



## IMPACTS OF STUDENTS' INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP ON THEIR ADJUSTMENT AT UNIVERSITY

\*Sunbal Younis, \*\*Dr. Muhammad Aamir Hashmi

\*M. Phil Scholar, Superior University, Lahore

\*\*Associate Professor, Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore

### ABSTRACT

*The primary purpose of this research is to ascertain how students think about their adjustment in university and interpersonal relations. The study was statistically quantitative and a survey was used. A total of 300 students a public university was included in the sample and analysis. The research sample was selected at random. A total of 300 students were included in the sample. Questionnaire was used. Each quiz has a five-point Likert scale. The first section of the questionnaire covered basic demographic information. Expert review and preliminary testing of the instrument confirmed its validity and reliability in local context. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyse the data. To get a sense of the distribution of students across a demographic variable, we used mean and standard deviation calculations from descriptive statistics. Independent sample t-tests and One-Way ANOVA (analysis of variance) of differences, and pearson r used for inferential statistics. The results showed that the mean scores of students' adjustment in university is higher than interpersonal relations, as well as there was no significant relation was existed on the basis of this study between interpersonal relations and adjustment in university.*

**Keywords:** University Adjustment, Psychological Health, Academic Success

### Introduction

Many students find it challenging to make the jump from university to university because of the significant lifestyle changes and the capacity to adapt to a wide variety of new expectations that come with the transfer (Ramos & Nichols, 2007). There is more and more evidence that a student's ability to adjust to university life may affect not only their mental health but also their academic performance and whether or not they stay in the major they signed up for.

Much attention and study have lately been devoted to the issue of transitioning to university (Mackie, 2001). This is because schools genuinely care about their kids and want them to do well. There has been a lot of research into the factors that aid or hinder students' ability to adjust; the types of students who are more likely to have trouble adjusting; how students' adjustment



levels change over time; and how adjustment relates to students' academic success (Kalsner, 1991). An important part of this line of inquiry (Abramson & Jones, 2003) is figuring out how the results of this kind of study can be used by teachers and university leaders to improve the education of students.

Research on the predictors of university adjustment shows that studies that focus on demographic characteristics often provide conflicting and ambiguous results, suggesting that these factors have complicated associations that alter depending on the samples and contexts analysed (Larose & Boivin, 1998). However, when studies on the impact of psychological and interpersonal elements are examined, some consistency is seen (Zeidner et al., 2005). Specifically, higher levels of good psychological and interpersonal functioning are linked to a smoother adjustment to university life. For this reason, it is important to take into account a person's psychological resilience and their capacity to sustain positive social interactions when they make the move to higher education. But if students don't have these traits, it's a sign that they might not do well in school.

Findings from studies that have looked at long-term changes in university students' adjustment levels have usually shown that adjustment levels can fluctuate. While variations are universal, their precise shape might shift significantly from one study to the next. This is likely due to the fact that there are substantial differences between research in terms of sampling (for institutions, courses, and participants), the time period being explored, and how adjustment is being operationalized. There is also data to suggest that student characteristics influence adjustment patterns both longitudinally and cross-sectionally (Jackson et al., 2000). Therefore, the introduction of this new component contributes to the confounding impact, making the identification of a "normal" adjustment trajectory highly improbable. There is also the possibility that many of the factors associated with adjustment in cross-sectional studies might serve as predictors of adjustment patterns across time. They are known as "psychological strength" variables.

Adjustment and its relationship to important outcomes like academic success and student retention have been the topic of both theoretical and empirical studies. There is evidence that demonstrates a connection between a student's level of adjustment and their academic success,



and several empirical studies have provided support for this connection. Many important models of student retention (Trotter & Cove, 2005) centre on the idea of "integration," which bears obvious similarities to that of "adjustment," and some of these studies have also yielded evidence for correlations between adjustment and academic achievement (Pascarella, & Terenzini, 2005). Some people have questioned whether the theoretical models can be used with non-traditional students and institutions. However, research has shown that the links between adjustment and success criteria are weak or nonexistent (Baker, 2004).

It's also worth noting that most studies on adjustment have been carried out in either the United States or Australia, with just a small fraction of similar data coming from the United Kingdom. Much of the research in this area is also a little stale at this time. Given the global disparities in educational systems and the recent trend away from an exclusive toward a more generalised higher education system, these are very important things to think about. The latter has led to a drastically diverse student population in addition to a substantial increase in the overall number of pupils. As a result, many students are unprepared for the rigours of higher education and are thus at a higher risk of failing to complete their degrees. This makes us want to find out how at-risk students can be found and helped more effectively, as well as how our original research in Pakistan can be updated to reflect the current situation there.

### **Measuring University Adjustment**

Due of the topic's importance, a great deal of research has been done on university adjustment. Both educators and researchers are interested in finding out more about the variables at work and the possibilities for enhancing students' educational experiences. On the other hand, there have been significant differences in how the notion has been defined and operationalized throughout the literature. While some studies have concentrated on certain aspects of the previously described problems, others have employed a single object to measure the entire construct. One study using a single-item measure of adjustment is examination of the variables influencing university adjustment (Lidy, & Kahn, 2006). On a scale ranging from 1 (extremely poor) to 5 (very well) (outstanding), participants scored their own "adjustment to university". Among its many benefits, this method's ease of implementation and reduced workload for participants are noteworthy. But there have been concerns expressed regarding this type of test's psychometric



validity (Baker, 2004). Concerns exist over the method's ability to convey the idea's intricacy as well as the likelihood that various people will interpret the inquiry in the same manner.

The University Adaptation Questionnaire is applied in a substantially higher capacity in European contexts (CAQ; Van Rooijen, 1986). This 18-item scale provides a quick, one-dimensional snapshot of how well a student is adjusting to university life. There are questions about a variety of aspects of adjusting to university life, but the primary emphasis seems to be on the student's level of contentment with their chosen school. The ACTA created this measurement tool (ACTA). Even though this seems to be a bias, Ashkanasy and Dasborough, (2003) found that there are still strong links between the measurement and the SACQ scores.

In conclusion, studies have looked at how university freshmen adapt to their new environment via qualitative techniques including interviews, focus groups, and diary keeping (Ruthig, et al., 2008). These types of research into readjustment are more free-form than quantitative methods, and as a result, they have the potential to yield data that is deeper and more illuminating. Also, keep in mind that there will be more opportunities for hidden issues to surface. In conclusion, several tools and indicators have been used to assess readjustment to university.

### **Research Questions**

1. How do the students' of perceive about university adjustment?
2. How well have students adjusted to their university life??
3. What is the level of students' interpersonal relations at university?
4. What is difference of Students' opinion about university adjustment on the basis of CGPA?

### **Research Methodology**

This was a purely quantitative study inspired by positivism. The study employed a correlational research strategy. The population of the study consisted of Lahore Public University students. The participants in this study were all university students. The study's sample was chosen using a simple random sampling method. Male and female students were selected at random, but rather through a non-proportional method. There were 300 total students in the survey. Interpersonal interaction via Dahmus & Bernardin (1992) and SACQ Baker & Siryk (1984/1989). In this survey, Likert-scale questionnaires were employed. In this study, a questionnaire served as an

instrument. The instrument was adjusted and changed with the research supervisor's direction. The three research professionals verified the validity of the instrument after making changes to the questions. The instruments were built using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The three research professionals verified the instrument's validity. Prior to the final data collection, a questionnaire was given to twenty university students for reliability purposes. Using Cronbach Alpha, the student questionnaire's dependability was found to be .82. The researcher personally gathered the data. Every pertinent source was consulted in order to gather data. The survey was also moved to Google Forms, and the fillable link was sent. Responses to the questionnaire were 81%.

## Results

Table 1

*The students' Mean. Standard Deviation(SD) Adjustment at university Scale*

<i>Variables</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Level</i>
Students' adjustment	3.71	.372	High

Table 1 shows that the level of students' adjustment at university was high (M=3.71, SD=.372). It is observed from the results that responses of university students regarding their adjustment in university environment is more than average and they felt that they can learn and adjust easily in university.

Table 2

*The students' Mean. Standard Deviation(SD)interpersonal relations Scale*

<i>Variables</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Level</i>
Interpersonal Relations	2.79	.134	Average

Table 2 demonstrates that the level of interpersonal relations was average (M=2.79, SD=.134), It is observed from the results that responses of university students regarding their interpersonal relations in university is average. It is also noted that the level of interpersonal relations as compare to adjustment is low.

Table 3

*ANOVA test for students' adjustment on the basis of CGPA*

		<i>Sum Squares</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Students' adjustment	Between Groups	1.559	2	.780	5.732	.003
	Within Groups	77.121	297	.136		
	Total	78.680	300			

Table 3 presents the results of the ANOVA test indicating that the Self-student adjustment factor is significant at the significance level (F(5.732)=.003, p>.05) between groups. Consequently, it may be said that there are notable differences amongst students based on their CGPA. Table 4.6 provides a comprehensive comparison of responses from students with varying CGPAs.

Table 4

*Post-hoc test for comparisons*

Dependent	Semester	M Difference (J)	Std. Error	Sig.	
Students' Adjustment	2 <sup>nd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	.111*	.033	.001
		8 <sup>th</sup>	.025	.049	.619
	4 <sup>th</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	-.111*	.033	.001
		8 <sup>th</sup>	-.086	.051	.088
	8 <sup>th</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	-.025	.049	.619
		4 <sup>th</sup>	.086	.051	.088

The results of the post-hoc test in Table 4 demonstrated that the student adjustment factor is significant at the significance level for the between-groups ANOVA test ( $p > .05$ ). Consequently, it may be said that there are notable differences amongst students based on their CGPA.

Table 5

*ANOVA test for students' adjustment in terms of age group of respondents*

		<i>Sum Squares</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Students' Adjustment	Between Groups	.298	2	.149	1.069	.341
	Within Groups	78.382	297	.138		
	Total	78.680	300			

According to table 5 results, the student adjustment factor's between-groups ANOVA test  $F(1.069)=.0341, p>.05)$  wasn't significant at the significance level. Consequently, it can be said that there are no appreciable differences between the pupils based on their age groupings. Table provides a detailed comparison of the responses from students in various age groups.

Table 6

Multiple Comparisons

Age	Age	M Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
18-21	22-25	.093*	.031	.003
	25+	.848*	.260	.001
22-25	18-21	-.093*	.031	.003
	25+	.755*	.261	.004
25+	18-21	-.848*	.260	.001
	22-25	-.755*	.261	.004

According to table 6 results, the student adjustment factor's between-groups ANOVA test  $F(1.069)=.0331, p>.05)$  is not significant at the significance level. Consequently, it can be said that there are no appreciable differences between the pupils based on their age groupings.



Table 7

*Students' level of adjustment by their high and low CGPA (N=300)*

	<i>Academic Presentation</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>sig</i>
Students' Adjustment	Low CGPA	3.77	.230	-	314	.435
	Average CGPA	3.30	.182	.782		

A t-test with independent samples was used in table 7 to compare the adjustment of university students with high and low CGPAs. The students' adjustment at the  $p \geq 0.05$  level of importance in the scores of low CGPA ( $M=3.77$ ,  $SD=.230$ ) and higher CGPA ( $M=3.30$ ,  $SD=.182$ ) was shown by the statistically insignificant difference on the basis of lower or higher CGPA;  $t(314) = -.782$ ,  $p = .435$ .

Table 8

*Comparison of overall students' perceptions (CGPA) about Interpersonal Relations*

<i>Variables</i>	<i>CGPA</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Df.</i>	<i>sig</i>
Interpersonal Relations	High	3.91	.208	2.174	298	.030
	Low	3.32	.201			

An independent-samples t-test was used in table 8 to examine the interpersonal relationships between students at the base of high and low CGPA. At the  $p < 0.05$  level of significance, there was a statistically significant difference in the students' scores ( $M=3.91$ ,  $SD=3.32$ ).

Table 9

*Male and female respondents about interpersonal relations*

	Gender	N	M	SD	t	df	p
Interpersonal Relations	Male	107	3.80	.357	1.434	568	.152
	Female	193	3.70	.372			

At the 0.05 level of significance, Table 9 demonstrates that the t-value (1.434) is not significant ( $p = .152$ ). Consequently, it can be said that there is no discernible difference between the interpersonal connections attitudes of male and female respondents.

Table 10

*Correlation between interpersonal relations and adjust in university of students*

	N	R	Sig.
Students' adjustment and Interpersonal Relations	300	.032	.324

Table 10 shows that the Pearson correlation coefficient was used to examine the relationship between the variables. According to the statistical analysis, there is no discernible link between students' adjustment and interpersonal relationships ( $r = .032$ ,  $sig = .324$ ).

### Discussion

According to the results of this study, for supporting several prior research have discovered a short-term correlation between students' interpersonal connections and their enthusiasm for adjustment in university. For instance, Maure and Brackett discovered that when students switched from university to university, when students moved from teachers they feel to be high in support to instructors they perceived to be low to support, the intrinsic value for inspiration



increased and the perceived usefulness as well as significance of interpersonal relationships significantly decreased (Maurer & Brackett, 2004). Using a retrospective method, the current research provided more support for the claim that students' social connections could be a driving force in the formation of relatively long-term domain-specific interest in further study.

Despite the claim that excellent interpersonal ties help students become interested in study, several students in this study reported being "uninterested in study," which was a perplexing finding. We should examine two linked concerns more closely. At the outset, we need to rethink the simplistic binary that labels people as either study-curious or study-averse. The is to say, just because someone falls into the category of "generally uninterested" does not indicate that person has zero interest in study. Some participants have said outright that early interest-raising experiences/relationships are responsible for their current interest, even if it is not as strong or as broad as that of someone else who is very interested in study. Therefore, it is not necessarily the case that the fact that many people who had interest-raising interactions ended up in the uninterested group means that these relationships were unimportant. On the contrary, without them, the already low levels of interest found in the study might have been substantially lower (Johnson et al., 2010).

Second, some students have suggested that there was room for an exceptional encounter to have sparked their curiosity. They anticipated that other scientific classes and instructors would be uninspiring and unforgiving. That is to say, when one's general impression of study and scientists is negative, even one or two positive experiences or interactions may not be enough to counteract that impression. Future research should seek to evaluate not only the positive and negative experiences that have an impact on a student's interest in study, but also the student's general schema about study, persons in study, and the student's perceived self with respect to study. It is also worth noting that the purpose of this work was not to found generalizable findings for any population by recruiting a large, randomly selected sample of that population, but rather to gain an individual's perspective on the role that interpersonal relations might play in the growth or lack of interest in study among university students. Analytical generalisation would allow the study's conclusions to be applied to a theoretical framework (Greenberg et al., 1995). Generalizing to a theory, as Firestone puts it, means providing data that is consistent with



that theory (Conti, 2000). Through analytical generalisation, the results of this study will contribute to the development of a theory, the identification of the scope of the theory, and the establishment of its generalizability when considered alongside results relating to the same difficulties acquired in different contexts. Each reader of the paper might, through analytical generalisation, determine whether or not the findings were applicable to his or her own teaching scenario and, if so, whether or not they would be valuable.

### **Conclusion**

The results of the present quantitative investigation indicate a number of factors that negatively affect university students' capacity to adjust to their new learning environment, friendships, and emotions. Moreover, the results demonstrated that first-year students who are having trouble adjusting to university typically employ avoidant coping strategies. Finally, the study's findings suggest a number of counselling interventions—both preventative and developmental—that could assist university freshmen better acclimate to their new environment. The first step is to pinpoint students who are having trouble adjusting emotionally to university life and to suggest a variety of outreach programmes to help them. In order to help new students build successful relationships with peers, faculty, and other staff members, universities should also set up effective mentoring programs and advisory systems. This is because informal and formal interactions with friends and faculty members help students adjust to university life. Lastly, colleges may provide a broad range of programs for the professional development of their faculty, including in-service training designed to teach faculty members how to use a range of methods of instruction and pedagogical strategies to effectively meet the social and academic requirements of first-year students in the classroom.

### **Recommendations**

There are some intriguing questions raised by some of the aforementioned cautions that may be investigated in further research. As it makes sense that institutional features helping mechanisms may all alter the connections between the variables analyzed, the first step would be to try to repeat the study at different types of universities. Subsequent investigations into adjustment may examine similar subjects to those covered in this thesis, but in the somewhat uncharted territory



of part-time, remote, and post-graduate students. This would offer an additional way to verify the external validity of the present findings.

To do more rigorous tests of causation with respect to psychosocial variables and adjustment, it would be helpful if future study attempted to assess psychosocial measures before the transfer. Research factors like EI that are susceptible to manipulation might be used to increase the evidence of causation. The effects of these manipulations on adjustment could then be investigated. Adjustment measurements ought to be taken more frequently, particularly during the first year of college. Additionally, expanding the study's time frame to encompass the length of the degree program may be beneficial for future research in this field. For instance, a more detailed understanding of adjustment trends might be possible if the noted declines in academic adjustment during the first two years continue. Finding out which psychosocial traits seem to be able to predict noticeably different courses of adjustment should be the focus of future research. It's likely that group-based statistical techniques, like the trajectory technique, could prove useful in this field's future research by identifying any unique student groupings that adhere to comparable adjustment trajectories. This statistical technique can be used to summarize longitudinal data by grouping individuals according to how similar their life pathways are (Duncan et al., 2010). This means that rather than the researcher trying to identify or characterize trajectories a priori, they arise from the data (McLachlan & Peel, 2000). Thus, it would be feasible to look at the reasons behind and consequences of belonging to a specific trajectory group.

Focus groups and in-depth interviews could also help us learn more. Combining these methods with regular quantitative evaluations of adjustment may help identify the variables influencing different levels of behavioral flexibility. Furthermore, the results of these research may provide insight into how students perceive their academic adjustment declining and whether or not this seems to be significantly linked to dropout. These strategies may illuminate the attitudes and behaviors of effective adapters, offering hints about other elements that might be essential for a smooth transition. They could also be a means of addressing one of the previously mentioned shortcomings of the SACQ. The results of this kind of qualitative research, in particular, might point to changes that could be made to the SACQ, such as adding or removing



items to better reflect the difficulties associated with transition and their applicability to students. Further information regarding the relationship between emotional intelligence and adjusting to university life may be of interest to researchers. One potential further measure and conceptualization of EI to take into account is the assessments of an individual's EI by observers. Additional research will be necessary to fully understand the new EI measures, particularly those that center on ability EI, but they will undoubtedly advance the field. Future research could examine the incremental efficacy of different EI tools. It would be useful to know when and to what degree specific emotional intelligence (EI) components are teachable or modifiable when developing intervention strategies. This would make clear which projects in this area had the best chance of succeeding.

## References

- Ashkanasy, N. M., & Dasborough, M. T. (2003). Emotional awareness and emotional intelligence in leadership teaching. *Journal of Education in Business, 79*, 18-22.
- Baker, S. R. (2004). Intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivational orientations: their role in university adjustment, stress, well-being, and subsequent academic performance. *Current Psychology, 23*, 189-202.
- Conti, R. (2000). University goals: do self-determined and carefully considered goals predict intrinsic motivation, academic performance, and adjustment during the first semester? *Social Psychology of Education, 4*, 189-211.
- Greenberg, M. T., Kusché, C. A., Cook, E. T., & Quamma, J. P. (1995). Promoting emotional competence in school-aged children: the effects of the PATHS curriculum. *Development and Psychopathology, 7*, 117-136.
- Jackson, L., Pancer, S., Pratt, M., & Hunsberger, B. (2000). Great expectations: the relation between expectancies and adjustment during the transition to university. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*, 2100-2125.
- Johnson, V. K., Gans, S. E., Kerr, S., & LaValle, W. (2010). Managing the transition to university: family functioning, emotion coping, and adjustment in emerging adulthood. *Journal of University Student Development, 51*, 607-621.



- Kalsner, L. (1991). Issues in student university retention. *Higher Education Extension Series*, 3, 3-10.
- Larose, S., & Boivin, M. (1998). Attachment to parents, social support expectations and socioemotional adjustment during the high school-university transition. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 8, 1-27.
- Lidy, K. M., & Kahn, J. H. (2006). Personality as a predictor of first-semester adjustment to university: the mediational role of perceived social support. *Journal of University Counseling*, 9, 123-134.
- Mackie, S. E. (2001). Jumping the hurdles: undergraduate student withdrawal behaviour. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 38, 265-76.
- Maurer, M., & Brackett, M. (2004). *Emotional literacy in the middle school: a 6-step program to promote social, emotional and academic learning*. New York: Dude.
- Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (2005). *How university affects students (Vol. 2): a third decade of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ramos-Sanchez, L. & Nichols, L. (2007). Self-efficacy of first-generation and non-first-generation university students: the relationship with academic performance and university adjustment. *Journal of University Counseling*, 10, 6-18.
- Ruthig, J. C., Perry, R. P., Hladkyj, S., Hall, N. C., Pekrun, R. H., & Chipperfield, J. G. (2008). A longitudinal analysis of perceived control and emotions in an academic setting. *Social Psychology of Education*, 11, 161-180.
- Trotter, E., & Cove, G. (2005). Student retention: an exploration of the issues prevalent on a healthcare degree programme with mainly mature students. *Learning in Health and Social Care*, 4, 29-42.
- Van Rooijen, L. (1986). Advanced students' adaptation to college. *Higher Education*, 15(3), 197-209.
- Zeidner, M., Shani-Zinovich, I., Matthews, G., & Roberts, R. D. (2005). Assessing emotional intelligence in gifted and non-gifted high school students: outcomes depend on the measure. *Intelligence*, 33, 369-391.