

## **Socialization Level of Working and Non-Working College Students of Bohol Island State University Main Campus**

**Carmel Glory C. Sotomayor**

carmelglory.sotomayor@bisu.edu.ph

Bohol Island State University – Main Campus

CPG North Avenue, Tagbilaran City, 6300, Bohol, Philippines

### **ABSTRACT**

The main thrust of the study was to determine the level of socialization of the working and non-working college students of Bohol Island State University Main Campus. Specifically, it aimed to determine whether or not, working and non-working students differ in their level of socialization with respect to family and school based on the following stages: the orientation of interaction, exploratory affective exchange, affective exchange and stable exchange. The study utilized the use of descriptive-survey research method in order to gather data in a form of a standardized questionnaire which was given to the one-hundred-seventy-nine non-working and fifty working students. The lists of working and non-working students were obtained from the Registrar's Office. The gathered data were statistically interpreted using the weighted mean and Z-test. The results of the study showed that working and non-working college students of Bohol Island State University "frequently" socialize with respect to their family and school. It as well shows no significant difference in the different stages of socialization. The researcher concluded that whether or not, their status does not affect their level of socialization. In connection to the results of the study, the following recommendations are made: students may attend seminars and symposia about the implications of socializing other people. School administration may organize activities that aim to give students more time with their families and peers. Future researcher can modify the methods utilized in this study to compare results for the improvement of the topic.

**Keywords:** Socialization, Working, Non-Working

### **INTRODUCTION**

"The more time a student devotes to employment, the less he or she has for either academic or social activities". (Fjortoft, 1995). How does working affect the development and socialization level of the individual? Employment during school could improve grades if working fosters attributes that are complementary with academic success, such as industriousness or time management skills, or may reduce grades by constraining time and energy available for schoolwork. Alternatively, working is correlated with academic performance and social aspects of life.

The collaboration of the family and the school in promoting activities common to their social goals is a powerful and pervasive force in the college student's daily life. Employment while being a student simply did not appear to affect student's level of academic achievement (Fjortoft, 1995). One logical explanation is that, working students tend to reduce leisure and socializing time rather than study time (Fjortoft, 1995). However, work may have an impact on the one's socialization, specifically, in relation to their family, school and workplace (Greenberge and Steinberg, 1981). It is within the family and institutions where students are taught of proper conducts and behavior expected of young people in the community nowadays.

Socially at school, they learned to interact with people such as their group of friends and peers. On the other hand, they would also learn to relate with their coworkers in the workplace. All these are fundamental building blocks for social development and are a powerful driver for development of individuals and society.

Being a working student at an early age can promote responsive behavior and psychological development; furthermore, these students got some advantage on the workplace over non-working

students (Nortimer, et. al, 2002). Thus, determining the level of socialization of working and non-working students in effect of work on development is significant (Green Berger & Steinberg, 1981).

The researcher's main purpose of the study was to determine whether or not, working and non-working students differ in their socialization level in connection to their family and school. In addition, this research aimed to provide encouragement and motivation to all students especially those who are financially distressed to pursue and finish a college degree in order to be competitive in the future and to be able to realize their goals and aspiration.

## METHODOLOGY

The researcher used the descriptive survey method through a questionnaire. Such method was used to gather sufficient data and reliable facts for the conduct of the study. The result of this study served as basis for determining the respondents' socialization level and it also present facts concerning the relationship of student's labor to socialization.

The study was conducted within the premises of Bohol Island State University Main Campus. This school is situated along Carlos P. Garcia, North Avenue, Tagbilaran City, Bohol, Philippines. The respondents were the college students of the said university.

Out of the 6424 total number of the college students of the four particular colleges, there were 50 working and 6351 non-working students. The researcher computed the population size for every college: 1692 from the College of Engineering and Architecture; 1120 from the College of Teacher Education; 1107 from the College of Business, Arts and Sciences; and 2505 from the College of Technology and Allied Sciences. Using the sample size formula, the researcher arrived with the following number of respondents: 47 from College of Engineering and Architecture, 31 from College of Teacher Education, 31 from College of Business, Arts and Sciences and 70 from College of Technology and Allied Sciences. Out of the population, the sample size was 179. From 179 non-working plus 50 working students 229 was the total number of respondents.

To collect data necessary for the conduct of the study, the researcher used a standardized questionnaire (Apostol, R. et. al), 2010) aiming to serve as foundation for conclusions and recommendations of the study.

The researcher asked permission from the Research Adviser, Research Instructor, Dean of the College and the Campus Director to carry out the study. The researcher sent a formal letter of request for the conduct of the study.

After their approval, the researcher requested the Registrar's Office of Bohol Island State University Main Campus to provide the total population of every college of BISU MC Students for the academic year 2013-2014, specifically for the second semester. From this population, the researchers determined who among the students were working and non-working. After determining the sample, the researcher distributed the questionnaire to the respondents.

To ascertain understanding of the items in the questionnaire, the researcher provided explanation to the respondents regarding the purpose of the study. Enough time to answer the questionnaire was allotted to the respondents. After completing the tests, questionnaires were collected, analyzed and interpreted.

To compute for the profile of the Bohol Island State University Main Campus College students, the formula for relative frequency was used.

In computing the total number of respondents, the researchers used the sample size.

To compute for the level of socialization in the two areas such as family and school, the formula for the weighted mean was used.

To compute for the difference between the working and non-working students in their level of socialization, the formula for Z-test was used.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

**Table 1**  
**Demographic Profile of the Respondents**

**N=229**

Demographic Characteristics	Course Department								TOTAL	
	CEA		CTE		CBAS		CTAS		F	%
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
<b>Student Status</b>										
Working	9	16.07	8	20.51	7	18.42	26	27.08	50	21.84
Non-working	47	83.93	31	79.49	31	81.58	70	72.92	179	78.16
TOTAL	56	100	39	100	38	100	96	100	229	100

For the students' demographic profile, table 1 show that the college students from the College of Technology and Allied Sciences had the highest number of working students with 26 out of 96 or 27.08% as well as on the highest number of non-working students with 70 out of 96 or 72.92%. This indicates that majority of both working and non-working college students were in the College of Technology and Allied Sciences. Most of the respondents came from this department since CTAS composed the greatest number of college students of BISU MC. Based on the total population, majority of the college students of Bohol Island State University Main Campus were non-working students which is 179 or 78.16%.

**Table 2**  
**Socialization Level of Working and Non-working College Students with Respect to Family and School based on the Different Stages of Socialization**

Stages of Socialization	Family			School		
	Working Student	Non-working Student		Working Student	Non-working Student	
Orientation of Interaction	2.74	2.60	Frequently	2.56	2.51	Frequently
Exploratory Affective Exchange	3.20	2.93	Frequently	2.83	2.93	Frequently
Affective Exchange	3.09	2.65	Frequently	2.71	2.75	Frequently
Stable Exchange	3.26	2.90	Frequently	2.70	2.72	Frequently
Average WM	3.07	2.77		2.71	2.73	

Legend: Never = 1.00-1.80; Sometimes=1.81-2.60; Frequently=2.61-3.40; Often=3.41-4.20; Always=4.21-5.00

Table 2 shows the Socialization Level of Working and Non-working College Students with respect to Family and School. It shows the mean difference of the students with regards to the four stages of socialization between the two factors. Results reveal that working students have a high mean difference in the area of family as compared to the non-working students. When it comes to the area of family, this

suggests that working students are more open and closer to their family members other than the non-working students. Working students are said to be more intimate to their family members rather than the non-working students since most of the working students work hard and sacrificed a lot to pursue education in order to help their own family in which they are greatly concerned. They earn some money and used these earnings to buy things they want for themselves and their family, save for the future, pay any expenses they have and help pay their own tuition fees. They are able to fully fund their education out of their own pocket instead of asking financial assistance from their parents (Hikks T., 2010).

On the other hand, non-working students' displays a high mean difference in the area of school over the working. Evidently in school, non-working students socialize more than the non-working students because they gain more time to interact with their schoolmates and peers unlike most working students often do. They also have more time to focus on school than work (Hikks T., 2010). The non-working student have more time in their plans which might get out of hand and use the time to have fun and it can take more of their studying time.

However, the weighted mean of each stage appears that both working and non-working students "frequently (with a range of 2.61-3.40)" socialized to areas with respect to family and school. This implies that working and non-working students do not have a difference in their interaction towards these factors since they lie on the same range. Based on Herbert Blumer's Symbolic Interactionism Theory (Nelson, 1998), people interact based on how they look upon other people. They act depending on how they interpret and perceive each individual. In the same manner, Social Penetration Theory (Altman and Taylor, 1973 as cited in Spring 2002 Theory Workbook) states that as relationships develop, communication moves from relatively shallow, non-intimate levels to deeper, more personal ones. In addition, Erik Erickson's stage of "identity vs. identity confusion", it states that the young individuals enter into a period of exploring different roles, values and skills. As part of identity formation, adolescents often affiliate with different groups. It is a time between childhood security and the responsibilities of adulthood. The more time one spends with others, the more likely one is to reveal more intimate thought and details of oneself (The Developmental Psychology Student, n.d.). This may explain why working and non-working college students are of the same level of socialization.

**Table 3**  
**Difference between Working and Non-working College Students in their Level of Socialization: Z-Value, Tabular, Significance and Interpretation**

<b>Socialization Level of Working and Non-working College Students</b>	<b>Computed z-value</b>	<b>Tabular value</b>	<b>Level of Significance</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
	-1.89	-1.96	0.05	Insignificant; Accept the Null Hypothesis

In this study, there were two areas which were being included, and these comprised the family and school. Table 3 shows no significant difference between the socialization level of working and non-working college students of Bohol Island State University in terms of these areas. The result of the z-test which is -1.89 is lower than the tabular value which is -1.96 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. This means that there was no significant difference in the stages of socialization categorized as orientation of interaction, exploratory affective exchange, affective exchange and stable exchange.

In terms of family, Kaufmann and Steinberg (1996, as cited by Ezinga, 2008) stated that young individuals develop psychosocial maturity: 1) the ability to control the own impulses and emotions, 2) the development of autonomy of adolescents in relation to their parents, 3) the increasing capacity to

sympathize and empathize with others and understand other peoples' differing opinions, and 4) an increasing feeling of responsibility to themselves and towards others.

### CONCLUSION

From the findings on the level of socialization of the working and non- working college students, it was concluded that the student status whether working or not, does not affect the level of socialization as this study with the Bohol Island State University Main Campus shows. Also, working and non- working students shows no significant difference in each of the stages of socialization when it comes to family and school.

### REFERENCES

- [1] Altman, I., Brown B., & Vinsel, A. (1981). *Dialectic Conceptions in Social Psychology: An Application to Social Penetration and Privacy Regulation*.
- [2] Blumer, H. (1996). *The Society for More Creative Speech*. Retrieved February 7, 2005, from <http://www.thepoint.net/-usul/text/blumer.html>
- [3] Cooley, C. (1902). *The Looking Glass Self. How Our Self- Image is Shaped by Society*. Retrieved on August 30, 2013 from <http://www.popularscience.com/2013/05/27/the-looking-glass-self-how-our-self-image-is-shaped-by-society/>.
- [4] Erickson, D. (2006). *Adolescents' self-disclosure to parents across cultures: who discloses and why*. Retrieved on September 19, 2013 from <http://jar.sagepub.com/content/26/4/447.refs>.
- [5] Eisenhower (2010). *Child Psychology*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors. Retrieved on September 20,2013.
- [6] Fjortoft, D. (1995). *To work or not to work: The Impact of work on students' college experience*. Retrieved on October [http://www.o cair.org/files/presentations/Paper2003\\_04\\_10](http://www.o cair.org/files/presentations/Paper2003_04_10), 2013 from <http://www.o cair.org/files/presentations/Paper2003-04>
- [7] Greenberger, E. Steinberg, L. (1986). *Adolescents who work: Effects of part-time employment on family and peer relations*. Retrieved on August 25, 2013 from <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF0208846#page-1./forum2004/DavidCheng.pdf>
- [8] Havighurst, J. (2011). *Workplace changes and it's Implications for work family- conflict and gender asymmetries in South Africa*. Retrieved on October 11, 2013 from [http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-01237-7\\_8#page-1](http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-01237-7_8#page-1).
- [9] Hurrelmann, K. (2009). *Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 45(3), May 2009, 740-763. Doi: 10.1037/a0015362. Retrieved on October 10, 2013 from <http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/dev/45/3/740/>.
- [10] La Rossa & Reitzes (1993). *Symbolic Interactionism and family studies*. Retrieved on August 30, 2013 from <http://www.google.com.ph/?gferd=cr&ei=r7NLU6fDGpfc-APn4YDgBg#q=La+Rossa+and+Reitzes%2C+1993+Self+concept>.

- [11] Levinson, D. (1978). Personality theories and development. Retrieved on August 6, 2013 from <https://www.inkling.com/read/lifespan-development-john-w-santrock-13th/chapter-16/personality-theories>
  
- [12] Mckechnie, G. et al. (1986). "Adolescents Perception of the Role of Part-Time Work". Retrieved from: <http://www.questia.com/google Scholar.qst?docid=5000343558>
  
- [13] Mead, G H (1934). The social self -G H Mead. Retrieved on September 19, 2013 from <http://www.cf.ac.uk/socsi/undergraduate/introsoc/social4.html>.