SOCIAL ADAPTATION AT CAMPUS ENVIRONMENTS
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ABSTRACT

The life sustaining process of a student is often dynamic and ongoing one at campuses. Social adaptation stimulates an unseen optimal level of functioning among students who be together as individuals and social groups with an ability to live with social restrictions and cultural demands. Thus, students own perspective of socialising is like gaining a social status for his or herself through social interaction, way by succeeding multiple social adjustments towards social adaptation.

Keywords: Social adaptation, Social adjustment, Campus environment, Student

Introduction

Social Adjustment versus Social Adaptation

Social Adjustment

Social adjustment acts as predictors of values and academic achievement (Elhassan & Hassan, 2015). As student’s experiences vary in socio-cultural context of adjustment (McGarvey et al., 2015) the social competence, perceived usefulness and use patterns of social networking sites like facebook impact college students adjustment (Yang & Brown, 2015). Moreover, with cultural background determining social adjustment dilemmas of students at college (McGarvey et al., 2015) with diverse cultures determine social life in higher education persuading college adjustment of peer interaction especially among first generation college students of minority race (Burgos-Cienfuegos et al.,2015). Thus social life adjustment impacts academic life achievement (Iyamu, 2012) as it only “a sense of belonging” at institutions that successfully aids towards adjusting to college life for undergraduate students (Massi et al., 2012).

Social Adaptation
Adaptation to minority status at campus impacts success of students on campus (Ogbu, 1992) with campus climate determining all forms of campus adaptations especially among students of minority race (Hurtado et al., 1996).

**Structural Components of Social Adaptation**

**Age**

Tremendous developmental changes in the social, biological, and cognitive domains are characterised at adolescent age-period as it’s a time of critical transitions in education and learning of a students life (Oberle et al., 2010). It is in age of 18 – 24 that students establish autonomy from parents (Klima et al., 2014) where students become more selective about the relationships that they maintain (Swenson et al., 2008) vindictive that cross-sectional age peers have higher social competence than same age peers (Cowan, 2011). Thus discrimination at campus could also exist on grounds of age (Thornton et al., 2016) though vehemently age is a part of the social hierarchy (Nakassis, 2013) influencing the socialisation process (Panizzon & Levins, 1997) responsible for bringing about the social change in society (Francis, 1999).

**Gender**

The intra-household educational expenditure varies by gender (Azam, 2011) penetrating that the natural landscape or terrain impacting gendered construction or construction of feminine gender roles in India (Datta, 2011). The transition of women students from higher education to industry is poisoned chalice - with short-term benefits only (Powell et al., 2011) as socialisation process of engineering students differ by gender (Riney & Froeschie, 2012) and attachment styles scores differ in terms of gender and presence or absence of a romantic relationship in the past and their settlement (Tagay & Karatas, 2012). Social experiences differed among undergraduates on manhood and masculinity identities (Strayhorn & Tillman-Kelly, 2013) revering benevolent sexism with men’s advantage on the prescription of warmth to women (Delacollette et al., 2013). In short females in science are affected by underlying gendered assumptions and structural power relationships (Watts, 2014).

**Disability**

Social adjustment influences motivation of disabled students to their level of social alienation and perceived competence (Wiseman et al., 1988). Negative stereotypes still mark the social representation of disability in society (Cambra, 1996) with disability being socially constructed to see’ students with different eyes on new pathways to personalise assessment, learning on curriculum, assessment, and pedagogy (Moore et al., 2008). Disabled student experiences of college varied by race were among disabled students educational satisfaction was negatively associated with the perception of discrimination and racial conflict (Parasnis & Fischer, 2005).
Further on social ties, families of disabled students impacted their college adjustment (Smith et al., 1998) with parental care positively impacting disabled students to view disability not more as a differential factor (Raya et al., 2013) followed by peer acceptance vehemently impacting inclusion of students with disabilities (Adibsereshki & Salehpour, 2014) without which risk of isolation would soar high especially among first generation disabled college students (Murray et al., 2013). As an extended note on social ties, students who stutter avoid communication and social interactions on campus form an undisclosed invisible disability (Meredith & Packman, 2015).

It is also vital to change the attitudes of faculty and student academic staff towards disabled students (Junco & Salter, 2004) where university staff must have adequate awareness on disabilities of students studying in post-secondary educational institutions (Padden & Ellis, 2015). After all an institute needs to showcase its cultural policy that impacts inclusion, exclusion, and diversity (Gilson & DePoy, 2011). Thus two types of social support (total support and satisfaction with support) had positive effects on the post-secondary adjustment of college students with disabilities (Murray et al., 2013).

**Academic Year**

Social factors impact adjustment among first-year students (Salami, 2011). The advice-seeking behavior among first-year engineering students impacts retention (Groll, 2011) influencing identity development especially of first year engineering students (Louis & Matusovich, 2011). This also positively influences learning communities on first-year students growth and development in college (Rocconi, 2011). Further vehicle ownership affects time utilization on the study, leisure, social activities, and academic performance of first year engineering students at rural institutions (Limanond et al., 2011).

Social engagement has an effect on learning at four-year institution (Sinanan, 2012). Social and cultural capital differences impacts students expectations of achievement on their performance and learning in the first year (Dukhan et al., 2012). The social adjustment problems seemed greater than education and psychological adjustment problem among first-year college students (Jemal, 2012) where female first-year students academic experience (Joyce & Hopkins, 2012) especially of engineering impact next year recruitment (Lehr et al., 2012). Social achievement goals for social behaviors also have a bearing adjustment in the first semester among the first year at college (Shim & Ryan, 2012). Academic advising improves the success of first-year students (Abdykhalykova, 2013) as mentoring and counseling facilitates the cultural and educational transition of first-year students (Sinacore & Lerner, 2013). This boosts academic persistence that differs among ethnic students of first-year students (Rigali-Oiler & Kurpius, 2013) especially among poor, minority and rural female students who are systematically
underrepresented in four-year institutions (Xiaobing Wang et al., 2013). Hence socio-demographics impacts the academic performance of first-year students (Deliens et al., 2013) with demographic and socio-economic contextual factors as predictors in first-year educational attainment (Mcmanus et al., 2013). Social engagement impacts students engagement and baccalaureate attainment of college students in four-year institutions (Flynn, 2014). The effect of perceived social support by peer than family support in first academic year of student adjustment (Páramo et al., 2014) indicates that demographic variables (Adeniyi et al., 2014) which are a part of students cultural background (Burgess et al., 2014) can be set off as structural diversity facilitating interracial friendships across college years (Martin et al., 2014).

**Academic Major**

Stratification in higher education results in social inequality (Triventi, 2013). Social and individual factors influence academic major choice at the institution (Hervás et al., 2013) with college students drawn from higher castes classes and of urban background were found in advanced academic major courses (Astagi, 2013). Thereby social influence and occupational knowledge are predictors of career choice among undergraduates (Amani, 2013). Social support also has a bearing on students perceived abilities and attitudes toward math and science academic majors (Rice et al., 2013) with social cognitive predictors of adjustment to engineering academic majors also varying by ethnicity (Lent et al., 2013). Stereotypical segregation of occupation exists (Kulkarni & Hatekar, 2013) with more observant occupational structure intruding socio-economic development (Anikin, 2013). This calls for students supports in academic major programs for development (Bettinger et al., 2013).

Lastly, though students positions of social interaction in small group discussions impact competency in students academic major (Due, 2014) the choice of academic major impacts the academic pipeline and creates earnings gap especially among students of minor race. Thus there exists a need to choose academic majors wisely (Alon, 2015). Solo status of being a single woman in academic major and body image status impacted women’s academic performance (Kiefer et al., 2006). It is observed that demographic group representations in technical occupations at societal level have significant positive influence on choosing corresponding college major fields (Ma, 2011a) with nutrition and physical activity programs impacts diverse nature of students in adopting academic major programs (Quintiliani et al., 2011). The less indicative are person variables in higher education to influence academic college major choice (Germeijs et al., 2012).

**Religion**

Religious socialisation has positive implication on adjustment among youths (Jackson et al., 2001) where religion and region impact women’s autonomy (Jejeebhoy & Sathar, 2001) with
vehemently noticed religious commitment higher in men than women (Schludermann et al., 2001). This was particularly observed in campus experience that varied by religious origin especially of minority religion like Muslims (Peek, 2003) who have been easily adhered to dress code impacting college adjustment (Rangoonwala et al., 2011).

Spirituality and religion are social indicators of university students (Yiengprugsawan et al., 2012). Contradiction and conflict between ‘leading identities’ of becoming an engineer versus becoming a ‘good muslim woman is always counter backed religion (Black & Williams, 2013). Differentiation of self-impacted relationships between spiritual well-being and both social justice commitment has intercultural competence (Sandage & Jankowski, 2013) with religion influencing social relation and lifestyle of people (Baloch et al., 2014) and spirituality enhancing nurturing and caring (Yilmaz & Gurler, 2014). Among college students’ everyday theologies, personal religious beliefs that emerge through individuals’ lived experiences and social interactions had the influence of attitudes than religion (Walls et al., 2014). Communication and interaction patterns impact student spiritual identity formation among students over four-year period in undergraduate community institutions (Forward et al., 2014) as some observe that religion hampers students entrance and progress in education with slow growth and low level of attainment (Rissler et al., 2014) with an off late player of academic staff at campus also witnessing spiritual intelligence on job burnout at campus (Karampoor & Beig, 2015).

Religious and non-religious activity engagement as an emotional regulation acts as assets in promoting social ties throughout university (Semplonius et al., 2015), especially where social life and identity of women on campus varied by religion (Pschaida, 2015). In short, spiritual quality of life and spiritual coping is impacted by spirituality, religiousness and personal beliefs module (Krägeloh et al., 2015) with spirituality increasing and religiosity decreasing at college and it varied by culture of students of minority race (Nunez & Foubert, 2015) having a positive bearing on underrepresented students in higher education (Hicks, 2016).

Caste

Racial identity impacts academic performance of students (Stewart, 2014). The autonomy and engagement that authenticates women of colour of race (Rose et al., 2014) into personal and contextual variables related hopes to work among undergraduate students from underrepresented backgrounds (Thompson et al., 2014). Interracial friendship impacts self-segregation (Kim et al., 2014) moulding interpersonal climate of learning among students of race (Lundberg, 2014) with student organisations or clubs facilitating interracial climate on campus (Park, 2014). Learning communities determine goal development among students of minority race (Lorch, 2014) where often being a language minority student impacts language proficiency (Hwang et al., 2014). Further college should have a culturally responsive approach to attract college pathways for
students of minority race or colour (Welton & Martinez, 2014) as social class shapes selves fuelling inequality (Stephens et al., 2014) with race masculinity impacting experiences of students on campus (Sweeney, 2014).

Racial socialisation or inter group interaction impacts academic motivation (Byrd, 2015) where cross-racial interaction, close interracial friendship impact college student outcomes (Bowman & Park, 2015). The awareness of social inequities and enactments of diversity can function as catalysts for campus cross-racial interaction (Sulé, 2015) with bilingual students sociocultural learning and cultural assets at institutions determining student success of race (Borrero, 2015). The cultural factors predict academic motivation among students of race (Piña-Watson et al., 2015) significantly highlighting that diverse cultures can impact their social life in higher education and college adjustment peer relation impact first generation college students of minority race (Burgos-Cienfuegos et al., 2015). Thus social and ethnic origin breeds educational inequalities (Grigoras, 2015) while social class explains students mobility (Yarnold, 2015) with time and money explaining social class differences in students social integration at university (Rubin & Wright, 2015) among visibility of minority groups of race (Henry, 2015).

Generation Status

Socialisation experiences varied by the generation of students (Shields, 2002). First generation students social transition in higher education (Inkelas et al., 2007) reflect that the invisible barriers are real for first generation college students (Gardner & Holley, 2011) indicating that the invisible hand of social capital impacts first generation college students in engineering (Martin, 2015) with first generation college students access to engineering social capital aiming towards developing a richer understanding of the same (Pfirman et al., 2014). The social perspective seems incomplete without the cultural introspective where language difficulties are challenges first generation students witness at campuses (Hailu & Ku, 2014) especially among first year first generation students academic success where language holds the key at the distant place (Amelink, 2005). The association of students with cultural norms, where following independent cultural norms results in negative emotions with cultural mismatch among first generation college students (Stephens et al., 2012). Culture acts as a source of support among students of minority race among first and second generation college students (Kouyoumdjian et al., 2015) and second generation students quality of integration process in institutions depends on heritage and culture with identity and group dimensions (Damigella et al., 2016). The lack of culture awareness is next best challenges first generation students face (Hailu & Ku, 2014). However, the cultural capital impacts academic achievement of first generation students (Paul Grayson, 2011) and the cultural shifts impacts positive self-evaluation by generations (Twenge et al., 2012). Lastly, the touch of spirituality combats loneliness and homelessness which is higher among first generation students than non-first generation students (Ferrari et al., 2015). In brief,
socialisation of first generation students of engineering impact nurturing next generation students in an academic discipline (Szelenyi, 2013).

**College Expense**

The evaluation of college education on earnings and productivity is usually made by comparing private gains and social gains from a college education (Becker, 1975). The high school grades are said to predict career plans which vary by students of low socioeconomic status and race in terms of paying towards college expense (Rosenbaum, 1998). Therefore person factors (interest) contextual factors (financial aid and social support) determines career choice among students (Lent et al., 2002) with gender bias in resource allocation in Indian household especially towards education expenditure of girls being observed (Jose, 2003). Further scholarship incentive influences minority students enrollment in college (Bergin et al., 2007) as college financing negotiating family support and responsibility, and campus racial dynamics perceived and behavioral affect student adjustment with a sense of integration (Hurtado et al., 2007). It is thus the ethical dilemmas in individual and collective rights-based approaches to tertiary education scholarship (Lehr, 2008) reflecting family and institutions personnel dominance on students willingness to borrow loans to pay institutional fee price (Perna, 2008). A glommed picture emerges in this regard where much noticeably household expenditure on education in India depends on returns to education in terms of employment and academic major (Fang & Mohnen, 2008) and uneven childhood investment in education impacts skills formation in the later stage of one’s career (Esping-Andersen, 2008). Hence engineering education is a debt trap for poor students (Venkataraman, 2009). Social differences in the students concern for the student loan repayment persists (Opheim, 2011) where gender ethnicity and work experience impacts college students debt experience (Wang, 2011). Increasing access to engineering education for economically disadvantaged students by financial aid and mentoring (Wilson et al., 2012) could be meted out by feminist scholarship in engineering education which owes to its own challenges and tensions (Beddoes, 2012). However parents socio economic status is related to students loan debt (Houle, 2013) which varies on repayment rates among minority students of race (Belfield, 2013) influencing students attainment (Gross et al., 2013). The negative trends with respect to financial resources on institutional priorities also influence minority race students participation in engineering education (Rotberg, 2013). In India by tackling social exclusion and marginality, it is only poverty reduction on higher education experiences that could be counted on (Thorat, 2014). In short, life course resources impacts minority students educational aspirations (Paat, 2015) where as a solution college personal finance courses may serve as positive inputs for financial socialization among young adults regardless of their demographic backgrounds (Mimura, Koonce, Plunkett, & Pleskus, 2015).
Socio-Economic Status of the Family by Parent’s Education, Occupation and Income

Social support for long has proved to impact students’ individual college adjustment (Lipschitz-Elhawi & Itzhaky, 2005) with parental attachment with separation-individuation influencing college students’ adjustment (Mattanah et al., 2004). The impact of socio-economic status on family functioning (Tiffin et al., 2007) makes parenting belief on adjustment differ by race on college students (Farver et al., 2007). The gender difference too found to have inflicted on leaving parental home for higher education (Blaauboer & Mulder, 2010) making social capital via social network formation (Brooks et al., 2011) rely on subjective expectations that parents have about the costs and returns to education differing by region, gender and caste (Maertens, 2011).

Further social returns exceed economic returns in higher education (Hout, 2012) but still one finds gender difference existing in parental investment in children’s education as it a determinant of future earnings and composition of labour market and human capital (Yamauchi & Tiongco, 2013). In brief, family structure impacts attachment in college student (Gourneau et al., 2013) with working-class students experiencing a lower sense of belonging, perceive a less welcoming campus climate, and pursue fewer courses (Soria & Bultmann, 2014) contributing to mother’s belief about children’s education and socialisation differ by gender and social class (Yamamoto, 2015).

A Conceptual framework on Social Adaptation derived from multiple Social Adjustment in Social Environment

From the conceptual framework above it is evident that social change affects important aspects of life over comparatively short periods of time and that such changes differ by structural component of students by age, gender etc stated above. Thus, in such a scenario, social adaptation becomes increasingly significant.
Conclusion

Socialisation is a process. It’s a day to day phenomenon differing in its own pace among students. Some socialise soon, some later over a period of time but the environment to which the undergraduate student is pressed to undergo could make a student a better person towards an individual social student or ascertain ones’ perceptions of persistence at the campus. It's consistency in socialisation that could enshrine forming the base for maturity in a student. In short, students are unique individuals in themselves who bring their unique selves into any social interaction. The process of socialization does not come from norms, rituals, routines, and rules as it is based solely on interaction. These experiences might be the most challenging because you might find that the social rules change depending on the people, time and place.
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