Reverence of Occupational Involvement by Parent – The Father’s Employment on Student’s Adaptability at Campus
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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.
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Introduction: - Economic crisis impacts educational system (Serban-Oprescu, Horobeţ, & Ţerban-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 (Ganjeboom, 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 (Ehler,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 (Ervästi, 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 afluffence being significant predictors of career indecision (Stârică, 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:** - Maturational 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 Luycx, 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 & Dougny, 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 (Gerustad & 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 permisssible 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, Enberg, & Manly, 2016).

The study proposes the following research hypothesis: -

H₀: -Campus adaptations of academic, social, physical – psychological and institutional environments do not vary among undergraduate student’s by their father’s level of employment

H₁: - 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Pearson Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Physical – Psychological Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Institutional Adaptation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: - n = 1420. Correlations greater than 0.05 are statistically significant (p < 0.5)

Source: - output data of SPSS 21 version

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: -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Distribution of difference in dimensions of campus adaptations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Level of Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed at Government (n = 676)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed at Private (n = 276)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own a Business (n = 306)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed as unskilled Labourer (n = 38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer (n = 45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired from Government service or Pensioner (n = 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Alive (n = 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed (n = 41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n = 1420)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 (Λ = 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 (Θ = 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 dependent 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's 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 and 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.
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