

# Reverence of Occupational Involvement by Parent – The Father’s Employment on Student’s Adaptability at Campus

Dr.Vijayalakshmi<sup>1</sup> N.S. & Dr. A.H.Sequeira<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty, P.G Department of Economics, University College Mangalore, Hampankatta  
Mangalore – 575001

<sup>2</sup>Professor and Dean Faculty Welfare, School of Management, N.I.T.K. surathkal  
Mangalore – 575025

Received: March 23, 2018

Accepted: April 29, 2018

## ABSTRACT

**Objective:** - The study aims to empirically test the relationship between types of campus adaptations across student’s father’s level of occupation among engineering undergraduate B. Tech student’s pursuing a four-year study at Indian Institute of Technology (IIT’s) and National Institute of Technology (NIT’s) in India. **Method:** - The Multivariate Analysis of Variance (Manova) test was run with SPSS vs. 21 to compare the student’s campus adaptations of IIT’s and NIT’s by student’s father’s level of occupation. Multistage random sampling with n = 1420 students were selected comprising of employed at government (n = 676), employed at private (n =276), own a business (n =306) employed as unskilled labourer (n=38), farmer (n =45), retired from government service or pensioner (n = 17), not alive (n = 21), unemployed (n = 41). **Result:** - In Academic adaptation, student’s father’s employed at government, employed as unskilled labourer, retired from government service as pensioner and unemployed had positive outcomes on student’s while student’s father’s employed at private, owned a business, farmer and not alive had negative outcomes. In Social adaptation, student’s father’s employed at private, owned a business and not alive had positive outcomes while student’s whose father’s were employed at government, employed as unskilled labourer, farmers, pensioners and unemployed had negative outcomes. In Physical – Psychological adaptation, student’s father’s employed at private, owned a business, retired from service as government pensioner, not alive and unemployed had positive outcomes while student’s father’s employed at government, employed as unskilled labourer, and farmer had negative outcomes. In Institutional adaptation, student’s father’s employed at government and retired from service as government pensioner only had positive outcomes while student’s father employed at private, owned a business, unskilled labourer, farmers, not alive and unemployed had negative outcomes. **Conclusion:** - Campus adaptations do vary across student’s father’s level of occupation influencing student’s experiences at university.

**Keywords:** socio economic status, college experiences, father, family, undergraduate.

## Introduction: -

Economic crisis impacts educational system (Serban-Oprescu, Horobeţ, & Şerban-Oprescu, 2012) with economic recession encroaching the quality of college experience among student’s (Kuh, 2009) vindictively as socio economic factors influence parents financial support to student’s (Majamaa, 2013). A vital attribute of Socio economic status like employment deriving its features from socio economic factors reveals that parental socio-economic status impacts student’s educational achievement (Memon, Joubish, & Khurram, 2010) as at times it adversely hampers student’s’ academic performance (Ambeken, Joseph, & Agwanyang, 2012) due to parent’s involvement being vehemently found (Vellymalay, 2012).

Socioeconomic Status is a demographic variable (Stockwell, 1966) that impacts the structural change in society (Coover, 1977) resulting in education attainment of college student’s (Barger & Hall, 1966) where it is often found that student’s with low socio economic status have their path critical towards college (Cabrera & Nasa, 2001). Never the less it could be that socio-economic background, and family structure results in inequality in educational opportunity (H. Park, 2007) extending its affluence at undergraduate student’s experiences at college (Donaldson, Lichtenstein, & Sheppard, 2008b). Thus socio economic status impacts educational attainment of student’s (Patel, 2012) through their academic achievement (Fin & Ishak, 2013). In short, there is a need to reimagining engineering diversity from an institutional perspective on socio economic status of student’s (Lundy-wagner, 2013) as it also varies on context of migration background of student’s (Hansson & Gustafsson, 2013).

*Father's Occupation:* - Occupation is an indicator of socio economic status (Ganzeboom, De Graaf, & Treiman, 1992). The lower graduation rates being associated with socioeconomic disadvantage, points out at parent's occupational status and family wealth (Carpenter, Hayden, & Long, 1998). Parents occupation representing socio economic status of the family impacts student's in educational attainment at higher educational institutions (McMillan & Western, 2000) with choice of academic major varying by gender (Leppel, Williams, & Waldauer, 2001) inflicting financial socialization too especially among first year college student's (Shim, Barber, Card, Xiao, & Serido, 2010). Parents traditional occupation impacts children's educational aspirations (Fulcher, 2011) and parental job loss impacts education enrolment of youth (Coelli, 2011). It is to be noted that females in higher education are from families whose father's education was high and earned higher net income (Gürel, 2011). Hence parental job loss impacts household or family income (Ehlert, 2013).

The study seeks to analyse the relationship among father's level of occupation on campus adaptations of student's with the following research question and research objective: -

**Research Question:** - What makes campus adaptations of academic, social, physical - psychological and institutional adaptation be unique across father's level of occupation?

**Research Objective:** - To investigate existence of variance among campus adaptations of academic, social, physical psychological and institutional across father's level of occupation.

### 1. Campus Adaptation: -

#### 1.1 Academic Adaptation: -

Student characteristics and family background impacts academic achievement (Cabrera & Nasa, 2001). Parent's academic gender stereotypes influences academic performance of children (Bhanot & Jovanovic, 2005). Socio economic status determines learning ability leading to faster entry to paying positions on the job market (Dar & Getz, 2007) as parent's expectations has an impact on career aspirations of children (Creed, Conlon, & Zimmer-Gembeck, 2007) especially connected to information technology areas of interests (Pick & Azari, 2008). More noticeably technology-supported attendance supervision system can bring value for all end-user groups serving primarily teachers and parents (Ervasti, Isomursu, & Kinnula, 2009). Parenting styles also influenced academic performance of college student's (E. a. Turner, Chandler, & Heffer, 2009) with parental background also found to impact the choice of first job of student's (Dutta & Punnose, 2010). The Bernstein's pedagogic discourse as a bridge connecting multiliteracies and engagement of student's from low socio-economic backgrounds (Zammit, 2011) reflects that social class impacts labour market outcomes (Reimer, 2011) with parental affluence being significant predictors of career indecision (Stărică, 2012). Socio economic background of student's influences student's' choice of post-compulsory science academic majors (Anderhag, Emanuelsson, Wickman, & Hamza, 2013) with parental choice of academic major inflicting student's educational level attainment (Cowen, Fleming, Witte, Wolf, & Kisida, 2013). Further engineering student's are found to have mother tongue influence in academic major classroom - language (Sen & Chin, 2012). Parents attitudes towards institutions with faculty and parent verbal intellect impacts academic motivation (Grigoryeva & Shamionov, 2014) with adjustment to university showcased by academic performance of financially disadvantaged student's or low socio economic student's (Petersen, Louw, & Dumont, 2009). Thus parenting style (Ishak, Low, & Lau, 2012) and socio economic status (Ahmar & Anwar, 2013) (Nasa, 2013) (Chandra & Azimuddin, 2013) (Katoch, 2013) impacts academic achievement. In brief, socio economic background of student's impacts their academic performance (Okioga, 2013). In short, student's' failure in academic environment is not only influenced by internal (personal) factors but also by external factors (family situation, social pressure, economic pressure) (Roman, 2014).

*1.2 Social Adaptation:* - Maturation sequence among females in relation to socio-economic status (Nath, 1987) have to be considered where social support is more often assumed to positively influence academic performance among student's (Ma & Kishore, 1997). Family status impacts occupational choice (Grazier & Sloane, 2006) and family attachment influences educational aspirations of rural student's (Howley, 2006). However, gender bias persists in parental investments in children's education (Pasqua, 2005) where a student is often found juxtaposed between parenting and identity formation impacting college adjustment among student's (K Luyckx, Soenens, Goossens, & Vansteenkiste, 2007). Socio economic status leaves its imprints also on student's vivid college experiences and education outcomes that diversifies in terms of its impact especially among the underrepresented student's of minority race (Walpole, 2008) where parental occupation results in social capital inequity on educational experiences and academic career decisions of engineering undergraduates (Trenor, Yu, Waight, & Zerda, 2008). Hence parental attachment varies among college student's by race (Melendez & Melendez, 2010) and the role of parents as advice giving and

intrusiveness impacts adolescent's competence with peers (Poulin, Nadeau, & Scaramella, 2012) especially an observed phenomenon of socio economic status on academic failure of male student's (Jeludar, Shayan, & AhmadiGatab, 2012). In brief, implicit gender stereotypes are placed by family especially that of parents on children (Endendijk et al., 2013) and family relations with social support impacts social undermining and adjustment among college student's (Taylor, 2015) with vital perspective of focus on academic achievement of dalit's to bring them into the mainstream society (Maurya, 2016).

### 1.3 Physical - Psychological Adaptation: -

1.3.1 *Physical Adaptation:* - Body dissatisfaction, living away from parents, and poor Social adjustment predict binge eating symptoms especially in young women at institutions (Barker & Galambos, 2007). Hence socio-economic and demographic factors impact on health and quality of life (Pappa, Kontodimopoulos, Papadopoulos, & Niakas, 2009).

1.3.2 *Psychological Adaptation:* - Independence from parents and self efficacy impacts adjustment of student's to college (Silverthorn & Gekoski, 1995) with mentoring relationship outside family positively contributing to psychological well being among student's (DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005). The perceived quality of early relationships with parents, attachment, personality pre dispositions impacts loneliness among student's (Wiseman, Mayseless, & Sharabany, 2006). Further socio economic status and cultural diversity in student's indicate the aspirations gap especially among low socio economic status student's (Bowden & Doughney, 2009). To transgress this stance, so far much noticeably it is found that smart parents raise smart children with intergenerational transmission of cognitive abilities impacting student outcomes (Anger & Heineck, 2010). Socio-Economic Status also influences student's' scientific epistemological beliefs (Ozkal, Tekkaya, Sungur, Cakiroglu, & Cakiroglu, 2010) as transition to college is all about managing family functioning, emotional coping and adjustment in emergent adulthood (Vanessa Kahen Johnson, Susan E. Gans, Sandra Kerr, & William LaValle, 2010). Thus parental attitude and involvement in children's education impacts parent's aspiration effecting student's' academic achievement (Mahamood et al., 2012) where socio economic status of the family influences mental health of student's that builds up occupational aspirations (Gjerustad & von Soest, 2012) impacting overall psychological wellbeing of student's especially that of women (Basu, 2012). In brief, socio economic status could have an embark on depression (Ibrahim, Kelly, & Glazebrook, 2013) leaving a gustative thought that family environment impacts adolescent socio - emotional functioning (Cavendish, Montague, Enders, & Dietz, 2014) and on the brink of permissibe parenting resulting in negative academic performance (Barton & Hirsch, 2015).

1.4 *Institutional Adaptation:* - Socioeconomic Status impacts intelligence that influences educational attainment in terms of graduation completion (Sewell & Shah, 1967). Socioeconomic demography of highly ranked universities impacts changes in rank of institutions (Meredith, 2004) with observed parental impact on institutional choice of student's for higher learning (Bers, 2005) leading to between and within institutional differences in student performance by socio economic factors (Marks, 2006). Further institutional culture impacts parent's decisions on institutions choice resulting in social disadvantage or social inequality (Hill, Samson, & Dasgupta, 2006). Thus social Class impacts admissions to elite institutions and campus life experiences of student's in them (M. Fischer, 2010) with family socio economic status impulsively impacting institutional adaptation (Carvalho & Novo, 2012). Never the less, adjustment problems are witnessed by student's in residential care or hostels mostly due to family background and lack of proper institutional care (Novotný, 2015) which calls on the need for college enhancement strategies needed to beat up socio economic inequality (Wolniak, Wells, Engberg, & Manly, 2016).

The study proposes the following research hypothesis: -

H<sub>0</sub>: -Campus adaptations of academic, social, physical - psychological and institutional environments do not vary among undergraduate student's by their father's level of employment

H<sub>1</sub>: - There is a significant difference in campus adaptations of academic, social, physical - psychological and institutional adaptations impacted by undergraduate student's father's level of employment attained.

## 2. Methods: -

2.1 *Participant:* - The reference population were undergraduate 4-year B. tech student's enrolled on a regular study mode at IIT's and NIT's. A total of 1460 student's participated with 1420 of valid responses for an overall 97.26 percent participation rate after deducting the questionnaire that contained empty answers. Data was collected for 20 weeks across institutions of IIT's and NIT's. Of the 1420 undergraduate student respondents on their father occupation level, 47. 6% were employed at government sector, 19.4 % were employed at private sector, 21.5% owned a business 2.6% employed as unskilled labourer, 3.16 as farmers, 1.19% as pensioners retired from service and unfortunately, 1.47 % student's father's were not alive.

2.2 *Sampling*: - Probability sampling technique followed by cluster sampling in identification of institutes of IIT's and NIT's was adopted. This is followed up with stratified sampling in sample choice of undergraduate student's' population and simple random in collecting data from the chosen student population stated above.

2.3 *Instrument and Procedure*: - The survey was conducted using a structured online questionnaire with reference to student's campus and non - campus email accounts. At all times, the student's were informed of the anonymous, confidential, and voluntary nature of their participation and any doubts that arose were clarified.

2.4 *Measures*: - All the 21 items in the questionnaire were measured with rating on a five point Likert scale ranging from "1 = strongly disagree" to "5 = strongly Agree". Reliability and validity of the questionnaire was tested

**3. Data Analysis: -**

Multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were conducted to asses' father's level of employment group differences in campus adaptation. This was followed by discriminant analysis to determine the nature of effect of campus adaptations by each father's level of employment group. There are several assumptions behind a MANOVA, including multivariate normality, linearity of relationships, low influence of univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance- covariance matrices and an absence of multicollinearity. Each assumption was tested, and no serious violations were noted.

Campus Adaptation	1	2	3	4	M	SD
1.Academic Adaptation	1.00				2.60	0.702
2.Social Adaptation	0.577	1.00			2.72	0.755
3.Physical - Psychological Adaptation	0.519	0.575	1.00		2.28	0.771
4.Institutional Adaptation	0.573	0.615	0.789	1.00	2.14	0.784

Note: - n = 1420. Correlations greater than 0.05 are statistically significant (p < 0.5)  
 Source :- output data of SPSS 21version

A Pearson product moment correlation analysis, that examined the relationship between campus adaptations revealed correlations greater than 0.05, hence statistically significant

**3.1 Descriptive Statistics: -**

Father's Level of Employment	Campus Adaptations							
	Academic		Social		Physical - Psychological		Institutional	
	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean	Std. Dev
Employed at Government (n =676)	2.63	0.677	2.73	0.737	2.30	0.772	2.17	0.806
Employed at Private (n =276)	2.60	0.752	2.76	0.778	2.32	0.751	2.14	0.729
Own a Business (n =306)	2.56	0.688	2.67	0.750	2.24	0.761	2.07	0.759
Employed as unskilled Labourer (n=38)	2.66	0.858	2.57	0.906	2.29	0.843	2.26	0.906
Farmer (n =45)	2.35	0.706	2.56	0.786	1.96	0.790	1.91	0.842
Retired from Government service or Pensioner (n = 17)	2.76	0.769	2.89	0.667	2.31	0.717	2.32	0.692
Not Alive (n = 21)	2.45	0.612	2.84	0.625	2.13	0.670	2.14	0.597
Unemployed (n = 41)	2.66	0.703	2.85	0.806	2.45	0.895	2.39	0.837
Total (n =1420)	2.60	0.702	2.72	0.755	2.28	0.771	2.14	0.784

Source :- output of SPSS 21 version

The mean in the descriptive statistics indicate that among undergraduate B.Tech student's, student's enjoyed high level of social adaptation irrespective father's occupation, with father's employed at government (M = 2.73, SD = 0.737) employed at private (M = 2.76, SD = 0.778) own a business (M = 2.67, SD = 0.750) farmers (M = 2.54, SD = 0.786) retired or government pensioner (M = 2.89, SD = 0.667) not alive (M = 2.84, SD = 0.625) unemployed (M = 2.85, SD = 0.806) with exception to parents employed as unskilled labourer whose children as student's had high level of academic adaptation (M = 2.66, SD = 0.858)

However, father's occupation level across occupations had lower level of institutional adaptation with father being employed at government (M = 2.17, SD = 0.806) employed at private (M = 2.14, SD = 0.729) own a business (M = 2.07, SD = 0.759) unskilled labourer (M = 2.26, SD = 0.906) farmer (M = 1.91, SD = 0.842) and unemployed (M = 2.39, SD = 0.837). the exception being retired father and father who was not anymore alive, where student's witnessed lowest level of Physical - psychological adaptation where (M = 2.31, SD = 0.717) and (M = 2.13, SD = 0.670)

Further within Academic Adaptation, student's whose father's who were retired from government service had high level of impact on adaptation (M = 2.76, SD = 0.769) and student's whose father were farmers had low level of adaptation (M = 2.35, SD = 0.706)

In Social Adaptation, whose father's who were retired from government service had high level of impact on adaptation (M = 2.89, SD = 0.667) and student's whose father were farmers impacted in low level of adaptation (M = 2.54, SD = 0.786)

In Physical - Psychological adaptation, student's whose parents where employed at private had high impact on level of adaptation (M = 2.32, SD = 0.751) and student's whose father were farmers impacted in low level of adaptation (M = 1.96, SD = 0.790)

In Institutional adaptation, student's whose parents were unemployed had high impact on student's level of adaptation (M = 2.39, SD = 0.837) and student's whose father's were farmers impacted on student's low level of adaptation (M = 1.91, SD = 0.842)

Overall, across campus adaptations and father's occupational level groups, student's had high level of social adaptation (M = 2.72, SD = 0.755) and low level of Institutional adaptation (M = 2.14, SD = 0.784). However, within father's occupation level, parent father who was retired from government service had high level of impact on student's social adaptation (M = 2.89, SD = 0.667) and student's whose father was a farmer had low level of institutional adaptation (M = 1.91, SD = 0.842).

### 3.2 Inferential statistics: -

The Box's M value of 73.488 indicates test of assumption of equality of covariance matrices are roughly equal as assumed with  $p = 0.464$  ( $p > 0.001$ ).

Using Manova test statistic of Pillai's Trace, there was a non-significant effect of father's occupation on student's' Academic, Social, Physical - Psychological and Institutional campus adaptations ( $V = 0.027$ ,  $F(28, 5648) = 1.350$  and  $p = 0.103$ ) ( $p > 0.05$ ).

Using Manova test statistic of Wilks Lambda, there was a non-significant effect of father's occupation on student's' Academic, Social, Physical - Psychological and Institutional campus adaptations ( $\Lambda = 0.974$ ,  $F(28, 5081) = 1.349$  and  $p = 0.103$ ) ( $p > 0.05$ ).

Using Manova test statistic of Hotelling's trace, there was a non significant effect of father's occupation on student's campus adaptations of Academic, Social, Physical - Psychological and Institutional ( $T = 0.027$ ,  $F(28, 5630) = 1.348$  and  $p = 0.104$ ) ( $p > 0.05$ ).

Using Manova test statistic of Roy's largest root, there was a non significant effect of father's occupation on student's campus adaptations of Academic, Social, Physical - Psychological and Institutional ( $\Theta = 0.011$ ,  $F(7, 1412) = 2.316$  and  $p = 0.024$ ) ( $p < 0.05$ ).

The univariate test statistic with levene's test of equality of variances for each of the dependent variable is non-significant i.e.  $p > 0.05$  with academic adaptation of 0.144, social adaptation of 0.536, physical - psychological adaptation of 0.754 and institutional adaptation of 0.195 enabling the assumptions of homogeneity of variance being met.

However separate univariate analysis or anova on the outcome with  $F(7, 1412)$  for Academic, social, Physical - Psychological and institutional adaptation revealed a no significant effect with F value (1.466) (1.246) (1.822) and (1.871) with p value (0.175) (0.275) (0.079) and (0.071)

Further the between - subjects SSCP matrix indicates that the sum of squares for the error SSCP matrix are substantially bigger than in the model (or father's education) SSCP matrix, whereas absolute values of cross products are fairly similar. This pattern of relationship indicates that the relationship between dependent variables is significant than individual dependent variables themselves. Thus to determine the nature of effect of father's employment level among dependent variables Manova is followed with discriminant analysis.

The first discriminant function explained 42.8% of the variance with canonical  $R^2 = 0.011$ ; the second discriminant function explained 30.2% of the variance with canonical  $R^2 = 0.008$ ; the third discriminant function explained 22.8% of the variance with canonical  $R^2 = 0.006$ ; the fourth discriminant function explained 4.2% of the variance with canonical  $R^2 = 0.001$  indicates that the variance in the canonical derived dependant variable was associated for father's occupation level.

In combination these discriminant functions did not significantly discriminate the father's occupation level. The first discriminant function significantly differentiated the student father's occupation level, with the first function  $\Lambda = 0.974$ ,  $x^2(28) 37.737$ ,  $p = 0.103$  ( $p > 0.05$ ); The second discriminant function  $\Lambda = 0.985$ ,  $x^2(18) 21.603$ ,  $p = 0.250$  ( $p > 0.05$ ); The third discriminant function  $\Lambda = 0.993$ ,  $x^2(10) 10.214$ ,  $p = 0.422$  ( $p > 0.05$ ) and the fourth discriminate function  $\Lambda = 0.999$ ,  $x^2(4) 1.587$ ,  $p = 0.811$  ( $p > 0.05$ ). indicates the non significant effect of discriminant functions.

The correlations between outcomes and the discriminant functions revealed that institutional adaptation loaded highly on first function ( $r = 0.768$ ) indicating it contributed more to the father's occupation level group separation (Bragman, 1970) than the relatively fair high loading in positive relationship in third function ( $r = 0.591$ ) with negative relationship in second function ( $-0.204$ ) and fourth function ( $r = -0.136$ ). Physical - psychological adaptation loaded highly on first function ( $r = 0.757$ ) indicating it contributed more to the father's occupation level group separation than the relatively high loading in positive relationship with second function ( $r = 0.397$ ) and third function ( $r = 0.417$ ) negated by negative relationship in the fourth function ( $r = -0.308$ );

Academic adaptation loaded highly on first function with ( $r = 0.747$ ) indicating it contributed more to the father's occupation level group separation than the than relatively fair high loading in the second function ( $r = 0.156$ ) third function ( $r = 0.194$ ) and fourth function ( $r = 0.616$ )

Lastly, social adaptation loaded highly on third function with ( $r = 0.882$ ) indicating it contributed more to the father's occupation level group separation than the relatively fair high loading in positive relationship with first function ( $r = 0.246$ ) second function ( $r = 0.278$ ) and fourth function ( $r = 0.291$ )

### 3.2 Findings: -

The student's father's occupation of being employed at government had positive academic (0.046) and institutional (0.014) adaptation with negative outcomes in social (-0.005) and physical - psychological (-0.005) adaptation.

The student's father's occupation of being employed at private had positive outcome at social (0.093) and physical - psychological (0.049) adaptation with negative outcomes in academic (-0.019) and institutional (-0.015) adaptation.

The student's father's occupation of owning a business had positive outcomes in social (0.093) and physical - psychological (0.049) adaptation with negative outcomes in academic (-0.019) and institutional (-0.015) adaptation.

The student's father's occupation of being employed as unskilled labourer had positive outcomes in academic (0.256) adaptation with negative outcome in social (-0.294) physical - psychological (-0.191) and institutional (-0.039) adaptation.

The student's father's occupation of being son of soil, the farmer had negative outcomes in academic (-0.388) social (-0.243) physical - psychological (-0.083) and institutional (-0.016) adaptation

The student's father's who are retired and now as government pensioner had positive outcome on student's' academic (0.121) physical - psychological (0.217) and institutional (0.207) adaptation but negative social adaptation (-0.31)

The student's whose father had expired had positive physical - psychological (0.350) and institutional (0.005) adaptation with negative outcomes in academic (-0.336) and social (-0.229) adaptations

The student's whose father was unemployed had positive academic (0.190) and physical - psychological (0.207) with negative outcomes in social (-0.130) and institutional (-0.119) adaptation.

In brief the alternate hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) is accepted and the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected at  $p < 0.05$ .

In short, campus adaptations vary across student's father's level occupation or employment criteria among engineering undergraduate student's.

Conclusion: - Those student's father's who were employed at government inflicted positive academic and institutional adaptation with negative social and psychological adaptation in student's. On the contrary student's father who were employed at private and also who owned a business enjoyed more social and physical - psychological adaptation. This could be owed to the fact that parents in India who have a regularised nature of job tend to make their children prone to academics and often share a major threshold

even in selection of institution. Irrespective of psychological willingness student's are forced by parent to opt for major that are against his or her personal interest and also extremely pressurised to perform well in academics that dethrones their nature of social and physical – psychological adaptation. Student's had only positive academic adaptation with negative social, physical – psychological and institutional adaptation whose father's were employed as unskilled labourers significantly pointing to the fact that student's were overburdened to perform and perform better in academics alone. This is almost close to functioning among student's whose father was a farmer or toiled the land as they only had negative adaptations in academic, social, physical – psychological and institutional adaptation. Student's whose parent were retired from service had positive academic, physical – psychological and institutional adaptation but negative social adaptation where parents seem to restrict student's socialising with a perspective of neglecting academic learning. Student's whose parent were not alive had positive physical – psychological and institutional adaptation but negative academic and social adaptation revealing that inspite of lower involvement in academics with poor socialisation, most student's were determined to persist at institutes of higher learning. Lastly student's whose father was unemployed had positive academic and physical – psychological adaptation but poor social and institutional adaptation reflecting that socialisation and persistence depends need financial spending which is not being present in the family in terms of father's employment.

Implications: - The nature of occupation of the parent – the father's level of occupational involvement inflicted student's involvement in campuses. The male bread winner's role in the family and its effect on student's cannot be nullified. However, the significant effect on the contour role of woman – the mother of the house as a bread winner could also have a impact on students campus adaptations. Further the parent's wholesome contribution jointly to the family or young adult's academic well being on campus need to be testified.

#### References: -

1. Ahmar, F., & Anwar, E. 2013. Socio Economic Status and its Relation to Academic Achievement of Higher Secondary School Student's. *Journal Of Humanities And Social Science*, 13(6): 13–20.
2. Ambeken, L., Joseph, K., & Agwanyang, F. 2012. Parental Socioeconomic Background as a Determinant of Student ' s Academic Performance in Selected Public Secondary Schools in Calabar Municipal Local Government Area , Cross River State , Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 3(16):129–136.
3. Anderhag, P., Emanuelsson, P., Wickman, P., & Hamza, K. M. 2013. Student's' Choice of Post-Compulsory Science: In search of schools that compensate for the socio-economic background of their student's. *International Journal of Science Education*, 35(18) : 3141–3160. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2012.696738>
4. Anger, S., & Heineck, G. 2010. Do smart parents raise smart children? The intergenerational transmission of cognitive abilities. *Journal of Population Economics*, 23(3) : 1105–1132. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-009-0298-8>
5. Barker, E. T., & Galambos, N. L. 2007. Body dissatisfaction, living away from parents, and poor social adjustment predict binge eating symptoms in young women making the transition to university. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 36(7) : 904–911. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-006-9134-6>
6. Barger, B. E. N., & Hall, E. 1966. The Interrelationships of Family Size and Socioeconomic Status for Parents of College Student's. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 28(2): 186–187.
7. Barton, A. L., & Hirsch, J. K. 2015. Permissive Parenting and Mental Health in College Student's: Mediating Effects of Academic Entitlement. *Journal of American College Health: J of ACH*, 64(1) : 1–8. <http://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2015.1060597>
8. Basu, S. 2012. Mental Health Concerns for Indian Women. *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*, 19(1) : 127–136. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0971521511101900106>
9. Bers, T. 2005. Parents of traditionally aged community college student's: Communications and choice. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(4) : 413–436. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-005-2968-z>
10. Bhanot, R., & Jovanovic, J. 2005. Do parents' academic gender stereotypes influence whether they intrude on their children's homework? *Sex Roles*, 52(9–10) : 597–607. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-005-3728-4>
11. Bowden, M. P., & Doughney, J. 2009. Socio-economic status, cultural diversity and the aspirations of secondary student's in the Western Suburbs of Melbourne, Australia. *Higher Education*, 59(1) : 115–129. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-009-9238-5>
12. Cabrera, A. F., & Nasa, S. M. La. 2001. On the Path to College: Three Critical Tasks Facing America ' s Disadvantaged ON THE PATH TO COLLEGE: Three Critical Tasks Facing America ' s Disadvantaged. *Research in Higher Education*, 42(2) : 119–149. <http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026520002362>
13. Carpenter, P. G., Hayden, M., & Long, M. 1998. Social and economic influences on graduation rates from higher education in Australia. *Higher Education*, 35 : 399–422.
14. Carvalho, R. G., & Novo, R. F. 2012. Family socioeconomic status and student adaptation to school life: Looking beyond grades. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 10(3): 1209–1222.
15. Cavendish, W., Montague, M., Enders, C., & Dietz, S. 2014. Mothers' and Adolescents' Perceptions of Family

- Environment and Adolescent Social-Emotional Functioning. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 23(1) : 52-66. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-012-9685-y>
16. Chandra, R., & Azimuddin, P. S. 2013. Influence of Socio Economic Status On Academic Achievement Of Secondary School Student's Of Lucknow City. *International Journal of Scientific and Engineering Research*, 4(12) : 1952-1960
  17. Coelli, M. B. 2011. Parental job loss and the education enrollment of youth. *Labour Economics*, 18(1) : 25-35. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2010.04.015>
  18. Coover, E. R. 1977. Socioeconomic Status and Structural Change. *Social Science History*, 1(4): 437-459. <http://doi.org/10.2307/1170792>
  19. Cowen, J. M., Fleming, D. J., Witte, J. F., Wolf, P. J., & Kisida, B. 2013. School Vouchers and Student Attainment: Evidence from a State-Mandated Study of Milwaukee's Parental Choice Program. *Policy Studies Journal*, 41(1) : 147-168. <http://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12006>
  20. Creed, P. a., Conlon, E. G., & Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J. (2007). Career barriers and reading ability as correlates of career aspirations and expectations of parents and their children. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70(2) : 242-258. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2006.11.001>
  21. Dar, Y., & Getz, S. 2007. Learning ability, socioeconomic status, and student placement for undergraduate studies in Israel. *Higher Education*, 54(1) : 41-60. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-006-9045-1>
  22. Donaldson, K., Lichtenstein, G., & Sheppard, S. 2008. Socioeconomic Status and the Undergraduate Engineering Experience: Preliminary Findings from Four American Universities. In *American Society for Engineering Education, 2007* (pp. 1-9).
  23. DuBois, D. L., & Silverthorn, N. 2005. Characteristics of natural mentoring relationships and adolescent adjustment: evidence from a national study. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 26(2) : 69-92. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10935-005-1832-4>
  24. Dutta, a., & Punnose, E. M. 2010. Factors Affecting Choice of First Employer: A Study of Indian Management Graduates. *Global Business Review*, 11(3) : 435-448. <http://doi.org/10.1177/097215091001100308>
  25. Ehlert, M. 2013. Job loss among rich and poor in the United States and Germany: Who loses more income? *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 32(1) : 85-103. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2012.11.001>
  26. Endendijk, J. J., Groeneveld, M. G., van Berkel, S. R., Hallers-Haalboom, E. T., Mesman, J., & Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J. 2013. Gender Stereotypes in the Family Context: Mothers, Father's, and Siblings. *Sex Roles*, 68(9-10) : 577-590. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-013-0265-4>
  27. Ervasti, M., Isomursu, M., & Kinnula, M. 2009. Experiences from NFC supported school attendance supervision for children. In *3rd International Conference on Mobile Ubiquitous Computing, Systems, Services, and Technologies, UBICOMM 2009* (pp: 22-30). <http://doi.org/10.1109/UBICOMM.2009.9>
  28. Fin, L. S., & Ishak, Z. 2013. Direct and Indirect Effects of Self-Concept and Socioeconomic Status on Student's ' Academic Achievement. *Educational Research International*, 1(2) : 40-49.
  29. Fischer, M. 2010. No Longer Separate, Not Yet Equal: Race and Class in Elite College Admissions and Campus Life By Thomas J. Espenshade and Alexandria Walton Radford Princeton University Press. 2009. 576 pages. \$35 cloth. *Social Forces*, 89(2) : 723-725. <http://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2010.0090>
  30. Fulcher, M. 2011. Individual Differences in Children's Occupational Aspirations as a Function of Parental Traditionality. *Sex Roles*, 64(1-2) : 117-131. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9854-7>
  31. Hansson, Å., & Gustafsson, J.-E. 2013. Measurement Invariance of Socioeconomic Status Across Migrational Background. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 57(2) : 148-166. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2011.625570>
  32. Hill, E., Samson, M., & Dasgupta, S. 2006. Expanding the School Market in India: Parental Choice and the Reproduction of Social Inequality. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 46(35) : 98-105.
  33. Howley, C. 2006. Remote Possibilities : Rural Children's Educational Aspirations. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 81(2) : 81-120. <http://doi.org/10.1207/S15327930pje8102>
  34. Ibrahim, A. K., Kelly, S. J., & Glazebrook, C. 2013. Socioeconomic status and the risk of depression among UK higher education student's. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 48(9) : 1491-1501. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-013-0663-5>
  35. Ishak, Z., Low, S. F., & Lau, P. L. 2012. Parenting Style as a Moderator for Student's' Academic Achievement. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 21(4) : 487-493. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-011-9340-1>
  36. Jeludar, S. S., Jeludar, Z. A., Shayan, N., & AhmadiGatab, T. 2012. Factors Affecting the Academic Failure of Male Student's. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46 : 2575-2578. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.526>
  37. Katoch, K. 2013. A Study of Socio Economic Status and the Academic Achievement of Xth grade Student's. *International Journal of Behavioural Social and Movement Sciences*, 2 : 9-21.
  38. Ganzeboom, H. B. G., De Graaf, P. M., & Treiman, D. J. 1992. A standard international socio-economic index of occupational status. *Social Science Research*, 21(1) : 1-56. [http://doi.org/10.1016/0049-089X\(92\)90017-B](http://doi.org/10.1016/0049-089X(92)90017-B)
  39. Gjerustad, C., & von Soest, T. 2012. Socio-economic status and mental health - the importance of achieving occupational aspirations. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 15(7) : 890-908. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2012.693590>

40. Grazier, S., & Sloane, P. J. 2006. *Accident risk, gender, family status and occupational choice in the UK.*
41. Grigoryeva, M. V., & Shamionov, R. M. 2014. Predictors of Emotional Well-being and Academic Motivation in Junior Schoolchildren. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 146 : 334-339. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.08.106>
42. Gürel, A. 2011. Higher Education in Turkey in the EU Harmonization Process: An Analysis of Living Conditions of Agricultural Engineering Student's with a Comparison Between Genders. *Turkish Studies*, 12(1) : 91-100. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14683849.2011.563500>
43. Kuh, G. 2009. Hard Truths in Dark Times: Avoiding Campus Climate Depression in a Recession. *Journal of College and Character*, 10(6). <http://doi.org/10.2202/1940-1639.1449>
44. Leppel, K., Williams, M. L., & Waldauer, C. 2001. The impact of parental occupation and socioeconomic status on choice of college major. *Journal of Family and Economic ...*, 22(4): 373-394. <http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1012716828901>
45. Luyckx, K., Soenens, B., Goossens, L., & Vansteenkiste, M. 2007. Parenting, Identity Formation, and College Adjustment: A Mediation Model with Longitudinal Data. *Identity*, 7(4) : 309-330. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15283480701600785>
46. Lundy-wagner, V. C. 2013. Reimagining engineering diversity : A study of academic advisors ' perspectives on socioeconomic status Reimagining engineering diversity : A study of institutional. In *120th ASEE Annual conference and Exposition* pp : 1-10.
47. Ma, X., & Kishor, N. 1997. Attitude Toward Self , Social Factors , and Achievement in Mathematics : A Meta-Analytic Review. *Educational Psychology Review*, 9(2) : 89-96 <http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024785812050>
48. Mahamood, S. F., Tapsir, R., Saat, A., Ahmad, S., Wahab, K. A., Boon, M. H. A., & Rahman, K. A. (2012). Parental Attitude and Involvement in Children's Education: A Study on the Parental Aspiration among Form Four Student's in Selangor. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 42(July 2010) : 117-130. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.04.173>
49. Majamaa, K. 2013. The Effect of Socio-Economic Factors on Parental Financial Support From the Perspectives of the Givers and the Receivers. *European Societies*, 15(1) : 57-81. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14616696.2012.721891>
50. Marks, G. N. 2006. Are between- and within-school differences in student performance largely due to socio-economic background? Evidence from 30 countries. *Educational Research*, 48(1) : 21-40. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00131880500498396>
51. Maurya, R. K. 2016. Parenting Practises Among Dalit Parents and Academic Achievement of Thier Children. In *Nationsl Seminat on Dr. Ambedkar: Social Justice and Inclusive Growth* (pp: 1-10).
52. McMillan, J., & Western, J. 2000. Measurement of the socio-economic status of Australian higher education student's. *Higher Education*, 39(2) : 223-248.
53. Melendez, M. C., & Melendez, N. B. 2010. The Influence of Parental Attachment on the College Adjustment of White, Black, and Latina/Hispanic Women: A Cross-Cultural Investigation. *Journal of College Student Development*, 51(4) : 419-435. <http://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0144>
54. Memon, G. R., Joubish, M. F., & Khurram, M. A. 2010. Impact of Parental Socio-Economic Status on Student's ' Educational Achievements at Secondary Schools of District Malir , Karachi. *Mifddle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 6(6) : 678-687.
55. Meredith, M. 2004. Why do universities compete in the ratings game? An empirical analysis of the effects of the U.S. News and World Report college rankings. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(5): 443-461. <http://doi.org/10.1023/B:RIHE.0000032324.46716.f4>
56. Nath, S. 1987. Maturational Sequence Among Females in Relation to Socio-Economic Status. *Indian Anthropologist*, 17(1) : 41-64. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41919552>
57. Nasa, L. 2013. Influence of Socio-Economic Status ( SES ) on Academic Achievement of Secondary School Student's. *International Journal of Research in Education*, 2(December) : 28-32.
58. Novotný, J. S. 2015 Adjustment problems and residential care environment. *Psychologie a Její Kontexty*, 6(2) : 37-48.
59. Okioga, C. K. 2013 The Impact of Student's ' Socio -economic Background on Academic Performance in Universities , a Case of Student's in Kisii University College. *American International Journal of Social Science*, 2(2) : 38-46.
60. Ozkal, K., Tekkaya, C., Sungur, S., Cakiroglu, J., & Cakiroglu, E. 2010. Elementary Student's' Scientific Epistemological Beliefs in Relation to Socio-Economic Status and Gender. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 21(7) : 873-885. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-009-9169-0>
61. Park, H. 2007. Inequality of Educational Opportunity in Korea by Gender, Socio-Economic Background, and Family Structure. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 11(1-2) : 179-197. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13642980601176324>
62. Pasqua, S. 2005 Gender Bias in Parental Investments in Children ' s Education : A Theoretical Analysis. *Review of Economics of the Household*, (3) : 291-314.
63. Patel, G. S. 2012. A Study of the Socio-Economic Status and Educational Achievement of Higher Secondary School Student's. *Indian E-Journal on Teacher Education (IEJTE)*, 1(2) : 31-35.
64. Pappa, E., Kontodimopoulos, N., Papadopoulos, A. a., & Niakas, D. 2009 Assessing the socio-economic and

- demographic impact on health-related quality of life: Evidence from Greece. *International Journal of Public Health*, 54(4) : 241-249. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00038-009-8057-x>
65. Pick, J. B., & Azari, R. 2008 Global digital divide: Influence of socioeconomic, governmental, and accessibility factors on information technology. *Information Technology for Development*, 14(2): 91-115. <http://doi.org/10.1002/itdj.20095>
  66. Petersen, I., Louw, J., & Dumont, K. 2009. Adjustment to university and academic performance among disadvantaged student's in South Africa. *Educational Psychology*, 29(1) : 99-115. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01443410802521066>
  67. Poulin, F., Nadeau, K., & Scaramella, L. V. 2012. The Role of Parents in Young Adolescents' Competence With Peers: An Observational Study of Advice Giving and Intrusiveness. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 58(4): 437-462. <http://doi.org/10.1353/mpq.2012.0021>
  68. Reimer, D. 2011 Labour market outcomes and their impact on tertiary decisions in Germany: class and gender differences. *Irish Educational Studies*, 30(2) : 199-213. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2011.569141>
  69. Roman, M. D. 2014. Student's Failure in Academic Environment. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 114 ; 170-177. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.679>
  70. Sen, N., & Chin, H. 2012 Applying statistical analysis to qualitative data: Student's mother tongue in mathematics classrooms. *Statistics in Science, Business, and mangement* <http://doi.org/10.1109/ICSSBE.2012.6396596>
  71. Silverthorn, N. A., & Gekoski, W. L. 1995. Social Desirability effects on Measures of Adjustment to University, Independence from Parents and Self efficacy. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 51(2) : 244-251.
  72. Stărică, E. C. 2012 Predictors for career indecision in adolescence. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 33 : 168-172. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.01.105>
  73. Serban-Opreșcu, G.-L., Horobeț, A., & Șerban-Opreșcu, A.-T. 2012. Assessment of the Romanian Tertiary Educational System in the Context of the Economic Crisis. Lessons Learned and Lifelong Strategy Tools for Improvement. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46 : 4575-4579. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.299>
  74. Shim, S., Barber, B. L., Card, N. A., Xiao, J. J., & Serido, J. 2010. Financial Socialization of First-year College Student's: The Roles of Parents, Work, and Education. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 39(12): 1457-1470. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-009-9432-x>
  75. Taylor, R. D. 2015. Kin Social Undermining, Adjustment and Family Relations Among Low-Income African American Mothers and Adolescents: Moderating Effects of Kin Social Support. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 24(5) :1271-1284. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-014-9935-2>
  76. Trenor, J. M., Yu, S. L., Waight, C. L., & Zerda, K. S. 2008 Influences for selecting engineering: Insights on access to Social Capital from Two Case Studies. In *Proceedings - Frontiers in Education Conference, FIE* pp: 1-6). <http://doi.org/10.1109/FIE.2008.4720259>
  77. Turner, E. a., Chandler, M., & Heffer, R. W. 2009 The Influence of Parenting Styles, Achievement Motivation, and Self-Efficacy on Academic Performance in College Student's. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(3) :337-346. <http://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0073>
  78. Vanessa Kahen Johnson, Susan E. Gans, Sandra Kerr, & William LaValle. 2010. Managing the Transition to College: Family Functioning, Emotion Coping, and Adjustment in Emerging Adulthood. *Journal of College Student Development*, 51(6), 607-621. <http://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2010.0022>
  79. Vellymalay, S. K. N. 2012. The Impact of Parent ' s Socioeconomic Status on Parental Involvement at Home : A Case Study on High Achievement Indian Student's of a Tamil School in. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 2(8) : 11-25.
  80. Walpole, M. 2008 Emerging from the pipeline: African American student's, socioeconomic status, and college experiences and outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, 49(3) : 237-255. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-007-9079-y>
  81. Wiseman, H., Mayseless, O., & Sharabany, R. 2006. Why are they lonely? Perceived quality of early relationships with parents, attachment, personality predispositions and loneliness in first-year university student's. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40(2) : 237-248. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.05.015>
  82. Wolniak, G. C., Wells, R. S., Engberg, M. E., & Manly, C. A. 2016. College Enhancement Strategies and Socioeconomic Inequality. *Research in Higher Education*, 57(3) : 310-334. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-015-9389-4>
  83. Zammit, K. P. 2011 Connecting multiliteracies and engagement of student's from low socio-economic backgrounds: using Bernstein's pedagogic discourse as a bridge. *Language and Education*, 25(3) : 203-220. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2011.560945>