



**LEVEL OF ADJUSTMENT AMONG 1ST YEAR COLLEGE STUDENTS IN
RELATION TO SELF EFFICACY**

Ms. Moomin Jan

Research Scholar, Faculty of Education, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, J&K

Abstract

The present study seeks to see the relationship of level of adjustment on self-efficacy with respect to their domicile and gender. For the present study purposive sampling method was used. For the present study the target group was 1st year college students, chosen from different government colleges in Kashmir valley. From the total, 120 number of college students, 60 Rural. (30 male, 30 female) and 60 Urban (30 male, 30 female) were selected by purposive sampling technique. In order to measure the level of adjustment and self-efficacy among the 1st year college going students Menezzel, A., (1999) Adjustment to College Scale (ATCS) and Self Efficacy Scale developed by Prothrow Stith (1987) were administered. The findings of the study revealed that there is no significant difference in level of adjustment between rural and urban college students and also shows that significant difference was found between rural and urban students on their self-efficacy.

Keywords: College Students, Adjustment, Self-efficacy, Rural, Urban\



[Scholarly Research Journal's is licensed Based on a work at www.srjis.com](http://www.srjis.com)

Introduction

College life is not an easy journey. College students face different challenges in their life. Aside from their academic requirements, they also have different responsibilities brought about by their different life roles. Young adults experience many changes in all aspects of

their lives. Adolescence is the transition stage from childhood to adulthood and this is the period of life characterized by a barrage of challenges. Moreover, it is the transition or adjustment period to adulthood when ethical values acquired in childhood are compared with the set of values gained as they were growing (Ozbay, 1997). Given that adolescence is the time of change that is exemplified by increased levels of personal searching (Jessor, Donovan, & Costa, 1991) and taking on of more mature life roles (Erikson, 1968), it is important for adolescents to have increased belief in their capacity to control one's environment or self-efficacy since this would pave the way for carrying out task with confidence and belief in oneself which would tend to lead to improved subjective wellbeing. This is an important stage in these young adults' life since they are about to experience career exploration in preparation for their graduating year.

Adjustment to college life can be defined as making a successful transition to a new learning and social environment that can be characterized as taking advantage of available resources and may require letting go of past attitudes, values, and behaviors and learning new ones in their place. Adjustment to college life can also be defined as successful negotiation of various obstacles commonly faced by college students while utilizing available resources. College education is filled with social, academic, and emotional stressors. In spite of that, a majority of students find ways to cope with adversity and achieve their academic goals. At the same time, a large portion of the undergraduate student body seems to be significantly less successful at attaining their educational goals with about 40% of entire college student population never receiving their diplomas. At the graduate level, only about one half of enrolled students will actually complete their studies leading to obtaining a Ph.D. and an estimated one third will not survive the first year of graduate school (Bowen & Rudenstine, 1992; Golde, 1996). This situation has many negative implications. For example, universities lose money in unrealized tuition, fees, and alumni contributions. The decision to leave early has also far reaching detrimental consequences for the college dropouts, putting them in an inferior position on the job market (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1989).

Self-efficacy have been shown to play a pivotal role in protecting children and adolescents in counteracting depressive states (Bandura, Pastorell, Barbaranelli and Caprara, 1999).

Perceived self-efficacy is concerned with people's beliefs in their capabilities to produce given attainments (Bandura, 1997). One cannot be all things, which would require mastery of every realm of human life. People differ in the areas in which they cultivate their efficacy and in the levels to which they develop it even within their given pursuits. For example, a business executive may have a high sense of organizational efficacy but low parenting

efficacy. Thus, the efficacy belief system is not a global trait but a differentiated set of self-beliefs linked to distinct realms of functioning. Multidomain measures reveal the patterning and degree of generality of people's sense of personal efficacy. There is no all-purpose measure of perceived self-efficacy. The "one measure fits all" approach usually has limited explanatory and predictive value because most of the items in an all-purpose test may have little or no relevance to the domain of functioning. Moreover, in an effort to serve all purposes, items in such a measure are usually cast in general terms divorced from the situational demands and circumstances. This leaves much ambiguity about exactly what is being measured or the level of task and situational demands that must be managed. Scales of perceived self efficacy must be tailored to the particular domain of functioning that is the object of interest. Although efficacy beliefs are multifaceted, social cognitive theory identifies several conditions under which they may co-vary even across distinct domains of functioning (Bandura, 1997).

The relationship between self-efficacy and adjustment has also been examined in international settings and with samples of international students. Harrison et al. (1996) looked at American military professionals residing in Europe and found that individuals high in self-efficacy experienced greater level of cultural adjustment than those low in self-efficacy. They found that expatriates high in self-efficacy were better adjusted to their general environment than those low in self-efficacy. Studies involving samples consisting of international students also confirmed those results. Hirose, Wada, and Watanabe (1999) found a positive relationship between self-efficacy and career adjustment among part-time employed Japanese college students while Leung and Berry (2001) found that international students enrolled at a Canadian university reported lower self-efficacy as compared to Canadians or even second generation migrants and that lower self-efficacy correlated with more adjustment problems.

Objectives

The following objectives were formulated for the present study:

1. To study the level of adjustment among 1st year college students with respect to domicile.
2. To study the self-efficacy among 1st year college students with respect to domicile.
3. To compare the level of adjustment among 1st year college students with respect to domicile.
4. To compare the self-efficacy among 1st year college students with respect to domicile.
5. To find out the relationship between adjustment and self-efficacy with respect to domicile.\

Hyphotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated for the present study:

Ho1: There will be no significant difference in level of adjustment among 1st year college students with respect to domicile

Ho2 There will be no significant difference in self-efficacy among 1st year college students with respect to domicile.

Ho3: There is significant correlation between adjustment and self-efficacy with respect to domicile.

Sample for the study:

The sample for the present study consists of 120 1st year college students in which 60 were rural students and 60 were urban students. Further the sample comprised 30 male rural, 30 female rural and 30 male urban and 30 female urban) were selected by purposive sampling technique.

Tools:

1. Menezzel, A., (1999) Adjustment to College Scale (ATCS)
2. Self Efficacy Scale developed by Prothrow Stith (1987)

Results And Discussion

Table 1: Frequency distribution of level of adjustment among 1st year college students with respect to domicile

Levels	Rural Students		Urban Students	
	N	Percentage	N	Percentage
High	19	31.67	17	28.33
Moderate	32	53.33	33	55.00
low	9	15.00	10	16.67
N=120	N=60		N=60	

From the above data it is clear that 31.67% of rural 1st year college students in the high level of adjustment and 28.33% urban students fall in high level of adjustment. 53.33% rural students and 55.00% urban students have moderate level of adjustment and only 15% rural students and 16.67% urban students have low level of adjustment.

Table 2: Frequency distribution of level of self-efficacy among 1st year college students with respect to domicile

Levels	Rural Students		Urban Students	
	N	Percentage	N	Percentage

Strongly agree	7	11.67	6	10.00
disagree	15	25.00	12	20.00
agree	32	53.33	35	58.33
Strongly agree	6	10.00	7	11.67
N=120	N=60		N=60	

It is clear from the above table that 11.67% rural students and 10.00% urban 1st year college students have strongly agree on their self-efficacy level, 25% rural students and 20% urban students have disagree on levels of self-efficacy scale, 53.33% rural students and 58.33% urban students agree on their level of self-efficacy and only 10% rural students and 11.67% urban students have strongly agree on their levels of self-efficacy.

Table 3: Mean Comparison of level of adjustment among 1st year college students with respect to their domicile

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	St. Deviation	Df	t-value
Adjustment	Rural	60	31.02	7.296	118	0.308 ^{NS}
	Urban	60	30.22	6.302		
Total (N) =120						

The above table shows the mean comparison between rural and urban college students on their level of adjustment. The table shows that there is no significant difference in level of adjustment between rural and urban college students. Therefore, our Hypothesis **Ho₁** (There will be no significant difference in level of adjustment among 1st year college students with respect to domicile) is accepted.

Table 4: Mean Comparison of self-efficacy among 1st year college students with respect to their domicile

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	St. Deviation	Df	t-value
Self- efficacy	Rural	60	24.01	3.92	118	6.63 ^{NS}
	Urban	60	23.36	3.58		
Total (N) =120						

The above table shows the mean comparison between rural and urban college students on self-efficacy. The table shows that there is a significant difference in self-efficacy between rural and urban college students. Therefore, our Hypothesis **H₀₂** (There will be no significant difference in self-efficacy among 1st year college students with respect to domicile) is rejected.

Table 5: Correlation coefficient between level of adjustment and self-efficacy among 1st year college students with respect to domicile

	Self-efficacy	p
Adjustment	.37*	.012

*p<0.05 level of significance

The above table shows Pearson Correlation Coefficients for level of adjustment and self-efficacy with respect to domicile. Ranging from (r=0.37, p=0.12) the correlation are significant. It is evident from the table that adjustment with respect to domicile is positively correlated with self-efficacy. Thus our hypotheses (**H₀₃**) which states that “there is significant correlation between adjustment and self-efficacy with respect to domicile” and

Conclusion

The findings thus obtained from the present study reveal that 31.67% of rural 1st year college students in the high level of adjustment and 28.33% urban students fall in high level of adjustment. 53.33% rural students and 55.00% urban students have moderate level of adjustment and only 15% rural students and 16.67% urban students have low level of adjustment.

The findings of the analysis revealed that 11.67% rural students and 10.00% urban 1st year college students have strongly agree on their self-efficacy level, 25% rural students and 20% urban students have disagree on levels of self-efficacy scale, 53.33% rural students and 58.33% urban students agree on their level of self-efficacy and only 10% rural students and 11.67% urban students have strongly agree on their levels of self-efficacy.

On mean comparison between rural and urban college students on their level of adjustment. The table shows that there is no significant difference in level of adjustment between rural and urban college students. On mean comparison between male and female college students on their level of adjustment. The table shows that there is a significant difference in level of adjustment between male and female college students. On mean comparison between rural and urban college students on self-efficacy. The table shows that there is a significant difference in self-efficacy between rural and urban college students.

It was found that the adjustment with respect to domicile is positively correlated with self-efficacy. It was found that the adjustment with respect to gender is positively correlated with self-efficacy.

References

- Al-amayra, H. (1988). Adaptation problems among new students in Yarmouk University. Unpublished Master thesis, Yarmouk University. Irbid.
- Bandura, A. (1995). Exercise of personal and collective efficacy in changing societies. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-efficacy in changing societies* (pp. 1-45). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Barker, S.(2004). Intrinsic, Extrinsic, and Motivational Orientation: the Role of University Adjustment Stress, Well Being, and Subsequence A academic Performance. *Current Psychology* , 23 (3): 189-202.
- Baron, M. (ed.). (1975). *Advising, counseling, and helping the foreign student*. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.
- Chen, C. P. (1999). Common stressors among international college students: Research and counseling implications. *Journal of College Counseling*, 2, 49-65. Church, A. T. (1982). Sojourners Adjustment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 91, 540-72.
- Clark, J. M., & Halern, D. E. (1993). The million dollar question: Can an intensive learning experience help lower-quartile students succeed in college? *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 20(1), 29-39.
- Coffman, D. L., & Gilligan, T. D. (2003). Social support, stress, and self-efficacy: Effects of students' satisfaction. *College Student Retention*, 4(1), 53-66.
- Craig, B. L. (1981). Variations and themes in international education. *Educational Record*, 62, 41-46.
- Crawford, J. (2000). *At war with diversity: U.S. language policy in an age of anxiety*. New York: Multilingual Matters.
- Dhkan, N., & Al-hajar, B. (2006). Psychological pressure among Islamic university students anits relation to hardness. *Islamic University Journal*, 14(2): 6-89.
- Grayson, J(2003). The Consequences of Early Adjustment to University. *Higher Education*, 64, (4) : 411-429.
- Gudykunst, W. (Eds.). (1988). *Cross-cultural adaptation: Current approaches*, 11. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Heikenheimo, P. S., & Shute, J. C. M. (1986). The adaptation of foreign students: Student views and institutional implications. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 27, 399-406.
- Kitsantas, A. (2004). Studying abroad: The role of college students' goals on the development of cross-cultural skills and global understanding. *College Students Journal*, 38(3), 441-452.
- Klineberg, O., & Hull, W. (1979). *At a foreign university: An international study of adaptation and coping*. New York: Praeger.
- Kobrin, S. J. (1984). *International expertise in American business*. New York, NY: Institute of International Education.
- Leel, M. (1993). A study for variables related to adjustment with university society among king Faisal male and female students. *Arabic Educational Journal*, 13(1): 2-32.
- Marshall, J. (1981). Making sense as a personal process. In P. Reason & J. Rowan (Eds.), *Human inquiry* (pp. 395-399). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (1997). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction*. New York, Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers Inc.
- Saldern, M.(1992). *Social Climate in the Classroom: Theoretical and Methodological Aspects*. NY: Waxmann studies. Sufian, N. (2004). *Introduction in Personality and Counseling*, Taz: Faculty of Education.