the perspective of students' expectations.

Benefits from Investment in Human Capital: Students' Expectations. To start with, what makes up students' expectations? Machlup (1978) explained that expectations are information that is gathered from past experiences, knowledge about predecessors' experiences, peer group, or even public opinion, pressure, and social norms that are associated with certain programs of education. Since these sources of expectations are vulnerable to variation (alternation) as a result of political, social and economic factors, it is likely that they will be imprecise calculations of the expected returns in the chosen program (OECD, 2002). Expectations themselves are not fixed; rather they depend a great deal on how favorable individuals perceive their circumstances to be in the changing situation (Williams, 2001).

In the most basic terms, students expect continued participation in education to give them a good earning ability, a high living standard, a respected social status in the future (OECD, 2002), and positive personal development (Purcell & Pitcher,

1996). Williams and Gordon (1981) found that British 16 year-olds' decisions to pursue higher education are affected by their expectations of how those decisions will alter their future lifetime earning. Similarly, Wong (1989) and Menon (1997) revealed that students of both Hong Kong and Cyprus respectively display similar traits with respect to their decisions to pursue higher education. Interestingly, Menon found significant differences between the anticipated expectations of students intending to pursue higher education and those who are not. In fact, not only deciding to continue participating in education is critical, but also what area of study is chosen.

Purcell and Pitcher (1996) found that in the United Kingdom in the 1990s, most of the students participating in their study revealed that they chose their respective courses for pragmatic reasons, namely getting a good job. In Egypt, Psacharopoulos and Sanyal (1982) compared students' expectations with the actual labor market and found that those expectations were in tune with then current market conditions. For instance, many Egyptian students decided to choose less popular disciplines of studies, e.g., agronomy, that would ensure them a better chance of more attractive benefits.

Across different regions of the World, English language study still attracts a fairly large number of students. However, students' expectations about English programs are based upon program-related differences. Boys et al. (1988) examined British students' entry behavior in different disciplines, including English, at nine different institutions, each of which has its own philosophy and mission, particularly teaching-based institutions and research-based institutions. They found that the choice of a specific program of study with respect to English has adjusted overtime to reflect students' expectations. For example, students choosing a liberal arts-based English degree program had different expectations with respect to life-long values from those

selecting teaching-based English. The latter, expected that their programs would provide them with employment-related gains. Besides appreciating the humane side of language study, there were a number of references to communication skills, which were held to improve the ability to assimilate and present information, so that when students select administration, management or personnel work, they would be well-equipped.

Boys et al. (1988) found also that students clustered within certain categories, e.g., students at liberal arts-based institutions held different expectations as a function of the course content. That is, the students attending a program focusing on classical and Victorian English literature were concerned more with the non-economic benefits of their chosen program than those attending a program focusing on modern and contemporary English literature. Interestingly, a question was raised regarding how far student' expectations can be considered independent of other influences on the academic system. It maybe, that although student preferences influence the responsiveness of the course content, they are in turn influenced by their economic and non-economic expectations of why they decide to continue participation in a specific program of study: labor market, employability, skills, added values (i.e., long terms goals). Based on the researchers' findings, an important point was made-- the relationship between academic and economic considerations is extremely complex. This complex relationship reflects the changing nature of students' expectations.

Expectations are not static. In a more recent study, Martin and Gawthrope (2004) revealed that students of English show a mix of attitudes towards English and economic expectations. Although students of English at liberal arts school scored low on direct career relevance, their decisions to continue studying the subject for pure enjoyment are often hedged with taking-up another, more applied subject, in a

combined program. Brennan and Williams (2003) observed the following in respect to the students of English at liberal arts school in the UK:

> If we compare the skills English graduates feel they lack to those the English benchmark statement reports they should possess, there is a mismatch in terms of developing team work, time management/organization and IT skills. Moreover, these same skills were all mentioned to a greater or lesser extent in the search of websites. And indeed… employers felt that English degrees were worst at developing time management and building relationships… although the evidence… is limited, it suggests that English departments may not be developing the full range of attributes and capacities outlined in the benchmark statement. (p. 27)

This may point to several issues in the area of the interaction of English language education and the real world. Most obviously it points to a widespread disappointment among graduates of English, with the quality of working life after a mismatch between expectations and experience. Those entering liberal arts or education-based English programs may indeed have an idealized image of career development, or an assumption that the degree is a ticket to a lifetime of demanding and rewarding work. However, it must also be considered that many expectations are not unreasonable (Martin & Gawthrope, 2004). The question of content and delivery method of English language education has arisen out of this new circumstance.

The emergence of English language programs that focus more on applied sides of language has become a phenomenon. Skills such as written communications skills, oral communication skills, documenting, searching and the like have predominated the prospectus of the English language-related programs, whether liberal-arts or education-based (Grin, 2002).

In sum, the validity of a bipolar dichotomy of economic vs. non-economic expectations of student of English is called into question. In fact, this dichotomy is better seen as a continuum; that is, students are located somewhere between these two extremes, not holding purely economic or non-economic expectations, or they may be located at either of these extremes (Brennan & Williams, 2003; Dominitz & Manski, 1996). Martin and Gawthrope (2004) clearly recognized that both types of expectations can exist simultaneously, and the dominance of economic expectations is due to the changing circumstances, but does not assert their superiority over other non-economic expectations.

Chapter Summary

Two major topics were presented in this chapter: (a) a contextual background of the problem, showing a brief history of education in Kuwait, with a special reference to English, and the current demographic situation of the labor market; and (b) theoretical background that reviews the major themes in this area of study, human capital theory and students' expectation of different programs of one area of study, focusing on English as liberal arts-based and as teaching-based (i.e., applied) areas of study. In chapter 3, the method which will be utilized in this study is detailed.

Chapter III: Method

Presented in this chapter are the methods and procedures that were used in this study. A discussion of the rationale for the research methods is followed by a description of the populations that were sampled for the study. The chapter is divided into the following sections: (a) a restatement of the research questions; (b) a description of the study populations and the methods utilized to obtain the samples; (c) instrumentation for the study including a description of the dependent and independent variables; (e) data collection procedures; and (f) the data analysis procedures. Each section is scrutinized with the utmost precision so that one understands exactly what was done, to the point where any researcher could precisely replicate the study (Gay & Airasian, 2003; Leedy & Ormond, 2005).

Restatement of Research Questions

This study examines how students of different academic programs of English, namely Arts and Education, at Kuwait University differ in their economic and non-economic expectations of these given programs? The research questions are

1. How do students of English at the College of Education and the Faculty of Arts rate on motivations for investing in higher education, their career intentions, and their choice of program?
2. How do students of English at the College of Education and the Faculty of Arts rate on opinions regarding the graduate labor market?
3. How do students of English at the College of Education and the Faculty of Arts rate perceptions of future employers' expectations?
4. How do students of English at the College of Education and the Faculty of Arts rate on their aspirations for career development and long term life goals?

The four inferential questions are:

1. Do students of English at the College of Education differ in their motivations for investing in higher education, their career intentions, and their choice of program from the students of English at the Faculty of Arts?
2. Do students of English at the College of Education differ in their opinions regarding the graduate labor market from the students of English at the Faculty of Arts?
3. Do students of English at the College of Education differ in their perceptions of future employers' expectations from students of English at the Faculty of Arts?
4. Do students of English at the College of Education differ in their aspirations for career development and long term life goals from students of English at the Faculty of Arts?

Based on the findings of the previous literature that there is a relationship between students' expectations and the program of study they choose (Dominitz & Manski, 1996; Williams, 2001), the following are the research hypotheses:

H1-a: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their hedonistic motivations for investing in higher education, their career intentions, and their choice of program from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

H1-b: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their pragmatic motivations for investing in higher education, their career intentions, and their choice of program from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

H1-c: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their fatalistic motivations for investing in higher education, their career intentions, and their choice of program from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

H2: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their opinions regarding the knowledge and skills required by the graduate labor market from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

H3: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their perceptions of future employers' expectations from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

H4-a: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their aspirations for career development from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

H4-b: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their long term life goals from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

The null hypotheses pertaining to the above research hypotheses to be tested are that the two study samples came from the same population. In other words, the two populations, from which the two samples were drawn, are identical.

Participants

The first step in the sampling procedure was to identify the target population. Population is the group of interest for which the researcher would like to generalize the results of the study. The target population of this study was students of English at the College of Education and the Faculty of Arts. The total number of students of English at the College of Education is 124 students, 112 of whom are female and 12 are male (College of Education, 2005/2006). On the other hand, the total number of

students of English at the Faculty of Arts is 417 students, 356 of whom are female and 61 are male.

In their effort to find out the nature of the relationship between variables, researchers utilize a relatively small sample of the targeted population (Leedy & Ormond, 2005). Only rarely is the total population of interest utilized as a sample; it is neither feasible nor necessary to the total group (Gay & Airasian, 2003). When the population of interest is large or geographically scattered, the study of such a population requires too much effort, money, and time. The purpose of sampling is to obtain information about a population. According Gay and Airasian, sampling is the process of selecting a number of individuals for a study in such a way that the individuals represent the larger group from which they were selected. Selection of a sample is a very important step in research since the appropriateness of a sample determines the generalizability of the results. There are methods to select a sample: random sampling and non-random sampling. Random sampling is preferable because the selection is made so that all individuals in the population have an equal and independent chance to be selected for the sample.

When the population contains a number of subgroups that are different in some of the characteristics being studied, typically, a type of probability sampling, termed stratified sampling, is utilized (Gay & Airasian, 2003; Leedy & Ormond, 2005; Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). Stratified sampling is the process of selecting a sample in such as a way that the identified subgroups in the population are presented in the sample in the same proportion that they exist in the population (Gay & Airasian, 2003).

Due to the fact that this study is concerned with language-related degree programs, other programs such as History or Geography were excluded. Moreover,

languages other than English were excluded. Therefore, sample students were divided into two strata: (a) students of English at the College (n= 100) of Education; and (b) student of English at the Faculty of Arts (n= 100). The sample size is as important as the sampling procedure, so in order to maximize probability sampling and minimize sampling errors, a process of random selection within each stratum was utilized. This is so systematic differences occurring among the participants or in the environment are eliminated as much as possible.

Based on previous studies conducted on students' expectations about their chosen programs, the samples were confined to students of the same year of study instead of a mixture of students of different years. It is believed that students from different years of study may vary in their expectations. For an expectations study like this one which explores into students' expectations for investing in continued education, including skills to be developed during their course of study, first year students were more suitable samples. They are freshmen of the higher education sector and are still excited and clear about to expect from it. Students of the other years may have become more practical, because of various reasons, during their course of study. Their expectations may also have changed (e.g., Purcell & Pitcher, 1996).

Instrumentation for the Study

Data were collected through the use of a survey which was administered to the participants. The survey questionnaire that was used in this study (see appendix 1) is largely based on the *Great Expectations* questionnaire originally developed by Purcell and Pitcher (1996; see also Yung, 2003) in their study of twenty-one higher education institutions representing a wide spectrum of educational philosophies (e.g., vocational vs. non-vocational) in the United Kingdom. Purcell and Pitcher's survey consists of five parts:

1. students' motivations for investing in higher education, their career intentions, and choices of program;
2. students' opinions on the increased tuition fees and the high interest on student loans;
3. students' opinions on the graduate labor market;
4. students' perceptions of future employers' expectations; and
5. students' aspirations for career development and long term life goals.

Since Purcell and Pitcher developed their instrument for use for a different population in another country, it was necessary to make some modifications in order to use it with the sample for the current study. First, the part pertaining students' opinions on increased tuition fees and the higher interest on student loans were not included because it is irrelevant to the participants. This irrelevance is due to the fact that, except for private education, education in Kuwait is completely free at all levels, although students still incur "an indirect cost in terms of forgone earnings equal to what secondary school graduates of the same age are earnings in the labor market" Psacharopuolos (2006, p. 5) . Second, since the instrument was originally designed to answer specific research questions that differ from the research questions for this study, items were modified in order to be appropriate. Since survey studies are notorious known for compiling background information (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991), only relevant questions were included.

The reliability and validity of the instrument are a concern for interested researchers. The instrument was used in different parts of the world and reliability coefficients were reported to be 'satisfactory' (see e.g., Murray & Robinson, 2001; Purcell and Pitcher, 1996; Yung, 1999). Additionally, validity was assessed against

some other measures and it was found that Purcell and Pitchers' survey (1996) is valid in terms of its construct validity. That is, it measures students' expectations of their chosen program of study (Murray & Robinson, 2001). However, no statistics are available for either the reliability or validity of the instrument. Hence, a pilot study of the present modified instrument was imperative.

Variables of the Study. Based on the research questions of this study, the variables are as follows:

1. Independent variable:

   There is one main independent variable: Program of study (student of English at the College of Education and student of English at the Faculty of Arts)

2. Dependent variables:

   There are four dependent variables (see Table 1):

   - students' motivations: Purcell and Pitcher (1996) categorized three kinds of motivation: (a) *hedonistic* refers to intrinsic interest or enjoyment in the participant; (b) *pragmatic* refers to choosing a specific program of study for vocational and longer-term reasons; and (c) *fatalistic* refers to students who embark on their program of study by default, because they could not get into the program they preferred.
   - students' opinions regarding the graduate labor market;
   - students' perceptions of future employers' expectations; and
   - students' aspirations for career development and long term life goals.

All these variables were assessed on a 5-point Likert scale. For positively and negatively worded statements, high scores reflect positive attitude whereas low scores reflect negative attitudes. Although the scale is a 5-point Likert scale through the questionnaire survey, the scale format was of different presentations such as 'agree,'

'possible,' and/or 'important.' These different presentations are meant to increase the optimal involvement of the participants when completing the questionnaire. However, these different presentations were based on their relationship to each concept respectively. For example, the part concerning the future labor market, 'highly possible' through 'highly impossible' format is used to reflect the conceptual content of the students' opinions regarding the graduate labor market. In addition, in order to make the survey a bit more attractive and motivate potential respondents, different font types were used (see the appendix 1).

Table 3

Research Independent Variables in Relation to the Survey Items

Research Independent Variables	Survey Items
Hedonistic Motivations	6, 7, 10, 15, 16, and 17
Pragmatic Motivations	1, 2, 4, 11, 12, 13, and 14
Fatalistic Motivations	3*, 5*, 8*, 9*, and 18*
Students' opinions regarding the graduate labor market	19*, 20*, 21*, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32*, 33, and 34
Students' perceptions of future employers' expectations	35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, and 52
Students' aspirations for career development	53, 54*, 55, 56, 57, 58*, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, and 66
Students' aspirations for long term life goals	67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, and 77

Note. * stands for negatively worded statements and accordingly reverse coded

Data Collection Procedures

Since this study is related to students' expectations of their chosen programs of different English language programs (Arts and Education), the necessary paperwork was submitted to the members of Internal Review Board (IRB) at Virginia Tech in order to obtain permission to conduct the study. When the permission was granted, a request was sent to the Head of the Department of Educational Administration and Planning at Kuwait University, Dr. Jasim Al-Hamdan, to obtain permission to administer the survey questionnaire to both the students of English at the College of Education and those at the Faculty of Arts. Dr. Al-Hamdan is chosen because he is the current head of department. After permission was obtained, the survey was divided according to the programs of study (Arts and Education). Since the average class size is twenty-five students, a number of classes were randomly selected from each program to get the desired number of participants mentioned previously. Subsequently, course instructors were contacted for permission to administer the survey questionnaire to their students during a class period. The instructors were assured that the complete administration of the survey (i.e., introduction, obtaining release forms signed, handing out the survey, responding to any questions from the respondents, and collecting the survey) would not take more than 30 minutes from their class time.

This stratified cluster sampling was done in a semi random manner: the classes to be surveyed were selected at random, but the actual participation of a particular class population was determined by the discretion of the instructor and the individual students. Once the instructors gave their approval, a schedule for class visits was prepared, and the instructors were notified of the date and times. At each class, agreement of the students was obtained to conduct the survey, distribute it, and then

collect it afterward. Confidentiality was assured, and they were told that they had the option to refuse to participate. After their approval was obtained, the IRB approved participation agreement and confidentiality statement was distributed for their signatures. After return of the signed permission forms, the survey was described and instructions given. Students were encouraged to ask questions if they did not understand something or if they need assistance to complete the survey. When the administration was complete, the surveys were collected, and students were thanked for their participation and given contact information for any enquiry concerning the study.

Data Analysis

In order to create a data file for analysis, a coding system was designed based on the questionnaire items and response categories. Each question and measured item formed a variable, and each response category within the variable was defined and assigned a numeric value. For the purpose of this study, each variable was coded in correspondence to its appearance in the survey instrument. For example, item 1 (i.e., this program will enable me to get the kind of job training opportunity I wanted.) was coded as 'item_1,' item 20 (i.e., There are few suitable jobs available.) was coded as 'item_20' and so on. Following data collection, an identification number was assigned to each questionnaire in order to keep track of each case and to check the accuracy of the data. Based on the coding system, responses were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, 2001) version 11.0, Microsoft Windows.

Based on the two types of research questions and hypotheses, the levels of measurement (nominal and interval) and the types of variables (continuous and discrete), two data analysis procedures were conducted: (a) descriptive statistics; and (b) inferential statistics, namely, two independent-sample t-test (see Table 2).

Table 4

Research Variables in Relation to Statisitcs Used

Variables	Statistics Used	
	Descriptive	Inferential
Discrete Variables		
- Disciplines of study	Frequency and percentages	----
- Gender	Frequency and percentages	----
Continuous Variables		
- Students' motivations for investing in higher education, their career intentions and choices of program	Means and Standard Deviations	Two independent-sample t-test
- Students' opinions regarding the graduate labor market	Means and Standard Deviations	Two independent-sample t-test
- Students' perceptions of future employers' expectations	Means and Standard Deviations	Two independent-sample t-test
- Students' aspirations for career development and long term life goals	Means and Standard Deviations	Two independent-sample t-test

As the name implies, descriptive statistics describe a body of data either graphically or numerically. Describing the data summarize their important characteristics (Witte & Witte, 2004). Therefore, for the nominal data, frequencies and percentages were used to describe their characteristics. For the interval data, on the other hand, their center midpoint (the *mean*) and how broadly they are spread (the *standard deviation*) were used to explore distribution of the data. As far as the data interpretation is concerned, the program of the study (College of Education and Faculty of Arts) was the dominating variable governing the meanings that emerge from the other variables. This last procedure was chosen to govern the inferential statistics as well. Additionally, the unit of analysis was students.

Two independent-sample t-tests were used to determine if there were any statistically significant differences between the two groups of students of English at the College of Education and the Faculty of Arts. There are two main reasons why this statistical test is appropriate for this study. First, it is assumed that there is minimal interdependence between the two groups, and hence the study design involves observations of two independent samples. Second, the population variance is unknown. Additionally, it is assumed that there are no systematic differences occurring among the participants or in the environment that would significantly affect outcomes. In statistics literature, it is assumed that a sample larger than 30 cases is sufficient to estimate population parameters (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991, p. 326; Witte & Witte, 2004, p. 336). Hence, a sample of 351 cases ensures the *robustness* of the t-test in case of moderate violations of the required assumptions.

Due to the fact that this study is concerned with Type II error, not finding a difference when there is a true difference in populations, and that the statistical test is the appropriate test, an increase in the statistical power (1-β) is desirable. Statistical

power in this context is the probability of finding differences when there are true differences in the populations. There are four key factors that influence the power of a statistical test: (a) the alpha that a researcher chooses; (b) the magnitude of the true population differences (i.e., effect size); (c) sample size; and (d) the appropriateness of the statistical test used. Thus, in addition to using the two independent-sample t-test as the appropriate statistical test and sufficient sample sizes (n= 351), the decision rule pertaining to rejecting the null hypotheses was set at the significance level (i.e., α) of 0.05, given the fact that the null hypotheses, which state that the two samples were drawn from one population (or identical ones, which amounts to the same thing) are true.

The Pilot Study

There are two vital reasons why this study used an existing instrument. First, developing a totally new research measure does not necessarily guarantee that it could answer all questions set by a researcher due, to the complexity of some variables under consideration like motivation and attitude. Second, the established measure is more advantageous than developing a new research tool, providing that validity and reliability be reported in previous studies. However, this does not mean that the adapted procedure does not need piloting in its new context without losing its original rationale. In other words, the most important point to consider in piloting adapted instruments is that changes made should not change the theory, that is, the assumptions upon which the instrument was constructed (Dornyei, 2001).

The significance of a pilot study is that it enables researchers to make changes, as necessary, on the proposed instrument, whether it is used in its original or modified form. As some researchers observed, every questionnaire must be tested and refined under real-world conditions before it is finalized, preferably by someone who is not

involved in its preparation, which would be reflect an independent point of view (Gay & Airasian, 2003; Leedy & Ormond, 2005; Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991).

A pilot study was conducted before the final administration of the proposed questionnaire. This pilot study checked three important purposes:

- the time needed for completion the survey is reasonable.
- identifying any recognized vagueness, and making sure that the language used is sound, appropriate, and clear for the sample chosen. This purpose was intended to verify the face validity of the proposed questionnaire.
- to check the internal consistency reliability of the subscale (see table 3) that constitute the whole survey. The internal consistency is defined as "the extent to which all items within a single instrument yield similar results" (Leedy & Ormond, 2005, p. 93).

Chapter Summary

Presented in this chapter was the methodology utilized in this study. Information was provided about: (a) the research questions; (b) the study populations and samples; (c) the data collection procedures; and (d) the data analysis procedures. In chapter 4, the results for this study will be represented. In chapter 5, the findings are discussed, conclusions will be drawn, limitations will be identified, and recommendations for future research prsented.

Chapter IV: Results

This study was conducted to investigate how students in different academic programs of English, namely Arts and Education, at Kuwait University differ in their economic and non-economic expectations of these given programs. This researcher sought to provide information in regard to students' expectations about their chosen programs. To do so, data were collected through a questionnaire that examined students' expectations.

This chapter presents the results of the pilot and the main study, and answers for each of the research questions based on the analysis of responses to the questionnaire items. Also presented in this chapter are the research questions.

Pilot Study

The pilot study (n = 100) showed that the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of the whole measure was fairly high (alpha = .83; see appendix 2). It seems clear, therefore, that the measure assessed the variables of interests with high levels of internal consistency. This high internal consistency, in turn, has two important implications with respect to the purpose of this study. First, this high internal consistency suggests that the 77 items were homogenous; that is, they are theoretically measure the same phenomenon (i.e., students' expectations about their chosen program). Second, although reliability is necessary but not sufficient for the validity of the instrument, it is critical for the instrument to correlate with itself (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991).

The pilot study was used as well to check whether the time needed for completing the survey form was sufficient and to test whether participants had any difficulties in understanding the questions. The outcome was satisfactory; most students were able to complete the questionnaire within twenty minutes and the

participants' feedback with respect to clarity was positive. No incident of vagueness was reported.

Demographic Data

The sample (n = 351) was composed of students of English in the Faculty of Arts (males = 90 and females = 90) and the College of Education (males = 87 and females = 84). As far as the data interpretation was concerned, a chi-square test was conducted to examine the degree of association between students' program of study (College of Education and Faculty of Arts) and their gender. The rationale was to explore the dominant variable governing the meanings that emerge from the data. As can be seen from the frequencies cross tabulated in Appendix 4, there was no association between gender and type of college, χ^2 (1, n = 351) = .27, p = .87. Therefore, the interpretation of data was governed by the college attended, not gender.

This study was no exception to the missing data challenge, and missing values (37%) were present in the question concerning GPA (see appendix 3). Failure to disclose their GPA is a students' behavior that researchers usually face when they conduct a study within the walls of Kuwait University (Al-Khezi, personal communication, August 30, 2006). Therefore, this categorical variable was excluded from the analysis.

Research Question 1

Research question 1 asks, "How do students of English at the College of Education and the Faculty of Arts rate on motivations for investing in higher education, their career intentions, and their choice of program? And, do students of English at the College of Education differ in their motivations for investing in higher education, their career intentions, and their choice of program from the students of English at the Faculty of Arts?" The hypotheses predicted that students of English at

the College of Education are different in their hedonistic, pragmatic, and fatalistic motivations for investing in higher education, their career intentions, and their choice of program from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

Hedonistic Motivation. The data suggested that there was a statistically significant difference only in the total scores of hedonistic motivation for students of English in the Faculty of Arts and College of Education (see appendix 5). Specifically, there were significant differences in scores of intrinsic motivation and enjoyment for the students of English in the College of Education (M = 16.8, SD = 4.8) and those in the Faculty of Arts (M = 15.7, SD = 5.4), $t_{0.025}$ (347.28) = -2.1, p = .04.

Pragmatic Motivation. The data suggested that students of English in the College of Education (M = 14.68, SD = 5.63) and the students of English in the Faculty of Arts (M = 12.56, SD = 4.67), demonstrated a statistically significant difference in the total scores of pragmatic motivation, $t_{0.025}$ (330.7) = -3.84, $p \leq .0005$ (see appendix 6). This pragmatic motivation specifically manifested in six components.

Students of English in the College of Education (M = 2.07, SD = 1.23) and their counterparts in the Faculty of Arts group (M = 1.78, SD = 1.03) demonstrated a significance difference in their opinions regarding the job training opportunity with which the their chosen programs would provide them (t[332.25] = -2.36, p = .02). That is, the participants from the College of Education consistently thought that enrolling in the College of Education would give them the training that they were seeking. Accordingly, the participants from the College of Education had a mean difference in their expectations with respect to the specialized skills and/or knowledge

that their program would help them to develop (*MD* = -.24, *SD* = .11) higher than that of the participants from the Faculty of Arts, $t_{0.025}(306.97) = -2.34$, $p = .02$.

Students of English in the College of Education scored higher than their counterparts in the Faculty of Arts in respect to job related motivations. The participants from the College of Education (*M* = 2.20, *SD* = 1.29) expected better job prospects than the participants from the Faculty of Arts (*M* = 1.78, *SD* = 1.15), $t_{0.025}(339.26) = -3.23$, $p \leq .001$. Similarly, students of English from the College of Education (*M* = 2.46, *SD* = 1.36) expected a better chance to enter their chosen career than do the students of English in the Faculty of Arts (*M* = 2.06, *SD* = 1.29), $t_{0.025}(349) = -2.83$, $p \leq .005$. Not only were the students of English from the College of Education motivated by job-related concerns, they also (*M* = 2.16, *SD* = 1.24) expected more positively that their chosen program would enable them to pursue their postgraduate studies than did the students of English from the Faculty of Arts (*M* = 1.92, *SD* = 1.12), $t_{0.025}(343.58) = -2.53$, $p = .01$.

Fatalistic Motivation. With respect to fatalists, students who embark on their program of study by default when they could not get into a preferred program, the findings were surprising (see appendix 7). In contrast to the hedonistic and pragmatic motivations, the data indicate that students of English from the Faculty of Arts (*M* = 18.05, *SD* = 4.49) were less fatalistic than their counterparts from the College of Education (*M* = 16.47, *SD* = 4.29), $t_{0.025}(349) = 3.35$, $p \leq .001$. Specifically, finding employment rather than being a university student was not as applicable to the participants from the Faculty of Arts (*M* = 3.51, *SD* = 1.44) as to participants from the College of Education (*M* = 2.88, *SD* = 1.53), $t_{0.025}(349) = 3.99$, $p \leq .0001$. Moreover, students of English from the Faculty of Arts (*M* = 3.89, *SD* = 1.38) did not cite

negative reasons that 'not finding a suitable job was their motivation to be in this program' as did their counterparts from the College of Education thought (M = 3.44, SD = 1.41), $t_{0.025}(349) = 2.98$, $p \leq .003$.

Research Question 2

Research question 2 asks, "How do students of English at the College of Education and the Faculty of Arts rate on opinions regarding the graduate labor market? The hypothesis stated that "students of English at the College of Education are different in their opinions regarding the knowledge and skills required by the graduate labor market from students of English at the Faculty of Arts." A review of data suggested that (see appendix 8) there was a statistically significant difference in the total score of opinions regarding the graduate labor market between students of English from the Faculty of Arts (M = 44.13, SD = 7.75) and students of English from the College of Education (M = 48.19, SD = 8.60), $t_{0.025}(349) = -4.64$, $p \leq .0005$. Table 5 shows the items on which the differences between the mean scores of participants from Faculty of Arts and College of Education students were statistically significant.

Table 5 shows that the students of English from the Faculty of Arts had more positive attitudes with respect to the competitive nature of the Kuwaiti labor market and the availability of jobs than did the students of English from the College of Education. For the former, the competition in the labor market seemed relatively unchallenging and their feelings toward the availability of suitable jobs were more positive than were those of their counterparts from the College of Education.

Table 5

t-test Results for Items Showing Statistically Significant Differences in Students' Opinions Regarding the Graduate Labor Market

Item	Program of Study		*t*-value	Sig
	Arts	Education		
The graduate labor market is very competitive.*	4.24 (1.42)	3.81 (1.33)	3.29 (335.2)	.001
There are few suitable jobs available.*	3.76 (1.47)	3.29 (1.47)	2.94 (349)	.003
I will apply for post graduate study only if I can not find a suitable job.*	3.97 (1.31)	3.63 (1.52)	2.28 (336.2)	.023
I do not think I will have problems finding a job.	2.55 (1.43)	3.27 (1.51)	-4.56 (345.2)	.000
My studies have nothing to do with my career.	2.26 (1.47)	2.86 (1.59)	-3.69 (342.8)	.000
I expect a low economic return in the next few years but a higher return over the long run.	3.16 (1.47)	3.78 (1.32)	-4.12 (347.8)	.000
When the economy recovers, there will be plenty of good jobs.	2.18 (1.45)	2.81 (1.53)	-3.95 (349)	.000
There is an oversupply of students of this program.	3.17 (1.50)	3.75 (1.31)	-3.90 (346.9)	.000
I will get exactly what I want.	2.26 (1.49)	2.79 (1.66)	-3.12 (340.3)	.002
I will take the best out of several job offers.	3.12 (1.51)	3.68 (1.41)	-3.63 (349)	.000
I will take the first offer I received in order to gain experience so that I may obtain the type of job I really want.	1.78 (1.21)	2.22 (1.51)	-2.98 (324.3)	.003
I will take the job to broaden my experience and to develop more general skills.	2.38 (1.44)	2.75 (1.51)	-2.32 (349)	.021
I will take anything that is available, rather than be unemployed.*	3.75 (1.38)	3.42 (1.45)	2.21 (349)	.027

Note. * indicates negatively worded statements that accordingly reverse coded

However, for the participants from the College of Education, rather than their counterparts from the Faculty of Arts, believed that finding jobs was no problematic, and that when the economy recovered, they were highly more likely to find employment. They felt more strongly than their counterparts from the Faculty of Arts, however, that there is an oversupply of students of their English program.

Table 5 also indicates that although the participants from the College of Education were more willing to accept the best out of several job offers; in general, the students of English from the Faculty of Arts were more concerned with the nature of the job they would find after graduation. For example, they were less willing than their counterparts from the College of Education to take any available job rather than remaining unemployed. They were also not as likely as the participants from the College of Education to take the first offer they received in order to gain experience untill they might obtain the type of job they really wanted. In the same line, the participants from the College of Education were much more inclined than their counterparts from the Faculty of Arts to take the job to broaden their experience and to develop more general skills. However, if a suitable job were unavailable, the participants from the Faculty of Arts were less willing than students of English from the College of Education to enroll in a graduate studies than to accept an unsuitable position.

Generally speaking, Table 5 indicates that the students of English from the College of Education were more positive than the students of English from the Faculty of Arts regarding the Kuwaiti labor market. This positive feeling was manifested in their belief that they would get exactly the employment position they wanted after graduation.

Research Question 3

Research question 3 asks, "How do students of English at the College of Education and the Faculty of Arts rate perceptions of future employers' expectations?" The hypothesis was that students of English at the College of Education are different in their perceptions of future employers' expectations from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

Data suggested that (see appendix 9) there were no statistically significant differences in the total score with respect to the perceptions of future employers' expectations for the students of English at the College of Education (M = 42.10, SD = 13.60), and the students of English at the Faculty of Arts (M = 19.70, SD = 2.02), $t_{0.025}(348) = -1.64$, $p = .10$. However, there was a statistically significant difference in the perception of the importance of "time management" between the participants from the College of Education (M = 2.97, SD = 1.44) and the participants from the Faculty of Arts (M = 2.58, SD = 1.48), $t_{0.025}(349) = -2.51$, $p = .01$. This last difference between the two groups is in consistent with what Brennan and Williams (2003) observed about the lack of time management among student of English at liberal arts schools.

Research Question 4

Research question 4 asks, "How do students of English at the College of Education differ in their aspirations for career development and long-term life goals from students of English at the Faculty of Arts?" The hypotheses were that students of English at the College of Education are different in their aspirations for career development, and long term life goals from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

Future Career Aspiration. Overview of data suggested (see appendix 10) that there was no statistically significant difference in the total score of the future

career aspirations for the participants from the College of Education (M = 39.97, SD = 7.25), and the participants from the Faculty of Arts (M = 38.65, SD = 7.18), $t_{0.025}(349) = -1.71$, $p = .08$. However, there were some items under this dimension where the two groups showed statistically significant differences.

Further, that there was a statically significant difference (see appendix 10) in the score of the possibility of changing employers for the participants from the College of Education (M = 2.75, SD = 1.37) and the participants from the Faculty of Arts (M = 2.42, SD = 1.39), $t_{0.025}(349) = -2.24$, $p = .025$. Additionally, the participants from the College of Education (M = 3.91, SD = 1.24) and the participants from the Faculty of Arts (M = 3.55, SD = 1.45) showed a statistically significant difference in the possibility of achieving a higher position, $t_{0.025}(344.79) = -2.52$, $p = .01$. Also, the participants from the College of Education (M = 3.82, SD = 1.23) and the participants from the Faculty of Arts (M = 3.3.42, SD = 1.49) showed a statistically significant difference in their belief in the possibility of achieving more secure employment, $t_{0.025}(341.81) = -2.79$, $p \leq .005$. However, in contrast to this line of differences in the respective future career aspirations for both groups, where the participants from the College of Education showed higher scores than their counterparts from the Faculty of Arts, the latter group (M = 3.21, SD = 1.34) believed they were much less likely to change their field of responsibilities than the participants from the College of Education (M = 2.76, SD = 1.21), $t_{0.025}(349) = 3.31$, $p \leq .001$.

Life Long Goals. Overview of data suggested (see appendix 11) that there was no statistically significant difference in the total score of life long goals scale for the participants from the College of Education (M = 41.14, SD = 4.99), and the

participants from the Faculty of Arts (M = 40.72, SD = 5.45), $t_{0.025}(349) = -.75$, $p = .45$.

Chapter Summary

This chapter presents the findings from the data collected from the respondents (n = 351). Since the dominant variable governing the meanings that emerged from the data was the program of the study (i.e., College of Education and the Faculty of Arts), an independent sample *t*-test was used to answer the research questions and to test the research hypotheses. Generally, the results showed that there were statistically significant differences between the participants from College of Education and the participants from Faculty of Arts pursuant to their total scores relating to: (a) hedonistic, pragmatic and fatalistic motivations; and (b) their opinions regarding the graduate labor market. In contrast, there were no statistically significant differences between the participants from College of Education and the participants from Faculty of Arts in their total scores relating to: (a) their expectations of future employers' expectations; (b) their aspirations for future career; and (c) their long term life goals. However, despite the absence of statistically significant differences in the total scores of the latter hypotheses, some items in those categories did show statistically significant differences, as discussed in the body of this chapter.

Chapter V: Summary, Discussion, and Implications

Chapter V provides a summary and discussion of the study findings, conclusions and recommendations for future research. Thus, it is composed of four sections: (a) an overview and summary of the findings from the study; (b) a discussion of those findings; (c) recommendations to this study; and (d) suggestions for future research.

Overview of the Findings

The purpose of this study was to identify how students of English enrolled in different colleges, the Faculty of Arts and the College of Education colleges at Kuwait University, differ in their expectations about their chosen programs.

The target population of this study was students attending Kuwait University during the 2006/2007 academic year. Only students in their second year and above were surveyed. The total number of students surveyed was 351: the Faculty of Arts (males = 90 and females = 90) and the College of Education (males = 87 and females = 84). The interpretation of data was governed by the college attended, not by gender.

The questionnaire used for this survey originally was developed by Purcell and Pitcher (1996). The adopted version consists of four parts: (a) students' motivations (*hedonistic*, *pragmatic*, and *fatalistic*); (b) students' opinions regarding the graduate labor market; (c) students' perceptions of future employers' expectations; and (d) students' aspirations for career development and long term-life goals. The survey was reliable and took reasonable time for completion. For this study, independent-sample t-tests were employed for data analysis procedures.

Summary of the Findings. The findings were reported in detail in chapter IV. The following is a summary of the findings for each research question:

Q1. Do students of English at the College of Education differ in their motivations for investing in higher education, their career intentions, and their choice of program from the students of English at the Faculty of Arts?

The relevant hypotheses were:

H1-a: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their hedonistic motivations for investing in higher education, their career intentions, and their choice of program from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

H1-b: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their pragmatic motivations for investing in higher education, their career intentions, and their choice of program from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

H1-c: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their fatalistic motivations for investing in higher education, their career intentions, and their choice of program from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

The data supported all three hypotheses that the two groups came from different populations. That is, the data showed that students of English from the College of Education were not only more intrinsically-motivated than their counterparts from the Faculty of Arts, but also more pragmatically-motivated. In other words, the participants from the College of Education expected more positively that their chosen program would provide them with job training opportunity, specialized skills and knowledge so that they would be able to get the job they would look for, enjoy better job prospects, and pursue graduate education. However, it was surprising to find that the participants from the College of Education felt that they were fatalistically-motivated to enroll in their chosen program; they expected their chosen program to be a better choice than being unemployed or not finding a suitable job.

Q2. Do students of English at the College of Education differ in their opinions regarding the graduate labor market from the students of English at the Faculty of Arts?

The hypothesis related to Q2 was:

H2: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their opinions regarding the knowledge and skills required by the graduate labor market from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

H2 was supported by the obtained data. Generally speaking, overview of the data showed that the students of English from the College of Education held more positive expectations of the graduate labor market than did the students of English from the Faculty of Arts. They expected the labor market would meet their expectations with respect to the jobs available. However, the participants from the Faculty of Arts were more positive in their expectations about the graduate labor market in two regards: the job market would be less competitive and jobs would be available after graduation. Also, showed the participants from the Faculty of Arts showed greater concerns with the nature or the quality of the future job market rather than the quantity of jobs available. For example, they were not willing to apply for any job offered in the graduate labor market apart from it worthiness and, in contrast to their counterparts from the College of Education, the fear of unemployment was not a sufficient reason for them to accept any job.

Q3. Do students of English at the College of Education differ in their perceptions of future employers' expectations from students of English at the Faculty of Arts?

The hypothesis was:

H3: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their perceptions of future employers' expectations from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

The hypothesis was not supported by the obtained data and suggested that both groups were generally similar in their perceptions about the future employers' expectations. However, the participants from the College of Education had a strong perception that "time management" is important than did their counterparts from the Faculty of Arts.

Q4. Do students of English at the College of Education differ in their aspirations for career development and long term life goals from students of English at the Faculty of Arts?

The relevant hypotheses were:

H4-a: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their aspirations for career development from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

H4-b: Students of English at the College of Education are different in their long term life goals from students of English at the Faculty of Arts.

Neither research hypotheses was supported by the obtained data. An examination of data showed that there were no statistically significant differences between the two groups in terms of their aspirations for career development and long term life goals. Nevertheless, there were some differences between the two groups on some individual items regarding the career aspirations. Participants from the College of Education were more inclined than their counterparts from the Faculty of Arts to believe that they would likely change their employer, achieve higher positions, and achieve more secure employment. On the contrary, the participants from the Faculty of Arts believed that they were less likely to change their field of responsibilities than were their counterparts from the College of Education.

Discussion of the Findings

First of all, it is important to know that both groups showed some rationale in choosing their field of study (Becker, 1964; Cohn & Geske, 1990). That is, the participants expected benefits from their investment in education. The statistically significant differences between the two groups were in the degree, not in kind (Abu-Allam, 1994). In other words, although the participants from the College of Education were, for example, more pragmatically-motivated to enroll in their selected program than were participants from the Faculty of Arts, it is not accurate to assume that the latter group was not at all pragmatically-motivated to enroll in their program. Secondly, the bipolar dichotomy of concepts is better seen as a continuum. That is, if some people are pragmatically-motivated, it does not necessarily mean that they are not hedonistically-motivated as well (Al-Thabeity, 1998). In fact, this continuum nature of combining different or even conflicting factors explains why some people showed varying levels of conviction with respect to different factors.

Investing in Human Capital. As students decide to continue participating in education, it is clear that they are aware of making an investment in their human capital (Blaug, 1985; Schultz, 1963). The mosaic of expectations, economic and non-economic, shows that relating any program of study to merely materialistic benefits is not realistic; non-economic returns to individual investment in education such as knowledge and skills are apparent in students' expectations (Psacharopoulos, 2001; Quiggin, 1999; Woodhall, 1998). For instance, beyond how much their program contributes to market earnings, students expect that the knowledge they gain from their chosen program can help them get added value such as respected social status and positive personal development in terms of skills and knowledge (Alexander &

Salmon, 1995; OECD, 2002; Purcell & Pitcher, 1996). Thus, students attending institutions of higher education, apart from their programs of studies, display similar traits with respect to their decisions to continue participating in higher education (Menon, 1997; Wong, 1989).

Despite the fact that the students of English from the College of Education were more fatalistically-motivated and, at the same time, more hedonistically pragmatically-motivated than the students of English from the Faculty of Arts, it is not unusual to come across such a case. According to Machlup (1978), the sources of expectations are various including individual information (e.g., one's own or acquaintance's experience) about the relevant peers, family and so on. Since these sources of expectations are vulnerable to variation (alternation) as a result of political, social and economic factors, it is likely that they will be present in students' calculations of the expected returns in the chosen program (OECD, 2002). Hence, expectations themselves are not fixed; rather they depend substantially on how favorable individuals perceive their circumstances to be in the changing situation (Williams, 2001). Haggan (1998), for example, has found in her study of Kuwaiti participants majoring in English at Kuwait University that although students held negative attitudes towards English, they expected materialistic returns for continued participating in the English program. Indeed, this last notice reflects that holding conflicting attitudes towards a multi-dimensional phenomenon is not unusual in social research (Abu-Allam, 1994).

Investing in Different English Language Programs. Although students of English have what might be called "generic" expectations with respect to investing in continued higher education in Kuwait, students who clustered within certain

categories held different expectations as a function of course content (Boys et al.; 1988). Hence, students of the two programs showed no statistically significant differences in terms of life-long expectations about their programs and their general philosophy of higher education in general. Moreover, since the future employer is very probably the government (Arab Planning Institute, 2002; El Touny, 2002), different programs of English language appear to be a less prominent indicator of future employers' expectations than if the employment were part of the free market. It is worth noting, however, that since the public sector is the first choice, students of English from the College of Education are more realistic in their perceptions about the graduate labor market in Kuwait.

In light of the increasing unemployment in the public sector (Ministry of Planning, 2005; Mubarak, 1999), finding a job is or investing in further education was declared better than remaining unemployed. This tendency showed that students of English from the College of Education are more sensitive to the opportunity cost of their decisions regarding investing in further education or joining the labor market. Accordingly, we can understand why both groups showed different motivations to invest in their respective programs.

It has been established that students have certain motivations for choosing certain type of education. Based on the differences concerning the course content and goals between studying English within liberal arts and career-based programs (Colleges of Education, 2005/2006; Faculty of Arts, 2003/2004), students of English from the College of Education showed greater concerns for pragmatic reasons.

As the ultimate objective designed for the English language graduate at the Faculty of Arts is developing educated *individuals* rather than meeting the society’s needs of manpower in public services (Faculty of Arts, 2003/2004), we can

understand why the students of English from the Faculty of Arts are less anxious with pragmatic motivations or even the graduate labor market.

Implications for Educational Policy

The findings of many studies (see ch. 2), including the current study, have demonstrated that students' expectations about investing in higher education have become, or are becoming, an important tool and an essential part of educational planning. The findings from this study suggest a number of implications for consideration by educational planners in Kuwait. First, they need to be aware of the role of the students' expectations in investing in further education. Primarily, the focus of implications is on educating students and their families about the importance of identifying their expectations, encouraging them to communicate those expectations about the potential benefits of their chosen program with those who are in a better position for advising them. The channels of communications are various.

Students planning to attend institutions of higher education, for instance, should start attending college fairs and information sessions early in their high school programs. This will enable them to start gathering information about college early on. As expectations themselves are not fixed, and they depend a great deal on how favorable individuals perceive their circumstances to be in the changing situation (Williams, 2001), the more information students gather about their chosen program during the college search process, the more informed they will be during the process of choosing their programs (Machlup, 1978; OECD, 2002). If students receive sufficient information about the different programs of study during the program search and selection processes, it may make their program choice process easier.

Second, despite the fact that economic indicators coming from the labor market are essential in designing, or modifying, academic programs in terms of admission

procedures or course requirements, the findings of the present study indicate that students' expectations are of no less importance as an input to policies concerning education and employment. The government has recognized as much, saying "Why not make the labor market in Kuwait responsive in one way or another to meet students and their families' expectations?" (Kuwait News Agency, 2005). Moreover, the role of education is not merely devoted to providing labor market with manpower or meeting the needs of future employers (Alexander & Salmon, 1995).

This implication leads us back to the recurrent question that was raised earlier in respect to the Kuwaiti labor market: are the nature and content of education to be determined by the labor market, or should these be determined by the academic system itself? (Nawfl & Alhindi, 2001). The answer needs further research; however, McMahon (2006) observed the following:

> When the non-market effects of education are considered, standard social rates of return can be seen to seriously understand the true return of education… Estimates suggest that the value the non-market impacts of education are about equal to, or a little more than, the value of the market impacts. (p. 15)

These impacts, though not observed by individual investor, include, among others, reducing crime, household efficiency, social cohesion, child education, consumption efficiency, and creativity (Psacharopoulos, 2006). If a student of English from the Faculty of Arts can produce an outstanding piece of work, then those from the College of Education can teach the values embodied in it to our children (Mubarak, Kazem & Rasheed, 1990).

Third, it is not plausible to assume that each program should present itself as an economically-based program as is the case with most prospectuses of the liberal arts-based English language programs (Grin, 2002). The case should be, however, that the

whole community believes in the unique contribution of each program, respectively. Furthermore, it is better to freeze any program, based on its circumstances, than distorting it through manipulating its vision, mission and philosophy (Dominitz & Manski, 1996; Grin, 2002). In sum, as Martin and Gawthrope (2004) recognized that the dominance of economic expectations due to the changing circumstances does not indicate, by any means, their superiority over non-economic expectations.

Recommendations for Future Research

The purpose of the present study was to investigate students' expectation about investing in different programs in higher education. This exploratory research reveals fascinating patterns within the expectations of the students of English enrolling career-based and liberal arts-based programs, and sets the stage for the next level of research inquiry. First of all, the extent to which students' expectations of enrollment in different programs are being and are likely to be met, and the extent to which their expectations of the transition from education to real world are realistic can only be assessed properly over a longer period (recommendations for future research below). Such further research might have important implications for educators, employers, and policy-makers.

Second, if I were to approach the research again, I would rather conduct a two-stage study, comprised a quantitative followed by a qualitative study. Alternatively, I suggest that a qualitative study be built on the findings of this and other similar studies. As this study is interested in identifying general patterns of students' expectations, it was logical to use such an exploratory method as Purcell and Pitcher's (1996) questionnaire. However, in order to close the gap between individuals' experiences, meanings and viewpoints reduced to quantitatively impersonal statistical

figures and the real constant interaction with the world they live in, an alternative to positivist and quantitative approaches appears warranted. A qualitative approach is appropriate in educational research as, according to Maxwell (1996) and Creswell (2003), it offers the following strengths which provide a suitable framework for reaching a deep understanding of a given phenomenon. In respect to the purpose of the present study (i.e., students' expectations), the qualitative approach provides (see Creswell, 2003; Rossman & Rallis, 2003):

- Understanding the participants' ways of making meanings of their experiences and events as well as how their expectations and their behavior in the real world mutually influence each other, and
- Understanding the particular context within which the participants act, and the influence that this context has on their actions.

The research design suggested for this purpose is the conduct of case study and In depth interviews. According to the literature on qualitative approach tradition (see e.g., Creswell, 2003; Maxwell, 1996), both designs are preferred strategies when the researcher has little or no control over the outcomes of events, and when the focus is on contemporary phenomena within some real-life context; i.e., when looking for answers to 'how' or 'why' questions. In answering "how" and "why" questions, the researcher deals with tracking situations over a period of time rather than tracking frequencies of occurrences.

Dissertation Summary

This study was conducted to identify expectations about their chosen English language-related programs for the students of English at the College Education and Faculty of Arts, Kuwait University. Four research questions were formulated to pursue to purpose of this study. There were 351 students from both schools who

participated in the study. The data were collected randomly and analyzed with the use of SPSS v11.0 (2001). The statistics procedures that were used were independent-sample t-test. Based on the published literature and the purpose of the present study, students' expectations as a construct was composed of various concepts: students' motivations to choose their program of study (*hedonistic*, *pragmatic*, and *fatalistic*), students' opinions regarding the graduate labor market; students' perceptions of future employers' expectations; and students' aspirations for career development and long term life goals. The instrument used was adapted from one by Purcell and Pitcher (1996) and it reflected that construct.

One main conclusion can be drawn from the findings of this study. Students' expectations play an important role in their decision making with respect to choosing their programs of study. Students were significantly statistically differentiated as a function of different expectations, particularly economic expectations. Expectations were not, however, confined to just the pecuniary benefits of investing in continued participating in education. The respondents tended to value the non-pecuniary benefits as well. Based on a given context, it could be reasonable to devise a term called "*global*" expectations where students show similar expectations, and "*program-related*" expectations in relation to which the differences appeared. To illustrate, the findings showed that all students, in a global manner, expected higher education to confer on them generic and transferable skills which would prepare them for future employment and life-long, whole-person development. However, although it is not always true, it was very sensible to find some students who, based on their program of study, were locally more instrumentally-motivated in their choice of investing in a particular program of study. Hence students' expectations should be included in

evaluating or revising the academic programs instead of relying entirely on the demands of the labor market and employers.

References

Abu-Allam, R. (1994). *Manaheg Albahth fi Atrbiya wa E'lm-nafs* [Research methodology in psychology and education]. Cairo: Dar-shabab-Al-Jamia'.

Aggarwal, Y., & Thakur, R. (2003). *Concepts and terms in educational planning- A guidebook.* New Delhi: National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, Operation Research and Systems Management Unit.

Alexander, K., & Salmon, R. (1995). *Public School Finance.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Almigadi, F. (2001). *Ightisadiyat ata'leem wa tamweelih fi alkuwait wa duwal alkhleej al'Arabiya* [Economics of education in Kuwait and Arab gulf countries]. Kuwait: Ministry of Education, Department of Educational Policies and Economics of Education.

Al-Thabeity, A. (1998). Reliability of assessment in the humanities. *Future of the Arab Education, v*, 112-131.

Al-Misnad, S. (1985). *The development of modern education in the Gulf.* London: Cornell University Press.

Arab Planning Institute (2002). *Siyasat al-'amal wa atanmiyah albashariyah fi alqtar al'Arabiya: Tahleel litajrubah alKuwaytiya* [Labor and human capital policies Arab countries: Analysis of the Kuwaiti experience]. Kuwait: Author.

Cohn, E & Geske, T. (1990). *The economics of education.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Becker, G. (1964). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Blaug, M. (1976). The empirical status of human capital theory: A slightly jaundiced survey. *Journal of Economics Literature, 4*(3), 826-855.

Blaug, M. (1985). Where are we now in the economics of education? *Economics of Education, 4*(1), 17-28.

Boys, C., Brennan, J., Henkel, M., Kirtland, J., Kogan, M., & Youll, P. (1988). Higher education and the preparation for work. *Higher Education Policy Series 4.* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Brennan, J., & Williams, R. (2003). *The English degree and graduate careers.* Egham, England: LTSN English Subject Centre.

College of Education (2005/2006). *Atagreer assanawi* [Annual report]. Kuwait: Kuwait University Press.

College of Education (2003/2004). *Dleel Kuliyyat Atarbiya* [Prospectus of the College of Education]. Kuwait: Kuwait University Press.

Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed approaches* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as A Global Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Dominitz, J. & Manski, C. (1996). Eliciting student expectations of the returns to schooling. *Journal of Human Resources, 31,* 1-26.

Dornyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation.* London: Longman.

El-Sayed, A. (1995). Status of English instruction in the Gulf. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*, 61-79.

El Touny, N. (2002). *Are labor market requirements compatible with the educational system in Kuwait.* Kuwait: Arab Planning Institute.

Faculty of Arts (2005/2006). *Atagreer assanawi* [Annual report]. Kuwait: Kuwait University Press.

Faculty of Arts (2003/2004). *Dleel Kuliyyat Eladab* [Prospectus of the College of Education]. Kuwait: Kuwait University Press.

Gay, L., & Airasian, P. (2003). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merill/Prentice-Hall.

Grin, F. (2002) *Using language economics and education economics in language policy.* Strasburg, France: Council of Europe, Language Policy Division.

Haggan, M. (1998). Islam and learning English: The approach-avoidance dimension. *Review of Applied Linguistics, 121-122,* 85-120.

Howell, D. (2002). *Statistical methods for psychology.* Australia: Duxbury Thomson Learning.

Kuwait News Agency (2005, February). *Almu'tamar Al'wal a'n Al'amala Alwatniya* [First conference on national manpower]. Retrieved January 10, 2006, from http://www.kuna.net.kw

Kuwait University (2006). *Brief history.* Retrieved February 2, 2006, from http://www.kuniv.edu.kw/

Lajnat muraje't aqsam aljami'a [University departments review committee] (2004, December, 15). *Al-Watan*. Retrieved February 1, 2006, from http://www.alwatan.com.kw

Leedy, P. D. & Ormond, J. E. (2005). *Practical research: Planning and design* (8th ed.). NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Levin, H., & McEwan, P. (2000). *Cost effectiveness analysis: Methods and applications*. New York: SAGE Publication.

From Mace, J. (1988). Education, the labor market and government policy. In Thomas, H., & Simkins, T. (Eds.), *Economics and the management of education: Emerging themes* (21-32). London: The Falmer Press.

Mace, J. (2000). *Economics of education- Advanced diploma in education.* London: University of London Press.

Machlup, F. (1978). *Methodology of economics and other social sciences.* London: Academic Press.

Martin, Ph., & Gawthrope, J. (2004). The study of English and the careers of its graduates. In Knight, P., and Yorke, M. (Eds.), *Learning, curriculum and employability in higher education* (pp. 69-85). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Maxwell, J.A. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. London: Sage Publications.

McMahon, W. (1981). Expected returns to investment in higher education. *Journal of Human Resources, 16,* 274-285.

McMahon, W. (1987). Student labor market expectations. In Psacharopoulos, G. (Ed.), *Economics of education: Research and studies* (pp. 182-187). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McMahon, W. (2006, February). *Education finance policy: Financing the non-market and social benefits.* Paper presented at the Symposium on Funding of Public Schools: The Economic and Social Value of Adequate Funding, University of Chicago Club, Chicago.

Menon, M. (1997). Perceived economic benefits of higher education: The case of Cyprus. *Education Economics, 5*(1), 53-61.

Ministry of Education (1999/2000). *Dha'af tulab almadares alhukumiah fi alughat alajnabiya* [Public school students' weaknesses in foreign languages: An annual report]. Kuwait: Author.

Ministry of Education (2004). *Annual report about the education development in the state of Kuwait- series of year 2004.* Kuwait: Author.

Ministry of information (2002). *Kuwait: Facts and figures.* Kuwait: Author.

Ministry of Planning (2005). *Annual statistical abstracts.* Kuwait: Government Press.

Dominitz, J. & Manski, C. (1996). Eliciting student expectations of the returns to schooling. *Journal of Human Resources, 31,* 1-26.

Mubarak, A. (1999). Kuwaiti identity and its relation to some demographic and psychological variables. *Journal of Research in Education and Psychology, 13,* 107-153.

Mubarak, B., Kazem, G., & Rasheed, S. (1990). *Teaching foreign languages in the Arab World: An evaluation.* Iraq: Ministry of Education.

Murray, Sh., & Robinson, H. (2001). Graduates into sales-employer, student and university perspectives. *Education + Training, 43*(3), 139-144

Nawfl, E., Alhindi, Kh. (2001). *Mkhrjat alta'aleem wa hajat souk al'ama fialkuwait* [Educational outcomes and labor market needs in Kuwait]. Kuwait: Ministry of Education, Department of Educational Research.

Oki, K. (2001). *'Why do you come to school': Motivation and expectations of secondary school students in Malawi.* Unpublished master's thesis, Institute of Education, England.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2001). *The well-being of nations: The role of human and social capital.* Paris: Author.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2002). *Responding to student expectations.* Paris: Author.

Pedhazur, E. J. & Schmelkin, L. P. (1991). *Measurement, design, and analysis: An Integrated approach*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Psacharopoulos, G. (2000). Economics of education *a la* Euro. *European Journal of Education, 35,* 81-95.

Psacharopoulos, G. (2006, February). *The value of investment in education: Theory, evidence and policy.* Paper presented at the Symposium on Funding of Public Schools: The Economic and Social Value of Adequate Funding, University of Chicago Club, Chicago.

Psacharopoulos, G., & Sanyal, B. (1981). Students' expectations and labor market performance: The case of the Philippines. *Higher Education, 10,* 449-472.

Psacharopoulos, G., & Sanyal, B. (1982). Students' expectations and graduate market performance in Egypt. *Higher education, 11,* 27-49.

Purcell, K., & Pitcher, J. (1996). *Great expectations: The new diversity of graduate skills and aspirations*. Manchester, England: Manchester University, Higher Education Careers Services Unit.

Rossman, G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (2003). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Quiggin, J. (1999). Human capital theory and education policy in Australia. *The Australian Economic Review, 32*(2), 130-144.

Schultz, T. W. (1963). *The economic value of education*. NY: Columbia University Press.

United Nations Development Programme (2002). *Programme governance in the Arab region- Kuwait: basic statistics.* Retrieved January, 16, 2006, from http://www.pogar.org/countries/stats.asp?cid=8&gid=1

Wajdi, A. (2004). *Nitham altawtheef almarkzi bidawlat alKuway* [The centralized employment system in Kuwait]. Kuwait: Civil Services Commission.

Williams, G. (2001). *Economic benefits of higher education: A short review of literature.* London: Institute of Education, Center for Higher Education Studies.

Williams, G., & Gordon, A. (1981). Perceived earnings functions and ex ante rates of return to post compulsory education. *Higher Education, 10,* 199-227.

Witte, R., & Witte, J. (2004). *Statistics.* PUBLISHER :Wiley.

Wong, K. (1989). *Perceived earning functions and ex ante rates of return to higher education- A case study of Hong Kong education.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Institute of Education, England.

Woodhall, M. (1998). Human capital concept. In Halsey, A., Lauder, H., Brown, P., & Wells, A. (Eds.), *Education, culture, economy, and society* (pp. 120-200). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yung, A. (1999, October). *21st century teachers: Education reform in post-capitalist society (the case of Hong Kong)*. Paper presented at the International Conference on 21th Century Education Reform: Teachers and Social Changes, Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong.

Yung, A. (2003). *"Undergraduates" expectations of economic and other benefits of higher education: A case study of Hong Kong.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Institute of Education, England.

Appendix 1: Survey Instrument

Expectations of the Different Benefits from the Chosen Area of Study

The information you give will be confidential, except for the academic research. No information about any individual will be published or passed on to either the educational institution in question, or to a third party.

1. **As an undergraduate student of English at Kuwait University, how far does each of the following statements apply to you?**

	highly Applicable	Applicable	Not sure	Not Applicable	Highly not Applicable
1. This program will enable me to get the kind of job training opportunity I wanted.	○	○	○	○	○
2. This program will enable me to go on to the postgraduate programs (e.g., masters or doctoral programs) I wanted.	○	○	○	○	○
3. This program will enable me to get a good job, although is not exactly what I hoped for.	○	○	○	○	○
4. This program will enable me to find a better job than I would have been able to otherwise.	○	○	○	○	○
5. I now believe that finding (or remaining in) employment would have been a better use of my time than being a university student.	○	○	○	○	○
6. I am not taking my program or degree for employment-related reasons.	○	○	○	○	○
7. My current program is my most preferred program.	○	○	○	○	○
8. I have no choice, since the placement in any program is decided by the university.	○	○	○	○	○
9. I have to choose this program because my parents want me to do so.	○	○	○	○	○

2. Why did you decide to study the program that you are in now? Please specify how far each of the following statements applies to you.

	highly Applicable	Applicable	Not sure	Not Applicable	Highly not Applicable
10. To develop a broader range of skills and/or knowledge.	○	○	○	○	○
11. To develop more specialized skills and/or knowledge.	○	○	○	○	○
12. To develop for my career.	○	○	○	○	○
13. I think it will improve my job prospects.	○	○	○	○	○
14. The successful completion of the course is important for entering my chosen career.	○	○	○	○	○
15. I am interested in the content of the program.	○	○	○	○	○
16. I have enjoyed studying English since secondary school.	○	○	○	○	○
17. I want to continue being a student and postpone working.	○	○	○	○	○
18. I have been unable to find a suitable job.	○	○	○	○	○

3. In terms of the future job market in Kuwait, how far do you agree with each of the following statements?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
19. The graduate labor market is very competitive.	○	○	○	○	○
20. There are few suitable jobs available.	○	○	○	○	○

21. I will apply for post graduate study only if I can not find a suitable job.	○	○	○	○	○
22. I do not think I will have problems finding a job.	○	○	○	○	○
23. My studies have nothing to do with my career.	○	○	○	○	○
24. I expect a low economic return in the next few years but a higher return over the long run.	○	○	○	○	○
25. When the economy recovers, there will be plenty of good jobs.	○	○	○	○	○
26. There is an oversupply of students of this program.	○	○	○	○	○

4. What is your view about first employment opportunities and the situation of your career at the time of your graduation? Please specify how possible each of the following statement is to you.

	Highly Possible	Possible	Not sure	impossible	Highly impossible
27. I will get exactly what I want.	○	○	○	○	○
28. I will take the best out of several job offers.	○	○	○	○	○
29. I will take the first offer I received in order to gain experience so that I may obtain the type of job I really want.	○	○	○	○	○
30. I will take the job to broaden my experience and to develop more general skills.	○	○	○	○	○
31. I will take the job to pay off my debts.	○	○	○	○	○

32. I will take anything that is available, rather than be unemployed. ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

33. I will get exactly what I want. ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

34. I will take the best out of several job offers. ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

5. Out of the competence and skills listed, which do you think are regarded by your future employer as the most important?

	Very Much	Quite A lot	A little	Very Little	Not at All
35. Ability to apply knowledge	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
36. Ability to use numerical data	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
37. Ability to work in a team	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
38. Computer literacy	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
39. Creativity	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
40. Desire to go on learning	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
41. Professional skills (e.g., documenting)	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
42. Interpersonal communication skills	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
43. Knowledge of international affairs	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ

44. Leadership skills	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
45. Logical thinking	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
46. Presentation skills	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
47. Problem-solving skills	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
48. Research skills	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
49. Self-confidence	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
50. Self-discipline	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
51. Specialist knowledge	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
52. Time management	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ

6. Which changes in your occupational life will you expect to make within the first five years?

	Highly Possible	Possible	Not sure	impossible	Highly impossible
53. Change my employer	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
54. Change my field of responsibilities	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
55. Achieve a higher position	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
56. Achieve more secure employment	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
57. Achieve a better use of my qualifications	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
58. Change to a completely different job or career	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
59. Move to a more demanding job	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ

60. Move to a less demanding job	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
61. Take a career break for personal development	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
62. Take a career break for family-related reasons	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
63. Undertake further full-time study	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
64. Study part-time for additional qualifications	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
65. Become self-employed	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
66. No major change	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ

7. **As far as long-term values that your current program can offer you are concerned, how important to you are the following?**

	Very Important	Important	Not sure	Unimportant	Very unimportant
67. Career development	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
68. Personal development and growth	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
69. Family development	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
70. Job satisfaction	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
71. Being valued by my employer	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
72. Doing socially significant work	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
73. Gaining international experience	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
74. Rewarding leisure/travel	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ

75. Involvement in local community issues	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
76. Concern with ecological issues	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ
77. Concern with current affairs	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ

Personal Details

a. Which College: College of Education ( ) Faculty of Arts ( )

b. Gender: Male ( ) Female ( )

c. GPA:_____

Appendix 2: Reliability Coefficients

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.834	77

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
item_1	212.89	715.614	.452	.828
item_2	212.24	726.972	.229	.832
item_3	211.48	784.030	-.502	.845
item_4	212.78	714.961	.458	.828
item_5	211.46	779.746	-.432	.845
item_6	211.40	724.889	.263	.831
item_7	211.27	721.411	.285	.831
item_8	211.90	767.263	-.284	.842
item_9	210.74	771.750	-.405	.842
item_10	212.41	723.638	.256	.832
item_11	213.46	729.867	.343	.831
item_12	213.46	727.645	.355	.831
item_13	212.77	713.795	.458	.828
item_14	212.40	709.273	.457	.828
item_15	212.71	708.228	.438	.828
item_16	211.90	712.657	.396	.829
item_17	212.74	703.568	.596	.826
item_18	211.21	786.269	-.559	.845
item_19	210.68	783.250	-.569	.844
item_20	211.29	780.774	-.450	.845
item_21	210.98	792.141	-.568	.847
item_22	211.87	706.680	.460	.827
item_23	212.44	702.208	.503	.826
item_24	211.32	707.695	.470	.827
item_25	212.55	709.058	.436	.828
item_26	211.49	717.404	.347	.830
item_27	212.48	705.343	.453	.827
item_28	211.34	713.802	.401	.829
item_29	212.91	704.184	.570	.826
item_30	212.14	700.303	.551	.826
item_31	212.79	706.753	.553	.826
item_32	211.35	790.876	-.571	.847
item_33	213.02	712.404	.536	.827
item_34	212.72	709.618	.491	.827
item_35	213.14	714.445	.519	.828
item_36	213.10	716.374	.508	.828
item_37	212.80	711.010	.475	.828
item_38	212.05	703.179	.502	.826
item_39	213.20	712.606	.519	.828
item_40	213.00	713.778	.453	.828
item_41	213.24	719.417	.497	.829
item_42	212.87	704.478	.599	.826
item_43	213.00	717.232	.422	.829
item_44	212.75	715.321	.410	.829
item_45	211.26	723.709	.300	.831
item_46	211.91	723.315	.260	.831
item_47	212.82	720.735	.333	.830
item_48	212.92	724.579	.314	.831
item_49	212.59	705.921	.537	.826
item_50	212.06	713.006	.404	.829
item_51	211.92	705.953	.501	.827
item_52	211.88	710.450	.457	.828
item_53	212.30	701.444	.574	.825
item_54	211.93	779.500	-.517	.844
item_55	211.09	707.153	.520	.827
item_56	211.14	712.364	.440	.828
item_57	211.00	717.434	.366	.830
item_58	212.65	775.260	-.404	.843
item_59	212.33	745.516	-.010	.836
item_60	211.55	734.513	.170	.833
item_61	211.69	746.135	-.021	.836
item_62	212.85	737.139	.116	.834
item_63	212.39	739.089	.089	.834
item_64	212.20	729.960	.200	.833
item_65	212.03	728.110	.224	.832
item_66	212.36	746.980	-.033	.837
item_67	212.01	744.293	.008	.836
item_68	211.93	749.258	-.066	.837
item_69	212.18	740.816	.066	.835
item_70	212.05	759.624	-.216	.839
item_71	210.98	724.989	.306	.831
item_72	211.04	726.443	.324	.831
item_73	210.53	731.949	.277	.832
item_74	210.63	723.225	.421	.830
item_75	210.58	724.852	.393	.830
item_76	210.44	729.744	.321	.831
item_77	210.86	732.000	.251	.832

Appendix3: Missing Data for the GPA Question

Statistics

What is your GPA?

N	Valid	221
	Missing	130

What is your GPA?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	D	39	11.1	17.6	17.6
	C	100	28.5	45.2	62.9
	B	64	18.2	29.0	91.9
	A	18	5.1	8.1	100.0
	Total	221	63.0	100.0	
Missing	System	130	37.0		
Total		351	100.0		

Appendix 4: Chi-Square Test for Gender and College

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
College * gender	351	100.0%	0	.0%	351	100.0%

College * gender Crosstabulation

			gender		
			Male	Female	Total
College	Arts	Count	90	90	180
		Expected Count	90.8	89.2	180.0
		% within College	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within gender	50.8%	51.7%	51.3%
		% of Total	25.6%	25.6%	51.3%
	Education	Count	87	84	171
		Expected Count	86.2	84.8	171.0
		% within College	50.9%	49.1%	100.0%
		% within gender	49.2%	48.3%	48.7%
		% of Total	24.8%	23.9%	48.7%
Total		Count	177	174	351
		Expected Count	177.0	174.0	351.0
		% within College	50.4%	49.6%	100.0%
		% within gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	50.4%	49.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.027[b]	1	.869		
Continuity Correction[a]	.003	1	.954		
Likelihood Ratio	.027	1	.869		
Fisher's Exact Test				.915	.477
Linear-by-Linear Association	.027	1	.870		
N of Valid Cases	351				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 84.77.

Appendix 5: T-Test for Hedonistic Motivation

Group Statistics

	College	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
total score of hendonistic motivation	Arts	180	15.6944	5.48853	.40909
	Education	171	16.8304	4.85803	.37150
item_6	Arts	180	3.18	1.416	.106
	Education	171	3.45	1.415	.108
item_7	Arts	180	3.44	1.431	.107
	Education	171	3.63	1.328	.102
item_10	Arts	180	2.19	1.419	.106
	Education	171	2.42	1.442	.110
item_15	Arts	180	1.99	1.470	.110
	Education	171	2.14	1.500	.115
item_16	Arts	180	2.78	1.608	.120
	Education	171	2.91	1.549	.118
item_17	Arts	180	2.09	1.310	.098
	Education	171	2.27	1.346	.103

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
total score of hendonistic motivation	Equal variances assumed	5.070	.025	-2.049	349	.041	-1.13596	.55433	-2.22621	-.04572
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.056	347.283	.041	-1.13596	.55260	-2.22283	-.04910
item_6	Equal variances assumed	.150	.698	-1.766	349	.078	-.267	.151	-.564	.030
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.766	348.109	.078	-.267	.151	-.564	.030
item_7	Equal variances assumed	2.546	.112	-1.268	349	.206	-.187	.148	-.477	.103
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.271	348.813	.205	-.187	.147	-.477	.102
item_10	Equal variances assumed	.007	.935	-1.484	349	.139	-.227	.153	-.527	.074
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.483	347.389	.139	-.227	.153	-.527	.074
item_15	Equal variances assumed	.424	.516	-.920	349	.358	-.146	.159	-.458	.166
	Equal variances not assumed			-.920	347.222	.358	-.146	.159	-.458	.166
item_16	Equal variances assumed	1.329	.250	-.765	349	.445	-.129	.169	-.461	.203
	Equal variances not assumed			-.765	348.931	.445	-.129	.168	-.460	.202
item_17	Equal variances assumed	1.318	.252	-1.272	349	.204	-.180	.142	-.459	.099
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.271	346.872	.204	-.180	.142	-.460	.099

Appendix 6: T-Test for Pragmatic Motivation

Group Statistics

	College	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
total score of pragmatic motivation	Arts	180	12.5611	4.67032	.34811
	Education	171	14.6842	5.62607	.43024
item_1	Arts	180	1.78	1.032	.077
	Education	171	2.07	1.230	.094
item_2	Arts	180	2.31	1.370	.102
	Education	171	2.69	1.476	.113
item_4	Arts	180	1.92	1.123	.084
	Education	171	2.16	1.243	.095
item_11	Arts	180	1.33	.804	.060
	Education	171	1.57	1.122	.086
item_12	Arts	180	1.39	.912	.068
	Education	171	1.54	1.118	.085
item_13	Arts	180	1.78	1.146	.085
	Education	171	2.20	1.291	.099
item_14	Arts	180	2.06	1.293	.096
	Education	171	2.46	1.360	.104

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
total score of pragmatic motivation	Equal variances assumed	5.930	.015	-3.854	349	.000	-2.12310	.55081	-3.20643	-1.03977
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.836	330.797	.000	-2.12310	.55343	-3.21178	-1.03442
item_1	Equal variances assumed	5.698	.018	-2.372	349	.018	-.287	.121	-.525	-.049
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.361	332.252	.019	-.287	.121	-.526	-.048
item_2	Equal variances assumed	3.837	.051	-2.530	349	.012	-.385	.152	-.683	-.086
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.525	343.578	.012	-.385	.152	-.684	-.085
item_4	Equal variances assumed	3.977	.047	-1.909	349	.057	-.241	.126	-.490	.007
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.904	341.072	.058	-.241	.127	-.490	.008
item_11	Equal variances assumed	20.946	.000	-2.364	349	.019	-.245	.104	-.449	-.041
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.345	306.977	.020	-.245	.105	-.451	-.039
item_12	Equal variances assumed	6.844	.009	-1.321	349	.187	-.144	.109	-.357	.070
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.314	328.329	.190	-.144	.109	-.358	.071
item_13	Equal variances assumed	5.994	.015	-3.235	349	.001	-.421	.130	-.677	-.165
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.225	339.264	.001	-.421	.131	-.678	-.164
item_14	Equal variances assumed	3.019	.083	-2.828	349	.005	-.401	.142	-.679	-.122
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.825	345.440	.005	-.401	.142	-.680	-.122

Appendix 7: T-Test for Fatalistic Motivation

Group Statistics

	College	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
total score of fatalistic motivation	Arts	180	18.0500	4.49739	.33522
	Education	171	16.4737	4.29954	.32879
item_3	Arts	180	3.39	1.335	.100
	Education	171	3.25	1.315	.101
item_5	Arts	180	3.51	1.443	.108
	Education	171	2.88	1.527	.117
item_8	Arts	180	3.06	1.514	.113
	Education	171	2.82	1.465	.112
item_9	Arts	180	4.19	1.168	.087
	Education	171	4.08	1.222	.093
item_18	Arts	180	3.89	1.386	.103
	Education	171	3.44	1.406	.108

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
total score of fatalistic motivation	Equal variances assumed	.108	.742	3.353	349	.001	1.57632	.47009	.65175	2.50088
	Equal variances not assumed			3.357	348.985	.001	1.57632	.46955	.65282	2.49982
item_3	Equal variances assumed	.257	.612	1.010	349	.313	.143	.142	-.135	.421
	Equal variances not assumed			1.011	348.529	.313	.143	.141	-.135	.421
item_5	Equal variances assumed	2.361	.125	3.998	349	.000	.634	.159	.322	.946
	Equal variances not assumed			3.992	345.009	.000	.634	.159	.322	.946
item_8	Equal variances assumed	.184	.668	1.486	349	.138	.237	.159	-.076	.550
	Equal variances not assumed			1.488	348.883	.138	.237	.159	-.076	.549
item_9	Equal variances assumed	.004	.948	.928	349	.354	.118	.128	-.133	.369
	Equal variances not assumed			.927	345.757	.355	.118	.128	-.133	.370
item_18	Equal variances assumed	.522	.470	2.982	349	.003	.444	.149	.151	.738
	Equal variances not assumed			2.981	347.481	.003	.444	.149	.151	.738

Appendix 8: T-Test for Students' opinion about labor market

Group Statistics

	College	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
total score of students' opinions about labor market	Arts	180	44.1389	7.75805	.57825
	Education	171	48.1930	8.60186	.65780
item_19	Arts	180	4.24	1.142	.085
	Education	171	3.81	1.330	.102
item_20	Arts	180	3.76	1.471	.110
	Education	171	3.29	1.474	.113
item_21	Arts	180	3.97	1.314	.098
	Education	171	3.63	1.519	.116
item_22	Arts	180	2.55	1.435	.107
	Education	171	3.27	1.514	.116
item_23	Arts	180	2.26	1.465	.109
	Education	171	2.86	1.592	.122
item_24	Arts	180	3.16	1.477	.110
	Education	171	3.78	1.323	.101
item_25	Arts	180	2.18	1.446	.108
	Education	171	2.81	1.531	.117
item_26	Arts	180	3.17	1.504	.112
	Education	171	3.75	1.310	.100
item_27	Arts	180	2.26	1.492	.111
	Education	171	2.79	1.663	.127
item_28	Arts	180	3.12	1.511	.113
	Education	171	3.68	1.408	.108
item_29	Arts	180	1.78	1.206	.090
	Education	171	2.22	1.518	.116
item_30	Arts	180	2.38	1.435	.107
	Education	171	2.75	1.511	.116
item_31	Arts	180	1.93	1.182	.088
	Education	171	2.15	1.297	.099
item_32	Arts	180	3.75	1.378	.103
	Education	171	3.42	1.454	.111
item_33	Arts	180	1.77	1.128	.084
	Education	171	1.92	1.220	.093
item_34	Arts	180	1.86	1.254	.093
	Education	171	2.07	1.291	.099

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
total score of students' opinions about labor market	Equal variances assumed	3.746	.054	-4.641	349	.000	-4.05409	.87351	-5.77211	-2.33608
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.629	340.912	.000	-4.05409	.87583	-5.77680	-2.33139
item_19	Equal variances assumed	7.176	.008	3.312	349	.001	.437	.132	.178	.697
	Equal variances not assumed			3.299	335.275	.001	.437	.133	.177	.698
item_20	Equal variances assumed	.419	.518	2.946	349	.003	.463	.157	.154	.772
	Equal variances not assumed			2.945	347.999	.003	.463	.157	.154	.772
item_21	Equal variances assumed	15.608	.000	2.290	349	.023	.346	.151	.049	.644
	Equal variances not assumed			2.281	336.228	.023	.346	.152	.048	.645
item_22	Equal variances assumed	1.350	.246	-4.568	349	.000	-.719	.157	-1.029	-.409
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.562	345.201	.000	-.719	.158	-1.029	-.409
item_23	Equal variances assumed	4.596	.033	-3.702	349	.000	-.604	.163	-.925	-.283
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.694	342.859	.000	-.604	.164	-.926	-.282
item_24	Equal variances assumed	4.133	.043	-4.113	349	.000	-.617	.150	-.912	-.322
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.125	347.818	.000	-.617	.150	-.911	-.323
item_25	Equal variances assumed	2.695	.102	-3.959	349	.000	-.629	.159	-.942	-.317
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.954	344.936	.000	-.629	.159	-.942	-.316
item_26	Equal variances assumed	10.059	.002	-3.895	349	.000	-.588	.151	-.884	-.291
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.909	346.412	.000	-.588	.150	-.883	-.292
item_27	Equal variances assumed	8.614	.004	-3.135	349	.002	-.528	.169	-.860	-.197
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.127	340.378	.002	-.528	.169	-.861	-.196
item_28	Equal variances assumed	2.825	.094	-3.636	349	.000	-.568	.156	-.875	-.261
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.643	348.873	.000	-.568	.156	-.874	-.261
item_29	Equal variances assumed	23.381	.000	-3.007	349	.003	-.439	.146	-.726	-.152
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.989	324.364	.003	-.439	.147	-.728	-.150
item_30	Equal variances assumed	1.391	.239	-2.323	349	.021	-.365	.157	-.674	-.056
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.319	345.332	.021	-.365	.157	-.675	-.056
item_31	Equal variances assumed	3.141	.077	-1.694	349	.091	-.224	.132	-.485	.036
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.690	341.915	.092	-.224	.133	-.485	.037
item_32	Equal variances assumed	2.760	.098	2.215	349	.027	.335	.151	.038	.632
	Equal variances not assumed			2.212	345.167	.028	.335	.151	.037	.633
item_33	Equal variances assumed	1.131	.288	-1.164	349	.245	-.146	.125	-.392	.101
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.162	343.255	.246	-.146	.126	-.393	.101
item_34	Equal variances assumed	.277	.599	-1.539	349	.125	-.209	.136	-.476	.058
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.538	346.776	.125	-.209	.136	-.476	.058

Appendix 9: T-Test for labor market expectations

Group Statistics

	College	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
total score of students' perceptions of future employers' expectations	Arts	180	39.7833	12.86035	.95855
	Education	170	42.1000	13.60371	1.04336
item_35	Arts	180	1.67	1.128	.084
	Education	171	1.77	1.155	.088
item_36	Arts	180	1.78	1.203	.090
	Education	171	1.80	1.141	.087
item_37	Arts	180	1.98	1.271	.095
	Education	171	2.23	1.372	.105
item_38	Arts	180	2.52	1.420	.106
	Education	171	2.73	1.498	.115
item_39	Arts	180	1.58	1.040	.078
	Education	171	1.63	1.090	.083
item_40	Arts	180	1.78	1.165	.087
	Education	170	1.81	1.247	.096
item_41	Arts	180	1.62	1.094	.082
	Education	171	1.77	1.148	.088
item_42	Arts	180	1.89	1.301	.097
	Education	171	2.09	1.377	.105
item_43	Arts	180	1.84	1.236	.092
	Education	171	1.91	1.231	.094
item_44	Arts	180	2.08	1.384	.103
	Education	171	2.15	1.324	.101
item_45	Arts	180	3.74	1.371	.102
	Education	171	3.75	1.275	.097
item_46	Arts	180	2.83	1.528	.114
	Education	171	3.05	1.531	.117
item_47	Arts	180	2.15	1.288	.096
	Education	171	2.06	1.282	.098
item_48	Arts	180	2.09	1.227	.091
	Education	171	2.02	1.292	.099
item_49	Arts	180	2.24	1.448	.108
	Education	171	2.46	1.452	.111
item_50	Arts	180	2.62	1.532	.114
	Education	171	2.85	1.470	.112
item_51	Arts	180	2.77	1.529	.114
	Education	171	2.97	1.416	.108
item_52	Arts	180	2.58	1.487	.111
	Education	171	2.97	1.437	.110

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
total score of students' perceptions of future employers' expectations	Equal variances assumed	1.933	.165	-1.638	348	.102	-2.31667	1.41456	-5.09882	.46549
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.635	343.585	.103	-2.31667	1.41683	-5.10343	.47009
item_35	Equal variances assumed	.189	.664	-.770	349	.442	-.094	.122	-.333	.146
	Equal variances not assumed			-.770	347.049	.442	-.094	.122	-.334	.146
item_36	Equal variances assumed	.004	.947	-.187	349	.852	-.023	.125	-.270	.223
	Equal variances not assumed			-.187	348.999	.852	-.023	.125	-.269	.223
item_37	Equal variances assumed	3.752	.054	-1.735	349	.084	-.245	.141	-.522	.033
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.731	343.365	.084	-.245	.141	-.523	.033
item_38	Equal variances assumed	1.572	.211	-1.340	349	.181	-.209	.156	-.515	.098
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.338	345.194	.182	-.209	.156	-.516	.098
item_39	Equal variances assumed	.123	.726	-.373	349	.710	-.042	.114	-.266	.181
	Equal variances not assumed			-.372	345.673	.710	-.042	.114	-.266	.182
item_40	Equal variances assumed	.491	.484	-.218	348	.828	-.028	.129	-.282	.225
	Equal variances not assumed			-.218	342.700	.828	-.028	.129	-.282	.226
item_41	Equal variances assumed	.697	.404	-1.251	349	.212	-.150	.120	-.385	.086
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.249	345.581	.212	-.150	.120	-.385	.086
item_42	Equal variances assumed	3.395	.066	-1.393	349	.165	-.199	.143	-.480	.082
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.391	344.956	.165	-.199	.143	-.481	.082
item_43	Equal variances assumed	.000	.990	-.515	349	.607	-.068	.132	-.327	.191
	Equal variances not assumed			-.515	348.224	.607	-.068	.132	-.327	.191
item_44	Equal variances assumed	.238	.626	-.513	349	.608	-.074	.145	-.359	.210
	Equal variances not assumed			-.514	348.982	.608	-.074	.145	-.359	.210
item_45	Equal variances assumed	1.207	.273	-.029	349	.977	-.004	.141	-.282	.274
	Equal variances not assumed			-.029	348.844	.977	-.004	.141	-.282	.274
item_46	Equal variances assumed	.027	.870	-1.377	349	.169	-.225	.163	-.546	.096
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.377	347.993	.169	-.225	.163	-.546	.096
item_47	Equal variances assumed	.719	.397	.667	349	.505	.092	.137	-.178	.361
	Equal variances not assumed			.667	348.237	.505	.092	.137	-.178	.361
item_48	Equal variances assumed	.081	.776	.528	349	.598	.071	.134	-.193	.336
	Equal variances not assumed			.528	345.312	.598	.071	.135	-.194	.336
item_49	Equal variances assumed	.026	.873	-1.367	349	.172	-.212	.155	-.516	.093
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.367	347.974	.172	-.212	.155	-.516	.093
item_50	Equal variances assumed	1.505	.221	-1.444	349	.150	-.232	.160	-.547	.084
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.445	348.966	.149	-.232	.160	-.547	.084
item_51	Equal variances assumed	3.730	.054	-1.296	349	.196	-.204	.157	-.514	.106
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.298	348.782	.195	-.204	.157	-.513	.105
item_52	Equal variances assumed	1.774	.184	-2.516	349	.012	-.393	.156	-.700	-.086
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.518	348.901	.012	-.393	.156	-.700	-.086

Appendix 10: T-Test for future career aspirations

Group Statistics

	College	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
total score of students' perceptions of future career expectations	Arts	180	38.6556	7.18652	.53565
	Education	171	39.9766	7.25660	.55493
item_53	Arts	180	2.42	1.394	.104
	Education	171	2.75	1.372	.105
item_54	Arts	180	3.21	1.337	.100
	Education	171	2.76	1.206	.092
item_55	Arts	180	3.55	1.454	.108
	Education	171	3.91	1.236	.095
item_56	Arts	180	3.42	1.498	.112
	Education	171	3.82	1.229	.094
item_57	Arts	180	3.81	1.379	.103
	Education	171	3.92	1.272	.097
item_58	Arts	180	2.31	1.443	.108
	Education	171	2.15	1.254	.096
item_59	Arts	180	2.57	1.346	.100
	Education	171	2.39	1.243	.095
item_60	Arts	180	3.08	1.266	.094
	Education	171	3.20	1.250	.096
item_61	Arts	180	3.12	1.278	.095
	Education	171	3.10	1.314	.100
item_62	Arts	180	1.77	1.114	.083
	Education	171	1.94	1.245	.095
item_63	Arts	180	2.22	1.178	.088
	Education	171	2.42	1.221	.093
item_64	Arts	180	2.40	1.275	.095
	Education	171	2.51	1.308	.100
item_65	Arts	180	2.44	1.334	.099
	Education	171	2.60	1.272	.097
item_66	Arts	180	2.36	1.311	.098
	Education	171	2.51	1.312	.100

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
total score of students' perceptions of future career expectations	Equal variances assumed	.162	.687	-1.713	349	.088	-1.32105	.77108	-2.83761	.19550
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.713	347.700	.088	-1.32105	.77128	-2.83800	.19590
item_53	Equal variances assumed	.311	.578	-2.246	349	.025	-.332	.148	-.622	-.041
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.247	348.550	.025	-.332	.148	-.622	-.041
item_54	Equal variances assumed	2.895	.090	3.312	349	.001	.451	.136	.183	.719
	Equal variances not assumed			3.321	348.069	.001	.451	.136	.184	.718
item_55	Equal variances assumed	11.755	.001	-2.509	349	.013	-.362	.144	-.646	-.078
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.519	344.798	.012	-.362	.144	-.645	-.079
item_56	Equal variances assumed	18.103	.000	-2.781	349	.006	-.408	.147	-.696	-.119
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.795	341.811	.005	-.408	.146	-.695	-.121
item_57	Equal variances assumed	4.445	.036	-.794	349	.428	-.113	.142	-.391	.166
	Equal variances not assumed			-.796	348.699	.427	-.113	.141	-.391	.166
item_58	Equal variances assumed	8.406	.004	1.140	349	.255	.165	.145	-.119	.449
	Equal variances not assumed			1.145	346.303	.253	.165	.144	-.118	.448
item_59	Equal variances assumed	2.347	.126	1.263	349	.208	.175	.138	-.098	.447
	Equal variances not assumed			1.265	348.730	.207	.175	.138	-.097	.447
item_60	Equal variances assumed	.000	.998	-.944	349	.346	-.127	.134	-.391	.137
	Equal variances not assumed			-.945	348.467	.346	-.127	.134	-.391	.137
item_61	Equal variances assumed	.187	.665	.125	349	.901	.017	.138	-.255	.289
	Equal variances not assumed			.125	346.862	.901	.017	.138	-.255	.290
item_62	Equal variances assumed	1.265	.261	-1.388	349	.166	-.175	.126	-.423	.073
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.384	340.127	.167	-.175	.126	-.423	.074
item_63	Equal variances assumed	.920	.338	-1.550	349	.122	-.199	.128	-.450	.053
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.549	346.373	.122	-.199	.128	-.451	.054
item_64	Equal variances assumed	.401	.527	-.789	349	.431	-.109	.138	-.380	.162
	Equal variances not assumed			-.788	346.974	.431	-.109	.138	-.380	.163
item_65	Equal variances assumed	.289	.591	-1.132	349	.259	-.158	.139	-.431	.116
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.133	348.993	.258	-.158	.139	-.431	.116
item_66	Equal variances assumed	.075	.784	-1.054	349	.292	-.148	.140	-.423	.128
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.054	348.037	.292	-.148	.140	-.423	.128

Appendix 11: T-Test for long term goals

Group Statistics

	College	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
total score of students' aspirations for long term life goals	Arts	180	40.7222	5.44865	.40612
	Education	171	41.1404	4.99684	.38212
item_67	Arts	180	2.74	1.274	.095
	Education	171	2.80	1.217	.093
item_68	Arts	180	2.75	1.303	.097
	Education	171	2.81	1.214	.093
item_69	Arts	180	2.80	1.339	.100
	Education	171	2.70	1.152	.088
item_70	Arts	180	2.76	1.221	.091
	Education	171	2.80	1.178	.090
item_71	Arts	180	3.91	1.145	.085
	Education	171	4.01	1.054	.081
item_72	Arts	180	3.92	1.116	.083
	Education	171	4.01	.952	.073
item_73	Arts	180	4.45	.786	.059
	Education	171	4.44	.855	.065
item_74	Arts	180	4.31	.833	.062
	Education	171	4.37	.861	.066
item_75	Arts	180	4.41	.850	.063
	Education	171	4.42	.818	.063
item_76	Arts	180	4.50	.822	.061
	Education	171	4.60	.740	.057
item_77	Arts	180	4.18	.866	.065
	Education	171	4.19	.888	.068

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
total score of students' aspirations for long term life goals	Equal variances assumed	.556	.456	-.748	349	.455	-.41813	.55887	-1.51730	.68104
	Equal variances not assumed			-.750	348.571	.454	-.41813	.55763	-1.51486	.67861
item_67	Equal variances assumed	.493	.483	-.424	349	.672	-.056	.133	-.318	.205
	Equal variances not assumed			-.424	348.990	.672	-.056	.133	-.318	.205
item_68	Equal variances assumed	2.151	.143	-.424	349	.672	-.057	.135	-.322	.208
	Equal variances not assumed			-.424	348.876	.672	-.057	.134	-.321	.207
item_69	Equal variances assumed	7.049	.008	.735	349	.463	.098	.134	-.165	.361
	Equal variances not assumed			.738	345.695	.461	.098	.133	-.164	.360
item_70	Equal variances assumed	.501	.479	-.267	349	.790	-.034	.128	-.286	.218
	Equal variances not assumed			-.267	348.914	.789	-.034	.128	-.286	.218
item_71	Equal variances assumed	1.850	.175	-.805	349	.421	-.095	.118	-.326	.137
	Equal variances not assumed			-.807	348.670	.420	-.095	.117	-.326	.136
item_72	Equal variances assumed	5.648	.018	-.806	349	.421	-.089	.111	-.308	.129
	Equal variances not assumed			-.810	345.049	.419	-.089	.111	-.307	.128
item_73	Equal variances assumed	.184	.668	.063	349	.949	.006	.088	-.167	.178
	Equal variances not assumed			.063	342.741	.950	.006	.088	-.167	.178
item_74	Equal variances assumed	.027	.870	-.760	349	.448	-.069	.090	-.247	.109
	Equal variances not assumed			-.759	346.520	.448	-.069	.091	-.247	.109
item_75	Equal variances assumed	.348	.556	-.174	349	.862	-.015	.089	-.191	.160
	Equal variances not assumed			-.174	348.945	.862	-.015	.089	-.191	.160
item_76	Equal variances assumed	1.971	.161	-1.153	349	.249	-.096	.084	-.261	.068
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.157	348.009	.248	-.096	.083	-.261	.068
item_77	Equal variances assumed	.372	.542	-.100	349	.920	-.009	.094	-.194	.175
	Equal variances not assumed			-.100	346.991	.921	-.009	.094	-.194	.175