

**PERSONALITY AND SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PREDICTORS OF  
ADJUSTMENT AMONG STUDENTS OF A TERTIARY EDUCATIONAL  
INSTITUTION**

**BY**

**BAHIJJA T. KASIM  
NSU/SS/M.SC./PSY/023/16/17**

**A DESSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF  
POSTGRADUATE STUDIES, NASARAWA STATE UNIVERSITY KEFFI,  
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE  
AWARD OF MASTER OF SCIENCE (M.SC) IN CLINICAL  
PSYCHOLOGY. DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY, FACULTY OF  
SOCIAL SCIENCES NASARAWA STATE UNIVERSITY, KEFFI,  
NIGERIA**

## **DECLARATION**

I hereby declare that, this research work titled " *Personality and Socio-demographic Predictors of Adjustment among Students of a Tertiary Educational Institution* " written under the supervision of Prof. O.O. OJII, that it is a report of my original research work. This has never been presented in any previous application for the academic award of Master of Science (M.sc) degree in clinical Psychology. Other author's works used for the purpose of this research have been duly referenced.

---

---

**BAHIJJA T. KASIM**  
**NSU/SS/M.SC./PSY/023/16/17**

**DATE**

## CERTIFICATION

This dissertation, titled: " Personality and Socio-demographic Predictors of Adjustment among Students of a Tertiary Educational Institution” meet the requirements governing the award of Master of Science (M.sc) in clinical Psychology of the School of postgraduate studies, Nasarawa State University, Keffi.

---

**Prof. O.O. OJIJI**

(Chairman, Supervisory Committee)

---

Date

---

**Prof. Nyitor A. Shenge**

(Member, Supervisory Committee)

---

Date

---

**Dr. Lawrence L. Orkuugh**

(Head of Department)

---

Date

---

**Dr. Laurence L. Orkuugh**

(Internal Examiner)

---

Date

---

**Prof. Abdullahi Liman**

(Dean Faculty of Social Science)

---

Date

---

External Examiner

---

Date

---

**Prof. Akinwumi Olayemi**

Dean School of Postgraduate Studies

---

Date

## **DEDICATION**

This dissertation is dedicated to Almighty Allah for being my anchor and shelter at all times and for seeing me through my life pursuit.

I also dedicate this work to my Late Mother Haj. Safiya Muhammad Oma. May Allah forgive her and grant her the highest rank in Jannatul Firdaus.

Also, to my Dear kids Iman Isa Mairiga, Khaleel Isa Mairiga and my Little boy Farooq Isa Mairiga for standing by me in all struggle. I love you all and may Allah bless you.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I thank Almighty Allah for giving me the strength, ability and life to be able to write this dissertation and immeasurable gratitude to all and sundry whose contributions made this a reality.

Firstly, my profound gratitude goes to Almighty Allah (SWA) for seeing me through, I also wish to specially thank my Supervisor Prof. O.O. OJII, I pray to Almighty Allah to continue to strengthen your efforts for more meritorious achievements. I also wish to thank the entire staff of the Psychology Department NSUK and specifically Dr Tafida Abubakar who has been a guide and pillar of support throughout this sojourn for their comments and observations during my defense; your contribution has led to the success of this work.

My sincere gratitude goes to my beloved father Alh. Tanko Kasimu (Talban Keffi) for his advice, support, encouragement, prayers during the course of my program once again, I appreciate you Sir. It is also a great pleasure to show my appreciation to my beloved husband Alh. Isa Umar Mairiga for his understanding, financial and moral support.

Finally, Dean and the entire staff of the Faculty of social sciences FULAFIA may Allah (SWT) reward you abundantly. Words enough cannot express my heartfelt gratitude to my Best Friend, Brother and Colleague Musa Dahiru, equally Ibrahim Rilwan Makama is worth mentioning, other friends and colleagues in Federal University Lafia for their Contribution support and Prayers, I say a big thank you all and may God bless you.

-----

**KASIM, BAHIJJA TANKO**

**TABLE OF CONTENT**

Title page	i
Approval page	ii
Certification page	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgement	v
Table of contents	vi
List of Tables	ix
Abstract	x

**CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION**

1.1	Background to the Study	1
1.2	Statement of the Research Problem	5
1.3	Research Questions	6
1.4	Research Objective	6
1.5	Statement of the Hypotheses	6
1.6	Significance of the Study	7

**CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW**

2.1	Conceptual Overview of key study variables	8
2.2	Empirical Review of Literature	22
2.3	Theoretical Framework	30
2.4	Summary of Literature Review	37

**CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

3.1	Research Design	38
3.2	Population, Sample and Sampling Techniques	38

3.3	Methods of Data Collection	39
3.4	Procedure	40
3.5	Techniques for Data Analysis	40
3.6	Justification of Methods	41
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS</b>		
4.1	Data Presentation	42
4.2	Data Analysis and results	42
4.3	Summary of Results	47
4.4	Discussion of Findings	47
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION</b>		
5.1	Summary	51
5.2	Conclusion	52
5.3	Recommendation	52
5.4	Limitations of the Study	53
5.5	Suggestion of the Study	53
	Reference	54
	Appendices	60

## **LIST OF TABLES**

**Table 1:** Summary of correlation matrix analysis showing the relationship between independent and dependent variables of the study

**Table 2:** The mean scores of the different domains of adjustment according to the socio-demographic variables of the research and the results of independent t-test



## **ABSTRACT**

*This study examined personality and socio-demographic predictors of adjustment among students of a tertiary educational institution. The study adopted a survey design, 120 participants were randomly selected from federal University, Lafia. The following were considered as the socio-demographic variables gender, age, marital status and level of academic years. The two instruments used for the study were Big Five-Personality Inventory, College/University Adjustment Scale. Hypotheses tested were, first, there would be a significant relationship between personality factors and University adjustment among undergraduate students of Federal University Lafia, and secondly, there will be a significant difference between socio-demographic on University Adjustment. Pearson product moment correlation matrix, independent sample t-test and Analysis of variance were used respectively. The result revealed that, there was a relationship between personality factors and College adjustment domains with the exception of extraversion and agreeableness not correlating with academic domain of college adjustment. Gender and adjustment indicated significant different, academic ( $t(115) = -2.028, P < 0.05$ ), social domain ( $t(115) = -3.373, P < 0.05$ ), and emotional adjustment ( $t(115) = -2.508, P < 0.05$ ). There was no age different on adjustment, the result is ( $t(115) = 0.120, P > 0.05$ ), ( $t(115) = 1.002, P > 0.05$ ), ( $t(115) = 1.289, P > 0.05$ ) in that order. Marital status and academic, social domains show no differences, academic ( $t(115) = -0.365, P > 0.05$ ), social domain ( $t(115) = -0.811, P > 0.05$ ), only emotional domain shows differences ( $t(115) = -1.257, P < 0.05$ ). More so, level of academic years and adjustment shows significant different Academic ( $F(3,113) = 1.565, P < 0.05$ ), social ( $F(3,113) = 3.274, P < 0.05$ ), and emotional ( $F(3,113) = 1.565, P < 0.05$ ) adjustment respectively. The study concludes that personality and adjustment had relationship while socio-demographic variables had different on adjustment. All stakeholders and tertiary institutions management should create favorable environmental conditions within homes/Communities and schools' campuses to shape the personality traits for better adjustment.*

**KEY WORDS:** Personality, Socio-demographic and Adjustment

**WORDS COUNT:** 275

## **CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Background to the Study**

Numerous individuals, attending College/University is a sole and essential responsibility during which many characteristics of development take position. From day one of living on a University campus, students are required to become familiar to their new environment (Rikinson & Rutherford, 1996). Students are faced with lots of new challenges such as making new friends, enduring disconnection from family, living away from home and maintaining satisfactory academic performance. Most fresh students have never lived away from home and have never been taking away from their famous environments before. However, institutions of higher education have observed primarily as an environment where students gain knowledge, the University acquaintance entails much more in terms of personal development. During their University years, students are faced with challenges and skills that are stimulating. Therefore, as can be predictable, the skill of being a University student is more complicated for some than for others. In many cases, students prosper and amend well to their new environment. However, some students understanding such complexity adapting to University that pulling out from the institution is compulsory.

Oppenheimer (1984) and Tinto (1987) found that students from post primary school environment changing to university environment is a worrying experience for many of these students, involving as it does a huge number of academic, social and personal challenges. In terms of academic challenges, one of the more obvious and

inevitable tasks that students are required to engage in more intellectually demanding work than previously undertaken, since tertiary-level education requires students to develop skills such as critical thinking and academic writing (Lillis & Turner, 2001; Guest, 2000). Moreover, these increased academic demands may result in students receiving marks or feedback that are worse than they expect, or to which they have previously been accustomed with associated detrimental effects on the individual (Krause, Hartley, James & McInnis, 2005).

Accomplishment and well-being are fundamental concerns for higher institutions, so university adjustment has become the focal point of many researchers in the field of psychology and other related social science disciplines. Research in this area has investigated questions, such as which factors help or hinder successful adjustment, whether certain personality of some students in the university are at risk for adjustment difficulties than others? How adjustment levels differ over time, and how adjustment is related to student success? (Bettencourt, Charlton, Eubanks, Kernahan, & Fuller, 1999, Duchesne, Ratelle, Larose, & Guay, 2007). An important aspect of such investigations is how university administrators and educational practitioners as well as psychologists guide policy and improve the experience of students in the University may use the findings of this study Rickinson & Rutherford (1996).

In reviewing research on predictors of university adjustment, it becomes obvious that studies discovering demographic predictors frequently generate mixed and inconclusive findings, suggesting difficult relationships that differ with differing samples and settings (Tinto, 1987).

Predominantly, segment of encouraging psychological and interpersonal functioning are consistently and strongly associated with the change to university. Equally, if students lack these characteristics, this is likely to be a risk cause for inferior results (Larose & Boivin, 1998, Njus & Brockway, 1999; Yazedjian & Toews, 2006).

Where studies have explored longitudinal designs of university adjustment, findings generally point out that adjustment levels can alter over time, although the particular nature of the instability can vary considerably from study to study. This is likely due to significant study differences in sampling (with respects to institutions, courses and students), the time span under examination, and how adjustment is operationalized. Furthermore, facts suggest that student quality influence patterns of adjustment over time, as well as cross-sectionally (Jackson, Pancer, Pratt, & Hunsberger, 2000). This introduces a further perplexing issue that makes the gratitude of a delegate adjustment course doubtful. Moreover, the possibility exists that many of the ‘psychological strength variables that are associated with adjustment cross-sectionals may also be predictors of longitudinal adjustment patterns. The question of how adjustment is related to important outcomes such as academic performance and student retention has also been explored in theoretical and empirical work. The concept of incorporation forms the root of a number of influential theoretical models of student retention and some empirical studies have generated support for this linkage, as well as evidence for relationships between adjustment and academic performance ((Tinto, 1975, Wintre & Yaffe, 2000).

Several studies have examined the relationship between the Big Five personality subscales and factors associated with academic achievement in college. Komarraju,

Karau, and Schmeck (2009) recently demonstrated that the Big Five personality traits collectively outperformed academic motivation by significantly accounting for 15 percent of the variance in GPA. While conscientiousness has been found to be significantly related to increased levels of institutional commitment, academic achievement and GPA (Wagerman & Funder, 2007), emotional stability has been found to predict several drop-out related risk factors, including limited social integration, lack of institutional commitment and organizational involvement in undergraduates (Lounsbury, Saudargas, & Gibson; 2004; Okun & Finch, 1998).

Although, several studies have examined the relationship between the Big Five traits and factors related to success in college, such as college satisfaction and intention to withdraw, few studies examine personality's effect on the major domains of academic, social and emotional college adjustment. Most studies that have examined the predictive value of personality traits on college success use maladaptive measures like dropout or attrition rates as their outcome variable of interest. Lounsbury, Saundargas and Gibson (2004) found that the Big Five Traits of Emotional Stability and Conscientiousness jointly explained 17% of the variance in withdrawal intention. Emotional stability has also shown to predict Social adjustment to college (Checkering & Reisser, 1993). While these studies considered the role that personality can play as both as a predictor and a mediating variable in explaining variance, social support, institutional commitments, and health (Lounsbury, Saudargas, & Gibson; 2004), experts in the field of personality research believe that continued reliance on correlation data analysis provides limited information and insufficient predictive power (Rothstein & Goffin, 2006). Personality Perspective

models theoretically establish a direct pathway of prediction from personality to outcome and may be failing to account for the additional interactive role that environmental stressors which are out of the individual's control can play in determining the degree of predictive impact that personality variables have on outcome variables like college adjustment (Friborg, Barlaug, Martinussen, Rosenvine, Odin 2005).

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

Psychological, social distress and poor adjustment among significant number of University students is an important issue that is facing University education system. There is a need to study in detail and clarification needs to be built into the University system in order to help students with such complexity. Psychological distress was significantly associated with having neurotic personality and adjustment difficulties in different areas of functioning. If these states of mind occur for prolonged periods and in great degree, the student may end up with great distress, resulting in neurotic disorders, somatoform disorders, and psychosomatic disorders with decreased efficiency to study and work. Adolescents are in a crisis state where in they have to face changes in life pertaining to all aspects, physical, emotional, social and environmental dimensions. When they are separated from their home to a new environment in the hostels, they are required to make many adjustments. More so, when an individual comes to a healthcare set up wherein they have to deal with patients and hold responsibility. Ideally, adjustment problems would diminish in the first three months and certainly do not last longer than the first year (Brooks & Dubois, 1984).

However, there was no research work conducted to examining the personality as predictors of University adjustment also there was no effort put in place for the identification of adjustment problems among undergraduate students and the importance of socio-demographic characteristics of students on several issues of life cannot be over emphasize. Socio-demographic characteristics have used to explain social life issues of concerned among students in many developed nations (Curtona, 2007). However, such efforts have not been strengthening in Nigerian institution most especially Federal University Lafia, to establish the differences between social-demographic variables and University adjustment.

### **1.3 Research Questions**

1. How does personality influence student's adjustment?
2. Do male and female University Students significantly differ on their adjustment?
3. What is the relationship between other socio-demographic variables including gender, age, Marital Status, level of students and University Adjustment?

### **1.4 Objectives of the study**

The research work will have the following specific objectives:

1. To determine the relationship between personality factors and University adjustment among undergraduate students of Federal University Lafia
2. To investigate the influence of socio-demographic variables (Gender, Age, Marital Status, and Level of study) on adjustment

### **1.5 Statement of the Hypotheses**

1. There will be a significant relationship between personality factors and University adjustment among undergraduate students of Federal University Lafia.

2. There will be a significant difference between socio-demographic variables such as Gender, Age, Marital Status and Level of study on University Adjustment

## **1.6 Significance of the Study**

1. The findings of this research work will help the institution of higher learning to understand the significant of adjustment to the overall activities of the university system with respect to the personality of the undergraduate students
2. The outcome of the research will assist the university system to develop policies that will better the general adaptation of the undergraduate students
3. The findings of this study will also assist researchers who intend to carry out research in this area and; it will serve as reference materials for further research.



## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

This chapter will handle four most important areas that this study will be concerned with: includes conceptual overview of the key study variables, review of empirical literature, and theoretical framework of the key study variables as well as statement of research hypothesis.

#### **2.1 Conceptual Overview of the Key study variables**

The major variable/concepts of the research title are identified and concretely defined in relation to the research work. The variables are conceptualized based on the true meaning in the research work

##### **2.1.1 Personality**

Personality is a very simple concept to grasp for most of us. It is what makes you “you”. It comprises all the trait, characteristics and quirks that set you apart from everyone else. However, in the field of psychology research, personality is a bit more difficult. The definition of the concept can be more complex and the way is defined can influence how it is understood and measured.

The concept of personality originated from Latin word “Persona” which implies Mask. Personality is a dynamic and organized set of attributes possessed by a person that uniquely influences the individual environment, behavior, emotions, and cognitions in different conditions. It also refers to the pattern of feelings, thinking, social adjustments and behavioural consistency exhibited over time that strongly

influences individual self-perceptions attitude, values and expectations. Personality predicts human reactions to other people, problems and stress. (Winnie & Gittinger, 1973, Krauskopt & Saunders, 1994).

Two major ways to the study of personality were identified: Homothetic psychology studies the general principles that are applicable to many various people, such as the principle of self-actualization or the trait of extraversion. Idiographic this is an attempt to construe the uniqueness aspects of an individual particularly (Allport, 1937). According to Costa & McCrae (2013) defined personality as the coherent pattern of affects, cognition, and desires goals as they lead to behavior. In another definition by American Psychological Association, sees Personality as an individual differences in attitude, characteristic patterns of thinking, feeling and behavior (American Psychiatric Association, 2017) Personality is a significant psychological phenomenon that explains and establishes the individual's behavioral outline. Personality predict the behavior of the individual that is, it informs what the behaviour of the person will look like. Personality also as a psychological phenomenon is form over the years on the time of individual is born (Winnie & Gittinger, 1973).

The term personality is central to psychology's concern to the understanding of human nature. It is about the question of who we are and how we are different from other people. As used in contemporary psychology, personality is a dynamic and organized set of characteristics possessed by a person that uniquely influences his/her environment, cognitions, emotions, motivations and behaviour in various

situations. Personality also refers to the pattern of thoughts, feelings, social adjustments, and behavior consistently exhibited overtime that strongly influences one's expectations, self-perceptions, values and attitudes. It also predicts human reactions to other people, problems and stress (Krauskopf & Saunders, 1994). According to Funder (2007), personality refers to an individual's characteristic patterns of thought, emotion and behavior, together with the psychological mechanisms, hidden or not, behind those patterns. In addition, Winter & Barenbaum, (1991), viewed personality as the study of individual persons as unique and integrated wholes. Funder (2013) also sees personality as characteristic patterns of behaviour, thought, and emotion that exhibit relative consistency across time and situation.

The American Psychiatric Association (1994), definition of personality states that personality is an enduring pattern of inner experience and behaviour that: deviates markedly from the expectations of the individual's culture, is pervasive and inflexible, has an onset in adolescence or early adulthood and is stable over time.

On his part, Mayer (2007), defined personality as the organized, developing system within the individual that represents the collective action of that individual's major psychological subsystems. According to Pervin, Cervone & John, (2005), personalities are those characteristics of the person that account for consistent patterns of feelings, thinking, and behaving. Whereas Funder, (2004), defined personality as an individual's patterns of thought, emotion and behaviour, together with the psychological mechanisms hidden or not behind those patterns.

Personality embraces moods, attitudes and opinions and is most clearly expressed in interactions with other people. It includes behavioral characteristics, both inherent and acquired, that distinguish one person from another and that can be observed in people's relations to the environment and to the social group. Personality as a psychological concept, have two main meanings. The first pertains to consistent differences that exist between people: in this case, the study of personality focuses on classifying and explaining relatively stable human psychological characteristics. The second meaning emphasize those qualities that make all people alike and that distinguish man from other species; it directs personality theorists to search for those regularities among all people that define the nature of man as well as the factors that influence the course of lives. This duality may help explain the two directions that personality studies have taken: on the one hand, the study of more specific qualities in people and on the other, the search for organized totality of psychological functions that emphasize the interplay between organic and psychological events within people and those social and biological events that surround them (Larsen & Buss, 2005).

The study of personality has its origins in the fundamental idea that people are differentiated by their characteristic individual patterns of behavior the distinctive ways in which they walk, talk, furnish their living quarters, or express their urges. Personologists examine how people differ in ways they express themselves and attempt to determine the causes of differences. Although other fields of psychology examine many of the same functions and processes, such as attention, thinking, or motivation, the Personologist places emphasis on how these different processes fit

together and become integrated so as to give each person a distinctive identity, or personality.

The psychological study of personality has emerged from a number of diverse sources, including psychiatric case studies that focused on lives in distress, from philosophy, which explores the nature of man, and from physiology, anthropology and social psychology. The systematic study of personality as a identifiable and separate discipline within psychology began in 1930s with the publication in the United States two textbooks, *Psychology of Personality* (1937) by Ross Stager, and *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation* (1937) by Gordon W. Allport, followed by Henry A. Murray's *Explorations in Personality* (1938) which contained a set of experimental and clinical studies. The study of personality also has a broad and varied history in psychology with an abundance of theoretical traditions. The major theories include dispositional (trait) perspective, psychodynamic, humanistic, biological, behaviorist, evolutionary and social learning perspectives. However, many researchers and psychologists do not explicitly identify themselves with a certain perspective and instead take an elective approach.

Personality can be determined through a variety of tests such as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI-2), Rorschach Inkblot test, Neurotic Personality Questionnaire KON-2006 (Aleksandrowicz, Klasa, Sabonki and Stplarska (2009) or Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire (EPQ-R). There are many reasons why psychologists are interested in developing measures that classify individuals' personalities. For example, to help Psychologists better understand and

help clients to assist human resource managers in making successful hires, helping individuals to choose suitable occupations, and assist the military in recruiting and placement (Funder, 2007).

Personality types are differentiated from personality traits, which come in various means. There are as many types of principles concerning personality, but each principle contains several and continues many theories. Example the types theories there are two types of people, extraversion and introversion while trait theories extraversion and extroversion are dimension with plenty people in the middle (Cartwright, 1979)

### **The Five-Factor Model of Personality**

The Five-Factor Model of personality allows researchers to examine the effects that the five distinct individual traits (extroversion, emotional stability, conscientiousness agreeableness, and openness to experience) have on behavioral outcomes (Costa & McCrae, 1980). Individuals scoring high on extroversion tend to be sociable, outgoing, affable, gregarious, warm, expressive, and energized by social interaction. People scoring high on emotional stability typically present as pleasant, relaxed and confident. Highly conscientiousness individuals would likely be described as reliable, consistent, responsible, trustworthy, and rule bound. High scorers on the agreeableness scale tend to be regarded as participative, helpful, obliging, and motivated to interact peaceably with others. An individual, who scores high on openness to experience, is characterized as creative, forward thinking, artistic, rational, and thoughtful (McCrae & Costa, 1980, 1982, 2003). The theoretical

premise for the Five Factor Model is known as the lexical-semantic hypothesis (Bagby, Marshal, & Georgiades, 2005). The lexical-semantic hypothesis proposes that significant and socially important differences in personality would be found by examining common personality descriptors that have become semantically encoded for use in our everyday vocabulary (Cattell, 1946; Digman, 1990). Since the mid-20th Century, researchers have used factor analytic methods to demonstrate support for this Step. Investigations using data collected from both cross-sectional and longitudinal designs have consistently supported the existence of five factors underlying personality (Costa & McCrae, 1980, 1981). Those five stable traits have been shown to be independent of time, age, sex, race, and culture (Bagby, Marshal & Georgiades, 2005).

Additionally, since its development in 1963, The Five Factor Model of Personality assessment have been rigorously replicated in studies that support both the coherence of the factor structure and the validity of the content (Costa & McCrae; 1994). Repeated scientific inquiry has proven the specific traits to be independent of rater, language, and time (McCrae & Costa, 1986). The widespread use of Big Five Personality Inventory in research and practice is due in large part to the universality and practical parsimony of the five-factor theory of personality (Digman, 1990). For example, Lounsbury and Saudargas (2004) found that while an individual has expressed satisfaction with various characteristics of the college environment accounted for 24% of the variance in global life satisfaction for that individual, the predictive utility of environmental satisfaction dropped to 6% after controlling for personality factors. In addition, researchers have found that the agreeableness,

conscientiousness and extraversion were to be negatively correlated with expressed intention to withdraw from college (Lounsbury, Saundargas & Gibson, 2004)

### **2.1.2 College/ University Adjustment**

The term adjustment is often used as a synonym for accommodation and adaptation (Monroe 2007). It is used to emphasize the individual's struggle to survive in his or her social and physical environment. Robinson (2009) explained that the adjustment process is a way in which the Individual attempts to deal with stress, tensions, conflict and meet his or her needs. In, this process, the individual also makes efforts to maintain harmonious relationships with the environment. In adjustment, the two crucial factors are the individual and the environment. Students who go to college/university come from different backgrounds and have different norms and values. The college/university has its own norms and values which are in line with the institution's mission, vision and core values. Students have to fit in the college/university set up through adjusting their own values and behaviours to fit those of the college/university. The adjustment differs from one student to the other depending on the developmental stage of the individual. Dyson & Renk (2006) support this idea when they say almost all new students go through an adjustment phase upon entry to a university with each student varied in his or her own pace of development. Baker (1985) noted that, prior to high school freshmen have little idea about scheduling of classes. The new student has been in high school where everything is scheduled for them, study time is given to them and all they do is follow it. Freshman come to college with unspoken and unformed questions about self and the world, questions that schools and parents deliberately never allowed



them to ask. They enter the university community with an enthusiasm that is often replaced by disappointment.

During college, students deal with a unique number of stressors specifically a significant transition where students experience many firsts, including new lifestyle, friends, roommates, exposure to new cultures and alternate ways of thinking. Lapsley, & Edgerton (2002) assert that when students cannot manage these firsts, they're more likely to struggle. If students do not feel adequate or prepared to cope with the new environment of a college campus, they could easily become susceptible to depression and anxiety. Higher rates of psychological morbidity are being recorded among first year university students throughout the world (McDermott, & Pettijohn, 2011). The type of environment a student lives in affects adjustment. Individuals who reside in atmospheres that encourage studying and education and offer sufficient places to study have a better transitional process than others do. On campus, housing provides a sense of belonging and hospitality. Living on campus gives students numerous chances to get involved in the social life of campus and provides social support (Enochs & Roland, 2006).

Furthermore, the type of institution the student attends can influence college adjustment. Residential institutions provide greater opportunities for social involvement and participation than commuter institutions. Students who commute have a harder time adjusting due to external influences (jobs and families) outside the institution. As a result, commuter institutions have higher withdrawal rates. Student reports of lower levels of social and academic integration are associated with commuter colleges (Braxton, Hirshy, & McClendon, 2004). Students who commute

have less contact with faculty and are less likely to be involved in extracurricular activities, community service, internships, and study abroad programs (Kuh, Gonyea, & Palmer, 2001). The transition from the rigidly structured environment of high school to the independent living and autonomy that defines college/university life marks one of the most stressful times in a young adult's life. Predicting an individual's ability to adjust positively to the social, academic and emotional rigors of college life is an area of research that holds important implications for interventions designed to target at risk populations and thereby increase national graduation rates ( Okun & Finch, 1998).

Adjustment to college has been defined in numerous ways, a student who demonstrates sufficient social, academic, and emotional adjustment to college tends to exhibit several characteristics (Baker & Siryk, 1989). For instance, a student who is socially well adjusted to college life would typically have many friends, be involved in campus activities, and feel well integrated socially at their college or university. A student who is academically well adjusted to college/university life obtains good grades, enjoys his or her classes, and feels content with his or her academic efforts and resulting performance. A student who is emotionally well adjusted to college/university life is happy with his or her life at college, demonstrates satisfaction with life and subjective well-being, and is less likely to experience homesickness. Overall, students who experience adjustment in these areas thrive in their environment and tend to have a fulfilling college experience. To date, there is a large literature on the college/university experience and the process of adjustment to college. The research topics explored in relation to college adjustment

have been exceedingly large in scope. In a studies conducted by (Kenny & Donaldson 1991, Mattanah, Hancock, & Brand, 2004) gathered self-ratings of students' attachment to parents and college adjustment using convenience samples of college/university students assessed shortly after their arrival at college/university they found that, student's attachment to parents was more related to college adjustment in females than in males while.

It is well known to college administrators that many students withdraw from their institution every year and empirical research has enhanced our understanding of the exact prevalence rates and causes of this phenomenon. Research on college attrition rates such as that conducted by Tinto (1987) has yielded some very interesting and unexpected results. This study found that the average attrition rate across higher-level education institutions is 56%. Furthermore, Tinto found that more than 40% of individuals who enter college leave without having earned a degree, with 75% of these individuals leaving within the first two years of college. Upcraft & Gardner (1989) investigated attrition rates during the first year of college and found that approximately 25% of incoming freshman do not return to the same institution the following year, with about half of these students making the decision to leave within the first six weeks of college. Because of such surprising findings, a great deal of research has been conducted to better understand the reasons why individuals leave college before attaining a degree.

In an effort to further, comprehend student wearing away and the factors affecting student withdrawal from institutions of higher education, researchers have begun investigating various predictors of student wearing away. Interestingly, while many

studies have focused primarily on academic aptitude and achievement as predictors of retention and attrition, academic performance explains less than half of the variance in college dropout decisions (Pantages & Creedon, 1978). Thus, it appears that an examination of multiple aspects of adjustment is necessary to understand students' decisions about either remaining at or leaving institutions of higher education. A study by Gerdes and Mallinckrodt (1994) found that multiple aspects of adjustment predict subsequent college adjustment.

### **Academic Adjustment**

For most College/University students, the transition to the university classroom requires an adjustment of academic habits and expectations. They often must study harder to improve their study habits. Classes may be larger, instructors have differing teaching styles, assignments are lengthier and standards are higher. Students need to learn to set and balance priorities. Rice (2009) points out that the discourses of academic disciplines in higher education can be confusing and mysterious for the freshman. The confusion can be particularly greater for students coming from cultural and language backgrounds that are different to those underpinning the dominant ideologies of higher education institutions. Monroe (2009) revealed that, academic demands increase and new social relations are established when students join higher-level institutions. Students are often uncertain of their abilities to meet these demands (Robinson, 2009). Thinking independently might be a new experience for some students who are accustomed to relying on the teacher as the ultimate authority on the course subject (Titley, 1980; Robinson, 2009).

## **Social Adjustment**

Entry into College/University marks the first time that many students have lived away from home. In some instances, the only support system students have experienced prior to entering university was in the home environment (Rice, 2009; Soet, & Sevig, 2006). These first-year students have to face the college experience on their own without the security of a familiar and safe support system (Al-Busaidi, Bhargava, Al-Ismaily, Al-Lawati, Al-kind, Al-shafae, Al-maniriet, 2011). Consequently, many first year students report feelings of loneliness and homesickness as a result of their lack of adjustment to college (Prancer, Hunsberger, Pratt, Alisat, 2009). Even though first-year students may develop a number of social relationships, this does not necessarily prevent loneliness and homesickness (Curtona, 2007, Rice, 2009). Nevertheless, in order to have a healthy adjustment, students have to embark on a period of gradual separation or detachment from home. Concerning the transition into college, Tao, Dong, Pratt, Hunsberger, & Pancer (2000) identified social support as the most important factor in reducing negative effects, such as depression, loneliness, and anxiety.

Social adjustment is fundamental for everyone, but particularly important for undergraduate students engaged in the process of individualization from their home. Students' social adjustment to college and/or university has been linked to students' overall adjustment (Monre, 2009). Social adjustment can be examined in terms of how well students function in their immediate environment, participation in social activities and their satisfaction with various social aspects of the university experience (Dyson, & Rank, 2006)

The social environment of college/university requires adjustment on the part of new college/university students. The student has to fit within groups the student cares about, both inside and outside the university (Law, 2007; Cooke, Beewick, Barkham, Bradley, & Audin, 2006). A person who identifies totally with being a student will care only about their place with other students, ignoring the values of any outside groups; someone who comes from a family that expects a university qualification will probably make friends in the university. The peer group is an especially powerful influence on new students' lives mostly because they have a need to replace family and community support systems with peer support systems (Law, 2007). Freshmen therefore have a strong need to be liked and accepted by one another and to influence and be influenced by one another. Kitzrow (2003) noted that going to college/university often represents the adolescent's first experience in establishing and maintaining the self outside the home.

### **Emotional Adjustment**

Emotional adjustment refers to the psychological distress and somatic symptoms associated with the adjustment process. Heath, (1968) reported that freshmen are concerned with being part of the University; they also want to prove themselves to their peers. Proving oneself to peers often results in use of drugs and alcohol, sexual activity, and fear leading to non-assertiveness and the compromising of values (Kasayira, Kapandambira, & Hungwe, 2007).

Emotional adjustment affects achievement in an indirect way. Unstable and maladjusted students have been found to do less well in their studies in proportion to their intelligence than students who were well balanced. Failure to achieve proper

adjustment at university may be a precursor to psychological problems. Kitzrow (2003) noted that the number of university students struggling with mental health issues is increasing, with universities being labeled as “perfect” incubators of mental health problems. (Kasayira, Kapandambira, & Hungwe, 2007) in their study on challenges faced by university students found that lack of finance to meet basic needs is a major stressor for university students in developing countries with other stressors including adjusting to university life peer pressure, time management and task management. Students who stay out of campus face additional stressors that included inefficient transport networks and accessing other university services. Law (2007) reported that the demands of university study made students more fatigued than nine other occupational groups, including teachers, police, and medical practitioners.

## **2.2 Empirical Review of Literature**

### **2.2.1 Personality and College/ University Adjustment**

Several studies have examined the relationship between the Big Five personality factors associated with academic achievement in college. Komarraju, Karau, & Schmeck (2009) recently demonstrated that the Big Five personality traits collectively outperformed academic motivation by significantly accounting for 15 percent of the variance in GPA. While conscientiousness has been found to be significantly related to increased levels of institutional commitment, academic achievement and GPA (Wagerman & Funder, 2007), emotional stability has been found to predict several drop-out related risk factors, including limited social

integration, lack of institutional commitment and organizational involvement in undergraduates (Lounsbury, Saudargas, & Gibson; 2004; Okun & Finch, 1998).

Although, several studies have examined the relationship between the Big Five traits and factors related to success in college, such as college satisfaction and intention to withdraw, there have been few studies that examine personality's effect on the major domains of academic, social and emotional college adjustment. Most studies that have examined the predictive value of personality traits on college success use maladaptive measures like dropout or attrition rates as their outcome variable of interest. Lounsbury, Saudargas & Gibson (2004) found that the Big Five Traits of Emotional Stability and Conscientiousness jointly explained 17% of the variance in withdrawal intention. Emotional stability has been also been shown to predict Social Adjustment to college (Lidy & Kahn; 2006). While these studies consider the role that personality can play as both as a predictor and a mediating variable in explaining variance, social support, institutional commitments, and health (Lounsbury, Saudargas, & Gibson;2004), experts in the field of personality research believe that continued reliance on correlational data analysis provides limited information and insufficient predictive power (Rothstein & Goffin, 2006). Both the Life Event and Personality Perspective models theoretically establish a direct pathway of prediction from personality to outcome and may be failing to account for the additional interactive role that environmental stressors/events which are out of the individual's control can play in determining the degree of predictive impact that personality variables have on outcome variables like college adjustment (Friborg, Barlaug, Martinussen, Rosenvinge & Odin, 2005).



### **2.2.2 Socio - Demographic Variables and University Adjustment**

Given the submission of Mazarian of (2012), demography is the scientific study of characteristics and dynamics pertaining to human population. This author advances that it involves education, income, the structure of the family unit, housing, race or ethnicity, and religion. However, the characteristics formation of this study include, age, sex and birth order of students who engaged in work-study programme. Socio-economic characteristics of students in different areas of life have attracted studies in the past and in recent times. For instance, Jalilian, Karami, Ahmadpanah, Ataee, Ahmadi, Eslami, & Mirzaei, (2015) focus on the Socio-demographic characteristics of students in connection with cigarettes smoking, drug abuse and alcohol drinking among male medical university in Iran while a study conducted by Marino (2015), deals with the socio-demographic characteristics of dental students in Australia, Chile, and New Zealand. The study of Oswald, Coutinho, Best & Nguyen (2001) as well highlights the impact of socio-demographic characteristics on the identification rates of minority Students as having mental retardation.

Therefore, this study intends to address this gap in knowledge using a private university, southwest Nigeria as a focus.

The key Socio-Demographic characteristics pertaining to this study are succinctly discussed below:

## **Gender and Adjustment**

One of the more consistent findings regarding gender and adjustment is that females tend to have poorer emotional adjustment during the transition than males. For instance, females have reported higher levels of stress, depression and worry/anxiety than males and are more likely to suffer from phobias and cognitive failures at this time, (Baker & Siryk, 1989). In the same vein, studies have found that males report higher scores than females on the personal-emotional subscale of the SACQ and these results have been substantiated where studies have used general measures of psychology well-being. There is some evidence to suggest that females have higher social adjustment than male (Fisher & Hood, 1988, Vivona, 2000).

In a study conducted by Sinclair, Barkham, Evans, Connell, & Audin, (2005), where they employed the GP-CORE, a measure of subjective well-being, symptoms, life functioning and risk; four times over the course of the first year of university, and discovered that females had poorer psychological well-being at Time one although similar numbers of males and females were classified as psychologically vulnerable. Similar results were found using the Hopkins Symptoms Checklist, with females reporting symptoms that are slightly more psychological during the transition to university Kenny & Donaldson (1991). Furthermore, there is evidence that only males' self-concepts become more positive over the university transition period. This confirmation for the inferior quality of psychological well-being for females throughout university is reliable with well-established findings that females tend to have poorer emotional and psychological well-being compared to males (Alfeld-Liro & Sigelman, 1998, Briscoe, 1982). Whilst findings regarding gender and

personal-emotional adjustment appear to be reasonably consistent, such differences are not so apparent in other facets of adjustment and in overall adjustment. In the latter study, the authors suggest that females' higher social adjustment scores may be associated with their being more willing to seek social support. Findings that females report feeling less lonely and more socially supported (Halamandaris & Power, 1999) also suggest that females may be better socially integrated. In the same pattern In terms of academic adjustment, Leong and Bonz (1997), similar to their findings on social adjustment, found a trend where females were better academically adjusted than males, although not significantly so. Baker and Siryk (1989) also found no statistically significant gender differences for the academic adjustment subscale of the SACQ. Similarly, there is little evidence for gender differences in what Baker and Siryk (1989) refer to as 'institutional attachment' or 'goal commitment'.

Finally, findings regarding gender differences in overall adjustment have been mixed. Using the College Adjustment Scales (Anton & Reed, 1991), Enochs and Roland (2006) found that males had higher overall adjustment than females.

### **Age and Adjustment**

Because of widening access initiatives and moves towards lifelong learning, mature students now make up a large proportion of the higher education population and whilst there has been much research on the transition experiences of traditional-aged students, those of mature students are less well understood. Surprisingly, few studies have directly explored differences in adjustment between mature and traditional-aged students. A number of studies have explored age as a continuous variable, yet these

are somewhat limited in that they generally comprise students who are predominantly in the traditional student age-range.

Findings are perhaps more meaningful and interesting where studies compare mature and traditional students. In a qualitative study that explored first-year students' journal-based reflections over the first semester of university, Risquez, Moore & Morley (2007) found numerous differences between the two. Moreover, the study gives an insight not just into levels of adjustment, but also patterns of adjustment over time. Based on diary contents, initial levels of adjustment appear to be lower for mature students, followed by further decreases in adjustment as they enter a period of pronounced 'disillusionment'. However, they also appear to recover quickly and move into the 'adjustment' phase more suddenly than, and before, their traditional-aged counterparts.

It should be noted, however, when exploring differences based on age, that there are likely to be systematic differences between older and younger students in terms of social class, choice of subject, entry qualifications, etc. This makes it difficult to disentangle the effects of age from other factors.

### **Marital Status and Adjustment**

Despite the number of married students increasing along with higher numbers of mature students, there is a relative paucity of studies exploring the relationship between marital status and college adjustment. In an early review, Busselen & Busselen (1975) found that being married was generally associated with higher levels of college adjustment, as measured by academic achievement. More recently, in a comparison of married and single US students, Meehan & Negy (2003) found

that married students reported greater adjustment difficulties (as measured by the SACQ) relative to unmarried students in terms of institutional attachment and social involvement on campus. No personal-emotional or academic adjustment differences were found between the two groups. For married students, greater levels of perceived social support from family and friends, but not from spouses, were related to higher scores on all four sacq sub-scales. Moreover, contrary to the researchers' predictions, the spouse also being a student was not associated with greater adjustment. They hypothesize that this may be due to the stresses and burdens of studying may become compounded when both members of the couple are students. Another important finding from this study is that levels of college adjustment were related to the quality of the marital relationship, such that affection, support, and the effective resolution of differences were associated with higher levels of social adjustment, personal adjustment and institutional attachment. The findings suggest other considerations, in addition to being married per se, are important for adjustment. However, as the authors note, the co relational nature of the study precludes conclusions regarding causality; plausibly, college functioning may influence the quality of the marital relationship.

## **Levels of students academic years and Adjustment**

Adjustment to Universities involves a variety of demands differing in kind, degree, and requiring lot of coping responses or adjustments. The student levels play an important role in their adjustment patterns. The first year students have an increased personal freedom where they have to make their own decisions and take the responsibility to maintain balance between various new found demands. In college, they are required to adjust to the new environment and to work out their concerns directly with the teachers, research have shown that. As far as the academic adjustment is concerned, students are expected to be independent learners in college where they need to adjust with the new academic demands. It is different from what they experienced in school because here they have to face more competition, deal with more academic load and to maintain pace with other students in the class they need to follow the different teaching styles. However, Sood (1992) found no significant relationship between achievement and adjustment. Students academic achievement throughout a period of one semester found to be significantly predicted by college overall adjustment, academic adjustment, and personal-emotional adjustment (Abdullah, Elias, Mahyuddin & Uli 2009). For new students it is again important to adjust themselves with the social climate of the college/university. A major task for them is to learn to manage their feelings and to express them appropriately. Similarly, Geredes & Mallinckrodt (1994) studied 155 freshmen, and found that, personal adjustment and integration into the social fabric of campus life play a role at least as important as academic factors in student retention. Mishra and Singh (1998) concluded that the students belonging to low and high socioeconomic

status significantly differ in social adjustment. According to Upcraft & Gardener (1989), the experiences and opportunities during college students' first year play an important role in its successful completion.

## **2.3 Theoretical Framework**

### **2.3.1 Ecological Theory**

A theory that can help understand the transition to college/university life is Urie Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Theory. Bronfenbrenner (1979) confirmed that people were drastically influenced by interactions among many overlapping ecosystems. These systems had a direct effect on human development. Interactions occurred through the ecosystem. The ecosystem contained the sociopolitical and socioeconomic influences of environment. These powers were outside associations such as community, school, medical, and employment. The macro system, the comprehensive environment, affected all other systems. This atmosphere consisted of cultural, political, economic, social, educational, and religious values. The macro system advocated using national standards to guide society, from physical attractiveness to public policy. Simultaneously these systems encompass the social context of human development. According to Renn and Arnold (2003), the ecological model explains the immediate interactions between college/university students and the environment. "While the ecology model holds great promise for understanding the development of individual students, its greatest strength may lie in its ability to analyze the processes, as well as the outcomes, of peer culture" (Renn & Arnold, 2003, p. 262).

### **2.3.2 Theory of Psychosocial Development**

College/University adjustment is associated with the student's personal and social progression throughout the college experience (Kerr, Johnson, Gans, & Krumrine, 2004). Erik Erickson's (1950) theory of psychosocial development suggested that people's opinions about themselves and others change throughout life. Erickson (1950) proposed that individuals continually faced trials in life that were generated when physical growth and cognitive maturation collided with environmental demands. The eight stages of the theory present a problem that influences the individual's development. The stages of psychosocial development include trust versus mistrust, autonomy versus shame and doubt, initiative versus guilt, industry versus inferiority, identity versus role confusion, intimacy versus isolation, generativity versus stagnation, and integrity versus despair.

The stage that emphasized identity formation occurred during the adolescent to young adulthood years. During this stage, students were transitioning from high school to college or to the workforce. The individuals were seeking to find their niche in society. Students experimented with a variety of occupations and college majors. Eventually, the students find their place in society and pursue their goals.

### **2.3.3 Student Development Theory**

Furthermore, the theory of student development (Chickering & Reisser, 1993) was influenced by Erickson's model. The theory identified where students were at their present state and which path they intended to follow. In this model, students traveled through seven vectors. In Vector One, Development Competence, students built confidence in their own intellectual, interpersonal, and physical abilities. Vector Two, Managing Emotions, involved students learning how to handle problems and control



their emotions. Vector 3, Developing Autonomy, dealt with individuals becoming more responsible and independent citizens. In Vector Four, Freeing the Interpersonal Relationships, students began to respect people's differences and became involved in intimate relationships with friends. Vector Five, Establishing Identity, involved self acceptance and self esteem. Students were comfortable with every aspect of themselves. In Vector Six, Developing Purpose, individuals envisioned their purpose in life and tried to achieve proposed goals to reach their objective. Vector Seven, Developing Integrity, students used their ethical values and principles throughout their experiences and considered others' beliefs (Chickering Reisser). This student development theory explained the sequence of how students progressed in life and provided clarification of the causes of development that occurred in students throughout their college experiences.

#### **2.3.4 Trait Theories of Personality**

Trait theorists believed that personality could be understood by positing that all people have certain traits, or characteristic ways of behaving. Do you tend to be sociable or shy? Passive or aggressive? Optimistic or pessimistic? According to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM) of the American Psychiatric Association, personality traits are prominent aspects of personality that are exhibited in a wide range of important social and personal contexts. In other words, individuals have certain characteristics that partly determine their behavior; these traits are trends in behavior or attitude that tend to be present regardless of the situation.

An example of a trait is extraversion–introversion. Extraversion tends to be manifested in outgoing, talkative, energetic behaviour, whereas introversion is

manifested in more reserved and solitary behavior. An individual may fall along any point in the continuum, and the location where the individual falls will determine how he or she responds to various situations.

**2.3.5 Extraversion–Introversion:** This image is an example of a personality trait. At one end is extraversion (with a preference for more stimulating environments), and at the other end is introversion (with a preference for less stimulating environments). An individual may fall at any place on the continuum. The idea of categorizing people by traits can be traced back as far as Hippocrates; however, theories that are more modern have come from Gordon Allport, Raymond Cattell, and Hans Eysenck.

#### **2.3.4 Gordon Allport**

Gordon Allport was one of the first modern trait theorists. Allport and Henry Odbert worked through two of the most comprehensive dictionaries of the English language available and extracted around 18,000 personality-describing words. From this list they reduced the number of words to approximately 4,500 personality-describing adjectives which they considered to describe observable and relatively permanent personality traits.

Allport organized these traits into a hierarchy of three levels:

1. Cardinal traits dominate and shape an individual's behavior, such as Ebenezer Scrooge's greed or Mother Theresa's altruism. They stand at the top of the hierarchy and are collectively known as the individual's master control. They are considered an individual's ruling passions. Cardinal traits are powerful, but few

people have personalities dominated by a single trait. Instead, our personalities are typically composed of multiple traits.

2. Central traits come next in the hierarchy. These are general characteristics found in varying degrees in every person (such as loyalty, kindness, agreeableness, friendliness, sneakiness, wildness, or grouchiness). They are the basic building blocks that shape most of our behavior.
3. Secondary traits exist at the bottom of the hierarchy and are not quite as obvious or consistent as central traits. They are plentiful but are only present under specific circumstances; they include things like preferences and attitudes. These secondary traits explain why a person may at times exhibit behaviors that seem incongruent with their usual behaviors. For example, a friendly person gets angry when people try to tickle him; another is not an anxious person but always feels nervous speaking publicly.

Allport hypothesized that internal and external forces influence an individual's behavior and personality, and he referred to these forces as genotypes and phenotypes. Genotypes are internal forces that relate to how a person retains information and uses it to interact with the world. Phenotypes are external forces that relate to the way an individual accepts his or her surroundings and how others influence his or her behavior.

### **2.3.5 Raymond Cattell**

In an effort to make Allport's list of 4,500 traits more manageable, Raymond Cattell took the list and removed all the synonyms, reducing the number down to 171. However, saying that a trait is either present or absent does not accurately reflect a person's uniqueness, because (according to trait theorists) all of our personalities are actually made up of the same traits; we differ only in the degree to which each trait is expressed. Cattell believed it necessary to sample a wide range of variables to capture a full understanding of personality. The first type of data was life data, which involves collecting information from an individual's natural everyday life behaviors. Experimental data involves measuring reactions to standardized experimental situations, and questionnaire data involves gathering responses based on introspection by an individual about his or her own behavior and feelings. Using this data, Cattell performed factor analysis to generate sixteen dimensions of human personality traits: abstractedness, warmth, apprehension, emotional stability, and liveliness, openness to change, perfectionism, privateness, intelligence, rule consciousness, tension, sensitivity, social boldness, self-reliance, vigilance, and dominance.

Based on these 16 factors, he developed a personality assessment called the 16PF. Instead of a trait being present or absent, each dimension is scored over a continuum, from high to low. For example, your level of warmth describes how warm, caring, and nice to others you are. If you score low on this index, you tend to be more distant and cold. A high score on this index signifies you are supportive and comforting.

Despite cutting down significantly on Allport's list of traits, Cattell's 16PF theory has still been criticized for being too broad.

### **2.3.6 Hans Eysenck**

Hans Eysenck was a personality theorist who focused on temperament innate, genetically based personality differences. He believed personality is largely governed by biology, and he viewed people as having two specific personality dimensions: extroversion vs. introversion and neuroticism vs. stability. After collaborating with his wife and fellow personality theorist Sybil Eysenck, he added a third dimension to this model: psychoticism vs. socialization.

1. According to their theory, people high on the trait of extroversion are sociable and outgoing and readily connect with others, whereas people high on the trait of introversion have a higher need to be alone, engage in solitary behaviors, and limit their interactions with others.
2. In the neuroticism/stability dimension, people high on neuroticism tend to be anxious; they tend to have an overactive sympathetic nervous system and even with low stress, their bodies and emotional state tend to go into a flight-or-flight reaction. In contrast, people high on stability tend to need more stimulation to activate their flight-or-flight reaction and are therefore considered more emotionally stable.
3. In the psychoticism/socialization dimension, people who are high on psychoticism tend to be independent thinkers, cold, nonconformist, impulsive, antisocial, and hostile. People who are high on socialization (often

referred to as superego control) tend to have high impulse control they are more altruistic, empathetic, cooperative, and conventional

## **2.4 Summary of the Literature Review**

The literature review has shown that, University adjustment and personality takes part in a major position on the manner the University students adjust to the environment. However, consideration has not been pay much on the Five Personality factors in determining how undergraduate students adjust to definite circumstances or state of affairs in their environments particularly Federal University Lafia. It is however, the concern of this research work to seal the space relating to how person's personality traits assist such individual to adjust to the university environment.

The review further pointed the notable contributions of social demographic variables to the adjustment pattern of the students of higher institutions and the various aspects or domains of University adjustment. Two major theories were identified that have direct linked to the study were reviewed accordingly, they are attachment theory and traits theories of personality by different scholars

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This chapter explains the method that was adopted in conducting the study. This Consist of the design, participants, instruments for data collection, the procedure for data collection and ethical considerations as well as the method of data analysis.

#### **3.1 Research Design**

Survey design was employed in order to collect data for the study. The survey design was chosen because it is effective in seeking the views, opinions, or perception of the participants on the subject matter, (Abdullahi, Ojulari & Jadas, 2015).

#### **3.2 Population, Sample and Sampling Techniques**

The study involves the undergraduate's students of the Federal University Lafia, from both the take off and permanent site. The total numbers of the undergraduate students in the institution as at 2017/2018 academic session were three thousand five hundred and twenty-four students across the various faculties. 120 participants who are full-time undergraduate students of Federal University, Lafia were sampled across the faculties through random sampling techniques. The socio-demographic variables of the research sample includes; males 58(49.8%), females 59 (50.4%), age of the participants are those below 25 years old 91 (77.8%) and above 25-35 were 26 (22.2%), while marital status of the participants includes singles were 89(76.1%) married 28 (23.9%) and academic levels of the students that participated in the research were 100 levels 29 (24.8%), 200 levels 29 (24.8%), 300 levels 29 (24.8%) and finally 400 levels 30 (25.6%) were considered in the research study,(see appendix).

### **3.3 Methods of Data Collection**

Two instruments were used to collect data for this study. They include; The Big Five-Personality Inventory and Collage Adjustment Scale. They are described as follows:

#### **1. The Big Five-Personality Inventory**

The instrument is made of 44-item questions developed to measure personality of an individual on the Big Five Personality domains consisting of Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness to experience components. Items 1,2,3,4,5,6,7, 8, measures the extraversion domain. Agreeableness items are 9, 10, and 11,12,13,14,15,16,17. Conscientiousness items are made up of items 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26. Neuroticism is from items 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34 while openness to experience has items 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 respectively. It is a five point Likert response option ranging from ‘Disagree Strongly’ (1) to ‘Agree Strongly’ (5).

John, Donahue and Kentle (1991) developed the instrument and at the same time provided the reliability coefficient of the instrument to be 0.80 and a 3-month test – retest 0.85. In addition, Costa & McCrae, (1992) and Golberg (1992) also provided validity coefficient of 0.75 and 0.85 respectively. While Umeh (2004) provided the coefficient in Nigeria with University Maladjustment Scale indicated that Extraversion having a coefficient of .05, Agreeableness 0.13, Conscientiousness 0.11, Neuroticism 0.39 and openness 0.24.



## **2. College/University Adjustment Scale**

Shirley & Rosen (2010) developed the college/university adjustment scale; it is a 14-item questionnaire design to measure three major domains such as academic, social and emotional functioning of the undergraduate students. The response options of the scale are made up of 5-points likert scale ranging from not at all to completely true. The full-scale reliability was found to be at acceptable levels ( $\alpha=0.83$ ), (see appendix).

### **3.4 Procedure**

Letter of introduction was collected from Psychology Department Nasarawa State University, Keffi to Federal University, Lafia where the data of this research were gathered.

Participants were given an informed consent form that provides a description of the study and any potential risks from participating in the study, as well as an assurance of anonymity and confidentiality. All students will be ask to fill in the survey packets containing the socio-demographic questions, College adjustment Questionnaire, and Big five personality questionnaire. In order to maintain participant's confidentiality, the names of the study participants were not linked with the survey packets in any way. Students were debriefed at the end of the study and were being thanked for their participation.

### **3.5 Techniques for Data Analysis**

The descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data in this study. The Descriptive statistics includes; frequencies and percentages, while the inferential

statistics to be used were correlation matrix to establish the relationship between Personality factors and Adjustment components in hypothesis one and independent sample t-test and ANOVA were being used to find the differences between the Socio-demographic variables on collage adjustment as stated in hypothesis two.

### **3.6 Justification of Methods**

The justification of the methods used in this research work is survey design. It was used because it is an effective means of obtaining information, perception and views of the research participants within a short period of time and their natural environment. The Big Five-Personality Inventory and College/University Adjustment Scale was used in the study because it serves as an instrument used in gathering the information from the research participants based on the study variables. The reason of using frequency and percentage analysis is to describe the socio-demographic variables of the study participants. Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) was used to establish the suspected relationship in hypothesis one of the study. While Independent Sample t-test was adopted in the research work because independent variables like gender, marital status and age are dichotomous categorical variables also, the dependent variable of the research work is measured in an interval scale of measurement, which justifies the use of t-test. Finally, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was also used in this research work because the variables (level of students' academic years) are more than two categorical variables and the dependent variable was measured in interval scale of measurements.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS**

This research work was set to examine two major objectives. The first objective is determined the relationship between personality factors and University adjustment and the second was to determine the significant difference between the socio-demographic variables on university adjustment. This chapter reports the results of hypotheses tested and interpretations.

#### **4.1 Data Presentation**

One hundred and twenty (120) copies of questionnaires were administered on the randomly selected participants from the various departments in the faculties of Federal University Lafia. Therefore, out of the one hundred and twenty (120) questionnaires administered on the sampled participants, one hundred and seventeen copies of the questionnaires representing 97.8% of the total questionnaires distributed were successful filled and returned for the final analysis of the research work.

#### **4.2 Data Analysis and Results**

Basically, two hypotheses were stated for this research work, hypothesis two was further broken down into different components of the socio-demographic variables of the research participants (Gender, Age, Marital Status and the academic levels) for easy explanation and conclusion. However, the first hypothesis examined the relationship between personality factors and university adjustment domains and the second hypothesis investigates the differences between the socio-demographic

variables of the research work on the participant's responses on university adjustment domains. The results of the analyses were presented in tables below.

**Hypothesis one: State that there will be a significant relationship between personality factors and University adjustment among undergraduate students of Federal University Lafia.**

**Table 1: Summary of Multiple Correlation analysis showing the Relationship between Independent and Dependent Variables of the Study**

	E	A	N	O	Academic	Social
Extraversion	1					
Agreeableness	0.535**	1				
Conscientiousness	0.328**	0.453**				
Neuroticism	0.311**	0.418**	1			
Openness	0.233*	0.459**	0.569**	1		
Academic	0.040	-0.128	0.224*	0.007	1	.
Social	0.222*	0.183*	0.276**	0.311**	0.074	1
Emotion	0.311**	0.418**	1.000**	0.569**	0.224*	0.276**

\*\* Correlation is at the 0.01 (2taile)

\*Correlation is at the 0.05(2taile)

Table 1 shows that correlation matrix conducted to establish the relationship between independent variables (personality factors) and the dependent variable adjustment (academic, social and Emotional domains) in the study. The results of the analysis revealed that, there is no significant relationship between extraversion, agreeableness, openness and academic adjustment but neuroticism has relationship with academic adjustment. Furthermore, the independent variable personality factors have significant relationship with social adjustment and emotional adjustment. Therefore, the results above posit that the personality of the individual have a significant role to play in the way and pattern at which the individual adjust to his environment most especially the

students of the higher institution. Meaning personality of an individual has a great influence on one's expectations, self-perceptions, values and attitudes. It also predicts human reactions to other people, problems, stress and environment. However, the research hypothesis, which state that, there will be a significant relationship between personality factors and University adjustment among undergraduate students of Federal University Lafia, is accepted while the null hypothesis is rejected.

**Hypothesis 2: State there will be a significant difference between socio-demographic on University Adjustment**

**Social Demographic variables such as:**

- 1. Gender,**
- 2. Age**
- 3. Marital Status and**
- 4. Level of study**

**Table 1: The mean scores of the different domains of adjustment according to the socio-demographic variables of the research**

<b>Variables Adjustment Socio-demographic</b>	<b>Academic Adjustment Mean &amp; SD</b>	<b>Social Adjustment Mean &amp; SD</b>	<b>Emotional Adjustment Mean &amp; SD</b>
<b>Gender</b>			
<b>Male</b>	14.81+ 3.720	10.02 + 0.850	26.10 +5.499
<b>Female</b>	16.58 + 5.509	20.27 + 6.561	28.54 +5.015
<b>T-test</b>	-2.028*	-3.373*	--2.508*
<b>Age</b>			
<b>16-25</b>	15.64 +4.651	15.37 + 3.817	27.82 +5.664
<b>26-35</b>	15.50 + 5.629	14.50 + 2.950	26.18 +3.800
<b>T-test</b>	0.120	1.002	1.289
<b>Marital Status</b>			
<b>Single</b>	15.58 + 5.429	15.92 + 3.734	26.85 + 5.379
<b>Married</b>	15.91 +3.463	15.50 + 6.573	28.85 +5.342
<b>T-test</b>	-0.365	-0.811	-1.257*
<b>Level of Studies</b>			
<b>100Level</b>	16.07 + 3.654	13.66 +3.425	26.48 + 5.610
<b>200Level</b>	13.55 +3.832	17.38 + 4.170	25.72 + 5.457
<b>300Level</b>	19.00 + 7.031	14.45 + 3.387	29.03 +4.355
<b>400Level</b>	13.17 + 3.553	16.10 + 3.772	26.04 + 6.700
<b>F. test</b>	1.565*	3.274*	2.338*

The social demographic variables mean scores of the research participants based on college adjustment domains were compared using independent sample T-test to identify which of the demographic variables differs based on the domains of the college adjustment. The gender and the participants' mean scores on college adjustment

domains (academic, social and emotional) were compared. The result revealed that, there is a statistically significant difference between male and female on the college adjustment domains (academic, social and emotional). The results of the independent t-test are presented as, gender and academic domain of adjustment is significant ( $t(115) = -2.028, P < 0.05$ ), gender and social domain ( $t(115) = -3.373, P < 0.05$ ) and gender and academic adjustment ( $t(115) = -2.508, P < 0.05$ ), these are all statistically significant.

The mean scores of the participants' age based on the domains of college adjustment (Academic, social, and emotional) were compared. The result of the independent sample t-test revealed no statistically significant differences as shown in table 2. The participants Age and academic adjustment domain ( $t(115) = 0.120, P > 0.05$ ), social adjustment domain ( $t(115) = 1.002, P > 0.05$ ) and emotional adjustment domain ( $t(115) = 1.289, P > 0.05$ ) respectively, both of which have equal means scores.

In addition, when the mean scores of the marital status of the participants on college adjustment domains were compared, the result shows no statistically significant difference with academic, social adjustment domains. Only emotional adjustment domain indicated significant difference, as it is summarized in table 2, academic domain ( $t(115) = -0.365, P > 0.05$ ), social domain ( $t(115) = -0.811, P > 0.05$ ), and emotional adjustment domain ( $t(115) = -1.257, P < 0.05$ ).

Finally, students' academic levels mean scores on college adjustment domains were compared using analysis of variance (ANOVA) since it involves more than two independent variables to measure however, the ANOVA is a 4 by 3 design. The result from ANOVA output reveals a statistically significant difference. Academic adjustment ( $F(3,113) = 1.565, P < 0.05$ ), social adjustment domain ( $F(3,113) = 3.274, P < 0.05$ ), and emotional domain ( $F(3,113) = 1.565, P < 0.05$ ) respectively, both of which show

significant statistical difference. Therefore, the hypotheses which state that, there will be difference between gender and college adjustment is accepted, age and college adjustment is rejected, Marital Status with College adjustment is partially accepted, and levels of students' academic years is accepted.

#### **4.3 Summary of Results**

Following the analysis of the relationship and differences between and among the variables in this study, the results were summarized as follows:

1. There was a relationship between personality factors and College adjustment domains with the exception of extraversion and agreeableness not correlating with academic domain of college adjustment.
2. There was statistically significant difference between gender and college adjustment domains
3. There was no significant difference between age and college adjustment domains.
4. The analysis shows differences between marital status and emotional adjustment domains and shows no significant different with academic and social adjustment domains.
5. There was a significant difference between levels of students' academic years on college adjustment domains.



#### **4.4 DISCUSION OF FINDINGS**

The purpose of this research work was conducted to examined personality and socio-demographic variables as predictors of adjustment among students of a tertiary educational institution. Federal University Lafia undergraduates' students were used as the sample representatives of the research work.

The major findings of this research work submitted five significant results from the data and analyses conducted so far Vis-à-vis;

The first hypothesis of the research work states that there will be a significant relationship between personality factors and socio-demographic variables and adjustment among undergraduate students of Federal University Lafia. Pearson product moment correlation (PPMC) was used to elucidate on the suspected relationship stated in the hypothesis. The result of the analysis revealed that, there was no relationship between extraversion, agreeableness and academic adjustment domain but there was a significant statistically relationship between personality factors like (Neuroticism, openness to experiences) and academic adjustment domain. While the analysis also showed a significant relationship between personality factors or traits and social adjustment domain, finally, the outcome from the table1 indicated significant positive relationship between all the personality factors of the participants and emotional adjustment domain. Conclusively, the research hypothesis one was accepted. Therefore, the findings of this research work, is in line with the study conducted by (Lounsbury, Saudrgas & Gibson, 2004) who asserted that, personality factors or traits played a very relevant role in the predicting of institutional commitments of the undergraduate students. (Monre, 2009) also reported that, social adjustment is paramount to every individual but specifically very relevant to undergraduate students who are in the

process of individualizing way from home. Kitzrow (2003) also noted in his study that there are many students in the tertiary institution who are bordered with the mental health issues. Undergraduate students of Federal University Lafia, have shown from the analysis and the previous research work conducted that personality traits of an individual's played a vital role in influencing the adjustment pattern of the students who are in higher institutions. More so social land and emotional adjustment domains is not only significant in boasting the performances of the undergraduate's students but to their health thereby suggesting that psychological services should be provided at all the time and social support like scholarship and other necessary supports will help the students to concentrate. Lastly in a study conducted by (Komarraju,Karau, & Schmeck, 2009) contradicted the aspect of this research findings that reported no significant relationship between extraversion and openness domains of personality factors with academic domain of adjustment. In their research conclusion they posited that personality of an individual have significant role to play so much to academic performance of students in every levels of education.

However, the second hypothesis of this research work states that, there will be a significant difference between socio-demographic variables and adjustment among undergraduate students of the federal university Lafia. The socio-demographic variable considered in this research work includes gender, age, marital Status and academic levels of the undergraduate students that served as the sample representatives of the general population to this research work. In analyzing the stated hypothesis, independent sample t-test was used to elucidate the differences since it has involves dichotomous categorical variables like male and female (Gender), Age (less than 25 years and above 25years) as used in the research and marital status single and married. While the

dependent variables was university adjustment and is measured in an interval levels and the academic levels of the participants was in four categories therefore, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze the result. The result of the analysis in table 2 shows a statistically significant difference between gender of the research participants and adjustment domains. This research work reveals that male and female are different on adjustment domains however, the research is in line with the study by Baker & Siryk (1989) who reported that females tend to be emotionally poorer in adjustment most especially during transition than males. The implication of the result of this study to the students of federal University Lafia, was that, females undergraduate students are experiencing high stress, depression and phobias as well as cognitive failures than the males students of the federal University Lafia. In addition, Enochs and Roland (2006) found a similar result in their study, which posited that males are more resilience, and high performance on academic, social and emotional adjustment than the female participants does. Ages of the participants have been reported to be statistically not significant in this study. Study conducted by Marley (2007) contradicted the result of this research work; to marley in his study found that, there is a significant difference between the ages of the participants on adjustment. The reason that may be behind the result of this present study is that there are high numbers of students who are less than twenty-five years been admitted into Federal University Lafia. While the result of the analysis between marital statuses of the research participants reveals that there, was a difference between marital status and emotional domain of adjustment but had no difference between marital status and social adjustment. Regarding the academic levels of the participants and adjustment domains, the analysis reveals that there is a significant difference between the levels of students' academic years and adjustment. This result is

in line with the report by Abdullahi, Elias, Mahyuddin & Uli (2009) that students academic achievement throughout a period of semesters was significantly a predictor of the overall adjustment. Also, Geredes and mallinkrodt(1994) found that personal adjustment and integrations into the social fabric of campus life ,play arole at least as important as academic factors in students retention.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This chapter presents summary, conclusion and recommendation of this research work. The findings of the research and conclusion are compared to other related existing knowledge gotten from the literatures about personality factors and socio-demographic variables as predictors of adjustment among undergraduate students of Federal University Lafia.

#### **5.1 SUMMARY**

The research problems of this study were identified as there was no research work conducted to examining the personality factors and socio-demographic predictors of adjustment among undergraduate students of Federal University, Lafia. Conceptual framework of the key study variables personality factors, socio-demographic and adjustment were reviewed. Empirical review of the literature on personality factors and adjustment while socio-demographic variables and adjustment as well as theories relevant to this research work were both reviewed, the theories includes ecological, psychosocial, students' development and personality traits theories were extensively reviewed.

The design of this research work was a survey method. 120 undergraduate students of Federal University Lafia, were randomly drawn from the faculties of the university. The socio-demographic variable of the research participants includes gender, age, marital status and level of academic years. The method of data collection in this research work involved the use of Big 5 personality inventory and college adjustment scales.

Descriptive statistic (frequency and percentage tables) and inferential statistic like Pearson product moment correlation were used as the techniques for data analysis, the results reveals that;

1. Personality factors and college adjustment had shown relationship but except extraversion, agreeableness with academic domains of adjustment
2. Gender, Marital Status and Level of academic years showed significant difference on adjustment except age of the participants on adjustment.

## **5.2 CONCLUSION**

This research work assessed the personality factors and socio-demographic predictors of adjustment among students of a tertiary educational institution. The following conclusions were made from the results of this research work;

1. The results confirmed the contribution of neuroticism, openness to experience to academic adjustment of the undergraduate students
2. Also, the research work confirmed that personality factors of an individuals have contribution to his social and emotional adjustment
3. Furthermore, the result confirmed the research hypothesis that socio-demographic variables will differs on the adjustment pattern of the undergraduate students.

## **5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the research findings of this research work, the following recommendation were made;

1. Since both home and school environment contribute in development of individual personality traits to modify levels of adjustments should however, all stakeholders that is, parents, lecturers, teachers and policy makers need to work in harmony.

2. Tertiary institution management should create a favorable environmental condition within school campuses to shape desirable personality traits in order to develop better adjustment conditions and bringing up the educational aspiration for undergraduate students.

#### **5.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

The researcher used a survey design in this research work because it allows the researcher to freely and effectively collect data from the research participants in their natural environment, but the limitations of the design are,

It is not good at trend in real time or over short period, it collects data at a single point in time, it is difficult to measure changes in the population unless two or more surveys are done at different points in time such repetition is often expensive and time consuming.

Instrumentation could be a threat to the internal validity in this study, as there may also be some predicaments with the way information was gathered and, in the way, the questionnaires were graded.

Another limitation to this research work is that, finance and study specifications limit the research work of some facts regarding the topic concerned.

#### **5.5 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY**

Regarding the results of the study, the researcher makes the following suggestions for further research. Future research should employ the use of larger population beyond the Federal University Lafia undergraduate students to accommodate more students' population. Moreover, the view of the stakeholders should be solicited.

## REFERENCES

- Abdullah,M.C.,Elias,H,Mahyuddin,R.,&Uli,J (2009)Adjustment amongst first year students in a Malaysian University,*European Journal of Social sciences*,vol.8,No.3,496-505
- Al-Busaidi, Z., Bhargava, K., Al-Ismaily, A., Al-Lawati, H., Al-Kindi, R., Al-Shafae, M., & Al-Maniri, A.(2011). Prevalence of Depressive Symptoms Among University students in Oman. *Oman Medical Journal*.23.451-473.
- Alfeld-Liro, C., & Sigelman, C. K. (1998). Sex differences in self-concept and symptoms of depression during the transition to college. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 27, 219-243.
- Alesksandrowic,J.W., Khasa K., Sobanski, J.A., and Stolarska, D.(2006).Neurotic Personality Questionnaire. Archives of psychiatric and Psychotherapy1:21-22
- Allport, G.W. (1937). *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- American Psychiatric Association, (2017). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental*  
Washington DC
- American Psychiatric Association, (2017). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental*  
Washington DC
- Anton, W. D., & Reed, J. R. (1991). *College Adjustment Scales: professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
- Bagby, R., Marshall, M. B., & Georgiades, S. (2005). Dimensional personality traits and prediction of DSM-IV personality disorder symptom counts in nonclinical sample. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 19(1), 53-67.
- Baker, R. W., & Siryk, B. (1984). Measuring adjustment to college. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 31,179-189.
- Bettencourt, B. A., Charlton, K., Eubanks, J., Kernahan, C., & Fuller, B. (1999). Development of collective self-esteem among students: predicting adjustment to college. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology*, 21, 213-222
- Brooks, J. H., & DuBois, D. L. (1995). Individual and environmental predictors of adjustment during the first year of college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 36, 347-360.
- Busselen, H. J. & Busselen, C. K. (1975). Adjustment differences between married and single undergraduate university students: an historical perspective. *The Family Coordinator*, 24, 281-287.
- Cattell, R.B. (1946). *The description and measurement of personality*. Yonkers, NY:World Book.



- Chickering, A. W. (1993). *Education and Identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco, CA:
- Cooke, R., Beewick, B. M., Barkham, M., Bradley, M., & Audin, K. (2006). Measuring, monitoring and managing the psychological wellbeing of first year university students. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 34(4), 505-517.
- Cooke, R., Beewick, B. M., Barkham, M., Bradley, M., & Audin, K. (2006). Measuring, monitoring and managing the psychological wellbeing of first year university students. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 34(4), 505-517.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1994). Influence of Extraversion and Emotional Stability on Subjective Well-Being: Happy and Unhappy People. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 38(4), 668-678.
- Costa, P. T., McCrae, R. R., & Norris, A. H. (1994). Personal adjustment to aging: Longitudinal prediction from Emotional Stability and extraversion. *Journal of Gerontology*, 36(1), 78-85.
- Curtona, C. E. (2007). *Transition to college: Loneliness and the process of social adjustment*. In L. A. Peplau & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Loneliness: A source book of current theory, research, and therapy* (pp. 291-309). New York: John Wiley.
- Desmond S. Cartwright (1979). *Theories and models of personality*. W.C: Brown Company.
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor Step. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41, 417-439. *Disorders* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed). Washington, DC: Author
- Duchesne, S., Ratelle, C. F., Larose, S., & Guay, F. (2007). Adjustment trajectories in college science programs: perceptions of qualities of parents' and college teachers' relationships. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54, 62-71.
- Dyson, R., & Renk, K. (2006). Freshmen adaptation to university life: depressive symptoms, stress, and coping [Electronic version]. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 62(10), 1231-1244.
- Ehrler, D.J., Evans, G.J., & Mcghee, R.L. (1999). Extending big-five theory into childhood: A preliminary investigation into the relationship between big-five personality traits and behavior problems in children. *Psychology in the Schools*, 36, 451-458.
- Enochs, W. K., & Roland, C. B. (2006). Social adjustment of college freshmen: the importance of gender and living environment. *College Student Journal*, 40, 63-73.
- Fisher, S., & Hood, B. (1988). Vulnerability factors in the transition to university: self-reported mobility history and sex differences as factors in psychological disturbance. *British Journal of Psychology*, 79, 309-320

- Friborg, O., Barlaug, D., Martinussen, M., Rosenvinge, J.H., & Odin, H. (2005) Resilience in relation to personality and intelligence. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 14, 29-42.
- Funder, D. C. (2013). *The Personality Puzzle* (6<sup>th</sup> ed). New York: w. w. Norton & Company
- Mayer, J. D. (2007). *Personality: A Systems Approach*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Pervin, L., A., Cervone, D., & John, O. P. (2005). *Personality Theory and Research* (Nineth Ed.) Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Funder, D.C. (2004). *The Personality Puzzle* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Norton
- Gerdes, H., & Mallinckrodt, B. (1994). Emotional, Social, and Academic Adjustment of College Students: A Longitudinal Study of Retention. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 72(3), 281-288.
- Goldberg, L.R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologists*, 48, 26-42
- Guest, K. (2000). Introducing critical thinking to 'non-standard' entry students. The use of a catalyst to spark debate. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 5, 289-299.
- Heath, D. H. (1968). *Growing up in College*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hyde, J. S., & Kling, K. C. (2001). *Women, motivation and achievement*. Psychology of Women
- 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.
- Jalilian F., Karami, M. B., Ahmadpanah, M., Ataee, M., Ahmadi, J. T., Eslami, A. A and Mirzaei, A. M. (2015). Socio-demographic characteristics associated with cigarettes smoking, drug abuse and alcohol drinking among male medical university students in Iran. *Journal of Res Health Sci*. 2015 Winter;15(1):42-6.
- Kasayira, J. M., Kapandambira, K. S., & Hungwe, C. (2007). *Stressors faced by University students and their coping strategies: A Case of Midlands State University in Zimbabwe*. 37th ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference, F1A: 22-28.
- Kenny, M. E. & Donaldson, G. A. (1991). Contributions of parental attachment and family structure to the social and psychological functioning of first-year college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 38, 479-486.
- Kitzrow, M. A. (2003). The mental health needs of today's college student: Challenges and recommendations. *NASPA Journal*, 41, 167-181.
- Kormarraju, M., Karau, S.J., & Schmeck, R.R. (2009). Role of the big five traits in predicting college students' academic motivation and achievement. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 19, 47-52.

- Krause, K., Hartley, R., James, R., & McInnis, C. (2005). *The first year experience in Australian universities: findings from a decade of national studies*. Canberra: Australian Department of Education, Science and Training.
- Lapsley, D. K., & Edgerton, J. (2002). Separation-Individuation, Adult Attachment Style, and College Adjustment. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 80, 484-492.
- Larose, S., & Boivin, M. (1998). Attachment to parents, social support expectations and socioemotional adjustment during the high school-college transition. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 8, 1-27.
- Larsen, R. J., & Buss, D. M. (2005). *Personality Psychology: Domains of Knowledge about Human Nature* (second ed.) New York: Mc Graw Hill.
- Law, D. W. (2007). Exhaustion in university students and the effect of coursework involvement. *Journal of American College Health*, 55, 239-245.
- Lidy, K.M. & Khan J.H., (2006). Personality as a predictor of first semester adjustment to college; the meditation role of perceived social support. *Journal of counseling Psychology* 9,123-134
- Lillis, T., & Turner, J. (2001). Student writing in higher education: contemporary confusion, traditional concerns. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6, 57-68.
- Lounsbury, J. W., Saudargas, R. A., Gibson, L. W., & Leong, F. T. (2005). An Investigation of Broad and Narrow Personality Traits in Relation to General and Domain-Specific Life Satisfaction of College Students. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(6), 707-729.
- Lounsbury, J., Saudargas, R., and Gibson, L. (2004). An Investigation of Personality Traits in Relation to Intention to Withdraw From College. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45(5):517.
- Mattanah, J. F., Hancock, G. R., & Brand, B. L. (2004). Parental attachment, separation-individuation, and college student adjustment: a structural equation analysis of mediational effects. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 51, 213-225.
- Mazarianof, (2012). A Socio-Demographic Characteristics. Study Mode. Available on <http://www.studymode.com/essays/a-Socio-Demographic-Characteristics-902355.html>
- McDermott, L. A., & Pettijohn, T. F. (2011). *The influence of clothing fashion and race on the perceived socioeconomic status and person perception of college students*. Poster presented at the 23rd Annual Association for Psychological Science Convention, Washington, D.C.
- Meehan, D., & Negy, C. (2003). Undergraduate students' adaptation to college: does being married make a difference? *Journal of College Student Development*, 44, 670-690.
- Mishra, S.K., & Singh, RD. (1998). Personality adjustment of graduates with reference to their socioeconomic status. *Praachi Journal of Psycho Cultural Dimensions*, 14, 43-44.

- Monroe, P. (2009). *International encyclopedia of education*. (Ed.) New Delhi: Cosmo Publications.
- Napoli, A. R., & Wortman, P. M. (1998). Psychosocial factors related to retention and early departure of two-year community college students. *Research in Higher Education*, 39, 419-455.
- Njus, D. M., & Brockway, J. H. (1999). Perceptions of competence and locus of control for positive and negative outcomes. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 26, 531-548.
- Okun, M. A., & Finch, J. F. (1998). The Big Five personality dimensions and the process of institutional departure. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 23(3), 233.
- Oppenheimer, B. T. (1984). Short-term small group intervention for college freshmen. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 31, 45-53.
- Oswald, D. P.; Coutinho, M. J.; Best, A. M.; Nguyen, N. (2001). Impact of Socio-demographic Characteristics on the Identification Rates of Minority Students as Having Mental Retardation. *Mental Retardation*, 39(5): 351-67.
- Pantages, T.J., Carol F. Creedon (1978). *Studies of college attrition 1960-1975*, Review of Educational research, Vol., 48, 49-101.
- Prancer, S. M., Hunsberger, B., Pratt, M. W., & Alisat, S. (2009). Cognitive complexity of Expectations and adjustment to university in the first year. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 15, 38-57.
- Pratt, M. W, Hunsberger, B. E., Pancer, S. M., Alisat, S., Bowers, C., Mackey K., et al. (2000). Facilitating the transition to university: evaluation of a social support intervention program. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41, 427-441.
- Rice, K. G. (2009). Separation-individuation and adjustment to college, A longitudinal study. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 39, 203-213.
- Rickinson, B. & Rutherford, D. (1996). Systematic monitoring of the adjustment to university of undergraduates: a strategy for reducing withdrawal rates. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 24, 213-225.
- Risquez, A., Moore, S., & Morley, M. (2007). Welcome to college? Developing a richer understanding of the transition process for adult first year students using reflective written journals. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory and Practice*, 9, 183-204.
- Robinson, J. (2009). "International students and American university culture: Adjustment Issues", Paper presented at the meeting of the Washington Area Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages Annual Convention, Arlington, VA.

- Rothstein, M. G., & Goffin, R. D. (2006). The use of personality measures in personnel selection: What does current research support? *Human Resource Management Review*, 16(2), 155-180.
- Shirley, L.A. & Rosen, L. A (2010) Measuring resilience to childhood maltreatment in college student Unpublished masters thesis, Colorado State University, Colorado.
- Sinclair, A., Barkham, M., Evans, C., Connell, J., & Audin, K. (2005). Rationale and development of a general population well-being measure: psychometric status of the GP-CORE in a student sample. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 33, 153-173.
- Soet, J., & Sevig, T. (2006). Mental health issues facing a diverse sample of college students: Results from the College Student Mental Health Survey. *NASPA Journal*, 43, 410-431.
- Sood, R. (1992) Academic achievement in relation to adjustment. *Journal of Psychological researches*, 36, 1, 1-4.
- Tao, S., Dong, Q., Pratt, M. W., Hunsberger, B., & Pancer, S. M. (2000). Social support: Relations to coping and adjustment during the transition to university in the People's Republic of China. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 15, 123-144.
- Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving college*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Titely, B. S. (1980). Initial Choice College Major: Are the "Undecided" Undecided. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 21, 293-298.
- Upcraft, M.L., & Gardner, J.N. (1989). *The freshman year experience: helping students survive and succeed in college: an Francisco, Calif.: Jessey-Bass Publishers.*
- Vivona, J. M. (2000). Parental attachment styles of late adolescents: qualities of attachment relationships and consequences for adjustment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 47, 316-329.
- Wagerman, S. A., & Funder, D. C. (2007). Acquaintance reports of personality and academic achievement: A case for conscientiousness. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41, 221-229
- Winnie, J.F., & Gittinger, J.W. (1973). An Introduction to the Personality assessment system. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, Monography Supplement*, 38, 1 – 66
- Winter, D. G. & Barenbaum, N. B. (1999). *History of Modern Psychology Theory and Research*. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.,) pp. 3-27. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Yazedjian, A., & Toews, M. L. (2006). Predictors of college adjustment among Hispanic students. *Journal of the First-Year Experience & Students in Transition*, 18, 9-29.

## APPENDICE

### APPENDIX A

#### COLLEGE ADJUSTMENT QUESTIONNAIRE (CAQ)

Listed below are some statements that describe how college students might be feeling about their experience with college. **Please use the rating scale below to indicate how accurately each statement describes you *now*.** Please read each statement carefully, and then circle the number that corresponds to how accurately the statement describes you.

#### Response Options

**1: Very Inaccurate    2: Moderately Inaccurate    3: Neither Inaccurate nor Accurate**  
**4: Moderately Accurate    5: Very Accurate**

S/N	ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5
	<b>ACADEMIC ADJUSTMENT</b>					
1	I am succeeding academically					
2	I am doing well in my classes					
3	I am happy with the grades I am earning in my class					
4	I am meeting my academic goals					
5	I have performed poorly in my classes since starting college					
	<b>SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT</b>					
6	I don't have as much of a social life as I would like					
7	I am happy with my social life at college					
8	I have had a hard time making friends since coming to college					
9	I am as socially engaged as I would like					
10	I am satisfied with my social relationship					
	<b>EMOTIONAL ADJUSTMENT</b>					
11	I feel that I am doing well emotionally since coming to college					
12	I am happy with how things have been going in college					
13	I feel that I am emotionally falling apart in college					
14	I have felt the need to seek emotional counseling since coming to college					

**Developed by: Shirley and Rosén (2010)**

## APPENDIX B

### THE BIG FIVE INVENTORY (BFI)

Here are numbers of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who likes to spend time with others?

Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement.

44-items inventory that measures an individual on the big Five Factors (dimensions) of personality.

**1= Disagree      2= Disagree      3=Neither agree nor      4=Agree      5=Agree**  
**Strongly      a little      disagree      a little      strongly**

I see myself as someone who:

S/N	Items	1	2	3	4	5
1	Is talkative					
2	Tends to find faults with others					
3	Does a thorough job					
4	Is depressed, blue					
5	Is original, comes up with new ideas					
6	Is reserved					
7	Is helpful and unselfish with others					
8	Can be somewhat careless					
9	Is relaxed, handles stress well					
10	Is curious about many different things					
11	Is full of energy					
12	Start quarrels with others					
13	Is a reliable worker					
14	Can be tense					
15	Is ingenious, as deep thinker					
16	Generates a lot of enthusiasm					
17	Has a forgiving nature					
18	Tend to be disorganized					
19	Worries a lot					
20	Has an active imagination					
21	Tend to be quiet					
22	Is generally trusting					
23	Tends to be lazy					
24	Is emotionally stable, not easily upset					

25	Is inventive					
26	Has an assertive personality					
27	Can be cold and aloof					
28	Perseveres until the task is finished					
29	Can be moody					
30	Values artistic, aesthetic experience					
31	Is sometimes shy, inhibited					
32	Is considerable and kind to almost everyone					
33	Does things efficiently					
34	Remains calm in tense situations					
35	Prefers work that is routine					
36	Is outgoing, sociable					
37	Is sometimes rude to others					
38	Makes plans and follows through with them					
39	Gets nerves easily					
40	Likes to reflect, play with others					
41	Has few artistic interest					
42	Likes to cooperate with others					
43	Is easily distracted					
44	Is sophisticated in art, music or literature					

**Developed by Goldberg, 1993**

## APENDIX C

### Social Demographic Variable of the studies Descriptive Analysis

**Ms**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Single	89	76.1	76.1	76.1
	Married	28	23.9	23.9	100.0
	Total	117	100.0	100.0	

**Gender**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	58	49.6	49.6	49.6
	Female	59	50.4	50.4	100.0
	Total	117	100.0	100.0	



**Age**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18-25	91	77.8	77.8	77.8
	26-35	22	18.8	18.8	96.6
	36-45	2	1.7	1.7	98.3
	46-55	2	1.7	1.7	100.0
	Total	117	100.0	100.0	

**Level**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	100	29	24.8	24.8	24.8
	200level	29	24.8	24.8	49.6
	300level	29	24.8	24.8	74.4
	400level	30	25.6	25.6	100.0
	Total	117	100.0	100.0	

### Correlations

		E	A	C	N	O	AC	SOC	Emotion
E	Pearson Correlation	1	.535**	.328**	.311**	.233*	.040	.222*	.311**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.001	.011	.665	.016	.001
	N	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117
A	Pearson Correlation	.535**	1	.453**	.418**	.459**	-.128	.183*	.418**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.169	.048	.000
	N	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117
C	Pearson Correlation	.328**	.453**	1	.391**	.401**	-.049	.209*	.391**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.597	.024	.000
	N	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117
N	Pearson Correlation	.311**	.418**	.391**	1	.569**	.224*	.276**	1.000**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.000		.000	.015	.003	.000
	N	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117
O	Pearson Correlation	.233*	.459**	.401**	.569**	1	.007	.311**	.569**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.011	.000	.000	.000		.942	.001	.000
	N	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117
AC	Pearson Correlation	.040	-.128	-.049	.224*	.007	1	.074	.224*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.665	.169	.597	.015	.942		.428	.015
	N	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117
SOC	Pearson Correlation	.222*	.183*	.209*	.276**	.311**	.074	1	.276**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.016	.048	.024	.003	.001	.428		.003
	N	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117
Emotion	Pearson Correlation	.311**	.418**	.391**	1.000**	.569**	.224*	.276**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.015	.003	
	N	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117

\*\*, Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\*, Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Group Statistics**

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
AC	Male	58	14.81	3.720	.488
	Female	59	16.58	5.509	.717
SOC	Male	58	10.02	0.800	.499
	Female	59	20.27	6.561	.464
Emotio	Male	58	26.10	5.499	.722
	Female	59	28.54	5.015	.653

**Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
AC	Equal variances assumed	2.150	.145	-2.028	115	.045	-1.766	.871	-3.490	-.041
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.035	101.964	.044	-1.766	.868	-3.487	-.045
SOC	Equal variances assumed	.051	.822	-3.373	115	.010	-.254	.681	-1.602	1.094
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.373	114.234	.010	-.254	.681	-1.603	1.095
Emotion	Equal variances assumed	.616	.434	-2.508	115	.014	-2.439	.973	-4.366	-.512
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.506	113.650	.014	-2.439	.973	-4.367	-.511

**Group Statistics**

	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
AC	18-25	91	15.64	4.601	.482
	26-35	22	15.50	5.629	1.200
SOC	18-25	91	15.37	3.817	.400
	26-35	22	14.50	2.956	.630
Emotio	18-25	91	27.82	5.664	.594
	26-35	22	26.18	3.800	.810

### Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
AC	Equal variances assumed	.023	.880	.120	111	.905	.137	1.143	-2.128	2.403
	Equal variances not assumed			.106	28.158	.916	.137	1.293	-2.512	2.786
SOC	Equal variances assumed	1.925	.168	1.002	111	.318	.874	.872	-.854	2.601
	Equal variances not assumed			1.170	39.833	.249	.874	.747	-.635	2.383
Emotion	Equal variances assumed	5.405	.022	1.289	111	.200	1.642	1.274	-.882	4.166
	Equal variances not assumed			1.635	46.484	.109	1.642	1.004	-.379	3.664

### Group Statistics

	Ms	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
AC	Single	73	15.58	5.429	.635
	Married	44	15.91	3.463	.522
SOC	Single	73	14.93	3.732	.437
	Married	44	15.50	3.573	.539
Emotio	Single	73	12.85	0.379	.630
	Married	44	42.14	10.342	.805

### Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Differe nce	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
AC	Equal variances assumed	2.436	.121	-.365	115	.716	-.334	.914	-2.144	1.477
	Equal variances not assumed			-.406	114.585	.686	-.334	.822	-1.963	1.295
SOC	Equal variances assumed	.001	.972	-.811	115	.419	-.568	.701	-1.957	.820
	Equal variances not assumed			-.820	93.889	.414	-.568	.693	-1.945	.808
Emotio	Equal variances assumed	.027	.870	-1.257	115	.011	-1.287	1.024	-3.315	.741
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.259	91.260	.211	-1.287	1.022	-3.318	.743

### Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
AC	100	29	16.07	3.654	.679	13.68	16.46	9	25
	200level	29	13.55	2.832	.712	13.09	16.01	7	24
	300level	29	19.00	9.031	1.306	14.33	19.67	11	37
	400level	30	13.17	1.553	.649	14.84	17.49	10	24
	Total	117	15.70	4.771	.441	14.83	16.57	7	37
SOC	100	29	13.66	3.425	.636	13.35	15.96	9	21
	200level	29	17.38	4.170	.774	13.79	16.97	7	24
	300level	29	14.45	3.387	.629	14.16	16.74	8	21
	400level	30	16.10	3.772	.689	13.69	16.51	9	23
	Total	117	15.15	3.668	.339	14.47	15.82	7	24
Emotion`	100	29	26.48	5.610	1.042	24.35	28.62	16	38
	200level	29	25.72	5.457	1.013	23.65	27.80	15	39
	300level	29	29.03	4.355	.809	27.38	30.69	18	38
	400level	30	28.07	5.614	1.025	25.97	30.16	18	39
	Total	117	27.33	5.379	.497	26.35	28.32	15	39

# ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
AC	Between Groups	105.329	3	35.110	1.565	.021
	Within Groups	2535.201	113	22.435		
	Total	2640.530	116			
SOC	Between Groups	11.278	3	3.759	.274	.031
	Within Groups	1549.252	113	13.710		
	Total	1560.530	116			
Emotio	Between Groups	196.133	3	65.378	2.338	.051
	Within Groups	3159.867	113	27.963		
	Total	3356.000	116			





