

Factors Affecting Self-Privacy Loss and its Impact on Academic Performance of the Students: a study in Rajshahi University

Dilip Kumar Mondol, PhD*

Abstract— Privacy is the ability of an individual or group to seclude them, or information about themselves, and thereby express them selectively. Education is one of the most important factors which are closely related to the socioeconomic development of a nation. For the improvement of a nation it is essential to improve the education system. On the other hand, students' attitude towards privacy is one of the vital obstacle factors on the way of achieving satisfactory academic performance (AP). The aim of this study is to investigate the factors affecting self-privacy and its impact on AP. Study collected primary data from 250 respondents using structured questionnaire from different departments of Rajshahi University. Descriptive, contingency and binary logistic regression analyses are used to identify the statistical significance of factors affecting self-privacy and its impact on AP. The study has revealed that fathers' occupation, mothers' education, family practice, present residence, importance and awareness for privacy, privacy at SSC and HSC level, relation with friend, privacy loss due to friend and feel uncomfortable due to privacy loss have significant effect on self-privacy as well as the AP. University counseling centers could target deficits in problem solving ability to enhance mood, while faculty and support centers could train problem solving strategies to improve academic functioning. With increased problem solving ability, students may experience greater self-efficacy with managing academic and emotional stresses.

Index Terms— Master students, Privacy, Self-privacy loss, Study, Factors affecting, Academic performance, Rajshahi University.

1 INTRODUCTION

In this era of globalization and technological revolution, education is considered as a first step for every human activity. Education plays a vital role in the development of human capital and is linked with an individual's well-being and opportunities for better living [1], [3]. It ensures the acquisition of knowledge and skills that enable individuals to increase their productivity and improve their quality of life. Increase productivity also leads towards new sources of earning which enhances the economic growth of a country [9]. The quality of students' performance remains at top priority for educators. It is meant for making a difference locally, regionally, nationally and globally. Educators, trainers, and researchers have long been interested in exploring variables contributing effectively for quality of student's academic performance (AP). These variables are inside and outside school that affect students' quality of academic achievement. These factors may be termed as student factors, family factors, school factors and peer factors [5], [13]. Generally these factors include age, gender, geographical belongingness, ethnicity, marital status, socioeconomic status, Unfortunately, defining and measuring the quality of education is not a simple issue and the complexity of this process increases due to the changing values of quality attributes associated with the different stakeholders' view point [4], [8]. Besides other factors, socioeconomic status is one of the most researched and debated factor among educational professionals that contribute towards the AP of students [14]. The most prevalent argument is that the socioeconomic status of learners affects the quality of their Ap. The low socioeconomic status causes environmental deficiencies which results in low self

esteem of students. Numerous studies conducted to examine student retention and propose several theoretical models to explain student retention [15], [16], [19].

Several factors could act as barriers to students' attaining and maintaining a high GPA that reflect their academic performance during their stay in the university. Moreover, better academic competence is not only pivotal in ensuring better AP but also in the likelihood of retaining students in educational institutions [12], [17], [18], [20], [21], [25]. On the other hand, AP and test anxiety were found negatively associated [11], [22], [23], [24], [27]. Anxiety is responsible for lower AP [14], [26]. On the basis of above discussion, it is observed that there is no mentionable study on the self-privacy loss effect on AP of the students. Therefore, the study gap in the present study is self-privacy loss impact on AP of the students. For this reason, the present study intends to investigate the factors affecting students' self-privacy loss and its impact on AP of the students of Rajshahi University.

2 CONCEPT OF TERMINOLOGY

Privacy

Privacy is the ability of an individual or group to seclude themselves or information about themselves, and thereby express themselves selectively. When something is private to a person, it usually means that something is inherently special or sensitive to them. Broadly speaking, privacy is the right to be let alone, or freedom from interference or intrusion. Information privacy is the right to have some control over how your personal information is collected and used. Privacy is a

* Professor, Department of Population Science and Human Resource Development, Rajshahi University, Rajshahi-6205, Bangladesh, PH- +88 01716810701, E-mail: dkmondol.pops@ru.ac.bd

fundamental right, essential to autonomy and the protection of human dignity, serving as the foundation upon which many other human rights are built. Privacy helps us establish boundaries to limit who has access to our bodies, places and things, as well as our communications and our information. The domain of privacy partially overlaps with security, which can include the concepts of appropriate use, as well as protection of information. Privacy may also take the form of bodily integrity. The right not to be subjected to unsanctioned invasions of privacy by the government, corporations or individuals is part of many countries' privacy laws, and in some cases, constitution.

Personal privacy

Most people have a strong sense of privacy in relation to the exposure of their body to others. This is an aspect of personal modesty. A person will go to extreme lengths to protect this personal modesty. At the same time, people are prepared to expose themselves in acts of physical intimacy, but these are confined to exposure in circumstances and of persons of their choosing. Even a discussion of those circumstances is regarded as intrusive and typically unwelcome.

Physical privacy

Physical privacy could be defined as preventing intrusions into one's physical space or solitude. This would include concerns such as preventing intimate acts or hiding one's body from others for the purpose of modesty; apart from being dressed this can be achieved by walls, fences privacy screens, cathedral, glass partitions between urinals by being far away from others, on a bed by a bed sheet or a blanket, when changing clothes by a towel etc.

Medical privacy

Medical privacy protected health information and allows a person to withhold their medical records and other information from others, perhaps because of fears that it might affect their insurance coverage or employment, or to avoid the embarrassment caused by revealing medical conditions or treatments. Medical information could also reveal other aspects of one's personal life, such as sexual preferences or proclivity.

Political privacy

Political privacy has been a concern since voting systems emerged in ancient times. The secret ballot helps to ensure that voters cannot be coerced into voting in certain ways, since they can allocate their vote as they wish in the privacy and security of the voting booth while maintaining the anonymity of the vote.

Internet privacy

Internet privacy is the ability to determine what information one reveals or withholds about oneself over the Internet, who has access to such information, and for what purposes one's information may or may not be used. For example, web users may be concerned to discover that many of the web sites which they visit collect, store, and possibly share personally

identifiable information about them.

3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Objectives of the study are as follows:

- to observe the linkage of background characteristics with self-privacy as well as AP of the students,
- to examine the factors association with self-privacy and AP of the students and
- to identify the significant effect of socioeconomic, demographic and institution related factors on self-privacy and AP of students.

4 DATA AND METHODOLOGY

According to the nature of the study those students who have at least one year study experience about university campus atmosphere. For this reason, students from 2nd year to masters are considered as study respondents. A total of 250 respondents data from different departments of Rajshahi University are collected using purposive sampling method. For direct interview of the respondents a structured questionnaire is used. For data analysis purpose, statistical techniques like descriptive, bivariate and binary logistic regression analysis are used. All analyses are conducted through statistical packages for social sciences SPSS version 20.

5 RESULT

Determine the association between self-privacy loss and the socioeconomic and demographic factors

It is observed from Table 1 that the sex and father age of the respondent have statistically significant association with privacy loss. Joint family systems were widely spread all over the country. But this tradition is breaking down and people are choosing to living with single family. It is found that family types are not statistically significantly associated with personal privacy loss. In case of family practice to express opinion, respondents from conservative (59.3%) and old idea (75.0%) families are lost personal privacy higher than candid, modern and others mentalities. A significant association is found between family practice and personal privacy loss. So it may conclude that family view is an important matter for protect personal privacy loss (Table 1). Awareness about privacy loss from school and college study period have vital role on personal privacy loss at higher study period. This study reveals that privacy awareness of the respondents at SSC and HSC level is statistically significantly associated with personal privacy loss. About 47.0% respondents are lost their personal privacy due to angry for noisy surrounding environment and only 22.6% loss their personal privacy who are not angry. Feeling angry for surrounding noisy environment and family conscious for result are statistically significantly associated with personal privacy loss.

Table 1: Demographic and socioeconomic characteristics and privacy consciousness association with self-privacy loss during school and college level study period

Background characteristics	Self-privacy loss		Background characteristics	Self-privacy loss	
	No (%)	Yes (%)		No (%)	Yes (%)
Age group			Marital status		
21-23	89(63.1)	52(36.9)	Unmarried	127(60.8)	82(39.2)
24-26	64(58.7)	45(41.3)	Married	26(63.4)	15(36.6)
Sex*			Mother age		
Male	63(54.8)	52(45.2)	33-49	112(61.2)	71(38.8)
Female	90(66.7)	45(33.3)	50-59	38(61.3)	24(38.7)
			60+	3(60.0)	2(40.0)
Religion status			Mother's occup.		
Islam	125(59.2)	86(40.8)	House wife	140(61.9)	86(38.1)
Hindu	28(71.8)	11(28.2)	Employment	13(56.5)	10(43.5)
			Other	0(0.0)	1(100)
Father age*			Family income		
40-49	30(56.6)	23(43.4)	Very low	10(66.7)	5(33.3)
50-59	101(66.9)	50(33.1)	Low	37(62.7)	22(37.3)
60+	22(47.8)	24(52.2)	Medium	58(59.2)	40(40.8)
			High	48(61.5)	30(38.5)
Father's occup.			Mother's edu.		
Day labor	6(85.7)	1(14.3)	Illiterate	9(64.3)	5(35.7)
Household	20(52.6)	18(47.4)	Primary	52(55.9)	41(44.1)
Employment	65(64.4)	36(35.6)	SSC	50(61.7)	31(38.3)
Business	43(58.9)	30(41.1)	HSC	22(68.8)	10(31.2)
Other	19(61.3)	12(38.7)	Higher	20(66.7)	10(33.3)
Father's edu.			Family expences		
Illiterate	8(88.9)	1(11.1)	Very low	15(83.3)	3(16.7)
Primary	26(52.0)	24(48.0)	Low	43(58.1)	31(41.9)
SSC	35(60.3)	23(39.7)	Medium	56(57.7)	41(42.3)
HSC	29(63.0)	17(37.0)	High	39(63.9)	22(36.1)
Higher	55(63.2)	32(36.8)			
Family types			Family practice**		
Single	126(60.6)	82(39.4)	Conservative	11(40.7)	16(59.3)
Joint	26(63.4)	15(36.6)	Old idea	3(25.0)	9(75.0)
Others	1(100)	0(0.0)	Candid	53(66.2)	27(33.8)
			Modern idea	75(67.0)	37(33.0)
			others	11(57.9)	8(42.1)
Permanent residence			Edu. cost source		
Town	44(64.7)	24(35.3)	Father	138(62.7)	82(37.3)
village	84(58.3)	60(41.7)	Brother	9(69.2)	4(30.8)
Uppuzela	25(67.6)	12(32.4)	Sister	0(0.0)	1(100)
Others	0(0.0)	1(100)	Education loan	1(20.0)	4(80.0)
			Others	5(45.5)	6(54.5)
Satisfy for SSC & HSC result			Angry for noisy environment?***		
No	82(63.1)	48(36.9)	No	65(77.4)	19(22.6)
Yes	71(59.2)	49(40.8)	Yes	88(53.0)	78(47.0)
Privacy at SSC & HSC**			Family conscious for result***		
Quiet	79(69.9)	34(30.1)	No	7(33.3)	14(66.7)
Noisy	9(47.4)	10(52.6)	Yes	146(63.8)	83(36.2)
Single	42(51.9)	39(48.1)			
Two more	23(62.2)	14(37.8)			

Note: > 5000.00 Tk. = very low, 5000.00-10000.00 Tk = low, 11000.00-20000.00 Tk = medium , 21000.00+ Tk. = high; * indicate 0.05; ** indicate 0.01 and *** indicate 0.001 level of significance

Determine the association between AP and the demographic, socioeconomic and self-privacy loss related factors

Table 2 contains the family practice to express opinion, conservative (63.0%) and old idea (58.3%) family holder respondents AP are more affected than candid (40.0%), modern (33.9%) and others (21.1%) mentalities. A significant association is found between family practice and personal privacy loss affect to AP. So it may conclude that family view is an important matter for protect personal privacy loss as well as better AP. Student feels trouble for surrounding noisy environment. It is found that feeling angry for noisy environment is statistically significantly associated with personal privacy loss effect on AP and loss self-privacy due to others causes is also significantly associated with personal privacy loss effect on AP. From Table 2 it is found that face any problem with roommate of the respondent is statistically significantly associated with personal privacy loss effect on Ap. It is also found that angry for privacy loss, privacy loss in RU and upset for privacy loss are statistically significantly associated with per-

sonal privacy loss effect on AP (Table 2).

Conscious about self-privacy is an important stage for human life as well as student life. It is revealed that consciousness about self-privacy of the respondent is statistically significantly associated with personal privacy loss effect on AP. Again, loss self-privacy due to others purpose of the respondents is also found statistically significantly associated with personal privacy loss effect on AP. Face trouble in study for privacy loss of the respondent is statistically significantly associated with personal privacy loss effect on AP. Felling upset for privacy loss of the respondent is statistically significant associated with personal privacy loss effect on AP. It is found that privacy loss cause of painful life in campus of the respondent is statistically significant associated with personal privacy loss effect on AP. It is evident from Table 2 that privacy loss affect future life is statistically significantly associated with personal privacy loss effect on AP. Share result with friends and other works harmful for AP of the respondent are statistically significantly associated with personal privacy loss effect on AP.

Table 2: Association of the demographic, socioeconomic and personal privacy loss related factors with AP

Background characteristics	Self-privacy loss effect on AP		Background characteristics	Self-privacy loss effect on AP	
	No (%)	Yes (%)		No (%)	Yes (%)
Age			Sex		
21-23	87(61.7)	54(38.3)	Male	65(56.5)	50(43.5)
24-26	65(59.6)	44(40.4)	Female	87(64.4)	48(35.6)
Religion			Marital status		
Islam	129(61.1)	82(38.9)	Unmarried	126(60.3)	83(39.7)
Hindu	23(59.0)	16(41.0)	Married	26(63.4)	15(36.6)
Father age			Mother age		
40-49	29(54.7)	24(45.3)	33-49	107(58.5)	76(41.5)
50-59	93(61.6)	58(38.4)	50-59	42(67.7)	20(32.3)
60+	30(65.2)	16(34.8)	60+	3(60.0)	2(40.0)
Fathers edu.			Mothers edu.		
Illiterate	6(66.7)	3(33.3)	Illiterate	7(50.0)	7(50.0)
Primary	31(62.0)	19(38.0)	Primary	59(63.4)	34(36.6)
SSC	37(63.8)	21(36.2)	SSC	47(58.0)	34(42.0)
HSC	24(52.2)	22(47.8)	HSC	20(62.5)	12(37.5)
Higher	54(62.1)	33(37.9)	Higher study	19(63.3)	11(36.7)
Fathers occup.			Mothers occup.		
Day labor	6(85.7)	1(14.3)	House wife	139(61.5)	87(38.5)
Household	23(60.5)	15(39.5)	Employment	12(52.2)	11(47.8)
Employment	60(59.4)	41(40.6)	Other	1(100)	0(0.0)
Business	42(57.5)	31(42.5)			
Other	21(67.7)	10(32.3)			
Family income			Family expenses		
Very low	11(73.3)	4(26.7)	Very low	12(66.7)	6(33.3)
Low	40(67.8)	19(32.2)	Low	53(71.6)	21(28.4)
Medium	56(57.1)	42(42.9)	Medium	52(53.6)	45(46.4)
High	45(57.7)	33(42.3)	High	35(57.4)	26(42.6)
Problem with roommate?*			Other works harmful for AP**		
No	128(65.3)	68(34.7)	No	125(67.9)	59(32.1)
Yes	24(44.4)	30(55.6)	Yes	27(40.9)	39(59.1)

Table 2: (continued)

Background characteristics	Self-privacy loss effect on AP		Background characteristics	Self-privacy loss effect on AP	
	No (%)	Yes (%)		No (%)	Yes (%)
Family types Single Joint Others	128(61.5) 23(56.1) 1(100)	80(38.5) 18(43.9) 0(0.0)	Family practice** Conservative Old Candid Modern others	10(37.0) 5(41.7) 48(60.0) 74(66.1) 15(78.9)	17(63.0) 7(58.3) 32(40.0) 38(33.9) 4(21.1)
Permanent res. Town village Uppuzela Others	41(60.3) 88(61.1) 23(62.2) 0(0.0)	27(39.7) 56(38.9) 14(37.8) 1(100)	Education cost Father Brother Sister Education loan Others	133(60.5) 9(69.2) 0(0.0) 2(40.0) 8(72.7)	87(39.5) 4(30.8) 1(100) 3(60.0) 3(27.3)
Satisfy for SSC and HSC result No Yes	79(60.8) 73(60.8)	51(39.2) 47(39.2)	Angry fro noisy environ-ment?*** No Yes	62(73.8) 90(54.2)	22(26.2) 76(45.8)
Privacy at SSC and HSC Quiet Noisy Single Two more	73(64.6) 7(36.8) 47(58.0) 25(67.6)	40(35.4) 12(63.2) 34(42.0) 12(32.4)	Loss self-privacy due to others *** No Yes	132(70.2) 20(32.3)	56(29.8) 42(67.7)
Angry for privacy loss?*** No Yes	111(72.5) 41(42.3)	42(27.5) 56(57.7)	Upset for privacy loss*** No Yes	83(81.4) 69(46.6)	19(18.6) 79(53.4)
Present residence Hall Mess Own home Other	97(66.4) 32(51.6) 20(52.6) 3(75.0)	49(33.6) 30(48.4) 18(47.4) 1(25.0)	Privacy loss affect future life*** No Yes	122(74.8) 30(34.5)	41(25.2) 57(65.5)
Living room Single Double Three plus	38(60.3) 33(53.2) 81(64.8)	25(39.7) 29(46.8) 44(35.2)	privacy loss cause of pain-ful life in campus*** No Yes	124(74.3) 28(33.7)	43(25.7) 55(66.3)
Relation with roommate Good Very good Bad Very bad	93(60.0) 57(62.6) 1(100) 1(33.3)	62(40.0) 34(37.7) 0(0.0) 2(66.7)	Share result with friend** No Yes	51(51.0) 101(67.3)	49(49.0) 49(32.7)
Loss privacy in RU*** No Yes	136(68.0) 16(32.0)	64(32.0) 34(68.0)	privacy loss solve Personally Share with friend Share with teacher Sharewith parent/relative	80(65.0) 47(54.7) 0(0.0) 25(64.1)	43(35.0) 39(45.3) 2(100) 14(35.9)
Does roommate respect you? No Yes	19(51.4) 133(62.4)	18(48.6) 80(37.6)	Aware for self-privacy?* Very much Much Little Very little	77(56.6) 61(67.8) 7(43.8) 7(87.5)	59(43.4) 29(32.2) 9(56.2) 1(12.5)
Is self-privacy im- portant? No Yes	7(50.0) 145(61.4)	7(50.0) 91(38.6)			

Determine the factors effect on self-privacy loss

From Table 3 it is seen that the female respondents have 0.455 times less effect on privacy loss than male and it is statistically significant. It is revealed that respondents fathers' occupational status service, business and others have 29%, 21% and 62% higher effect on privacy loss than whose father is farmer. It is also found that the effect of business and other occupations on privacy loss are statistically significant. Again Table 3 contains that the odds ratio of family practice old idea, candid and modern idea have 0.240, 0.106 and 0.112 times less effect and others have 1.054 times higher effect on privacy loss. It is also found that all types of family practice have found high statistical significant effect on privacy loss except old idea. It is observed from Table 3 that the roommate does not respect privacy have 0.220 times less effect on privacy loss and it is highly statistically significant. Relation with friend not good is found statistically significant effect on privacy loss.

Determine the factors and self-privacy loss effect on AP of the students

Table 3 depicts that the odds ratio of present residence mess and own home are 1.248 and 0.499 respectively indicate that mess and own home present residence have 1.248 times higher and 0.499 times less effect than hall on AP. Both types of pre-

sent residence are found statistically significantly effect on AP. Both importance and awareness of self-privacy have found statistically significant effect on AP. The odds ratio of privacy is not important is 0.143 indicate that respondents have 0.143 times less effect on AP than those have privacy importance. Similarly, the odds ratio of don't aware for privacy is 2.755 indicate that respondents have 176% higher effect on AP than those are aware about privacy. From Table 3 it is seen that the odds ratio 1.603 of relation with friend is not good implies that the relation with friend has 60% more effect on. From Table 3 it is observed that the odds ratio of privacy at SSC &HSC are 2.059 and 0.626 implies that privacy at SSC &HSC level have 2.059 times higher and 0.626 times less effect on AP. and the result is statistically significant. Privacy loss due to friend has significant effect on AP and respondents AP have 494% higher risk to be affected. Similarly, study problem due to self-privacy loss, privacy loss make upset and feel uncomfortable due to privacy loss have significant effect on AP of the respondents. Respondents AP have 126%, 185% and 231% higher risk to be affected due to study problem due to self-privacy loss, self-privacy loss make upset and feel uncomfortable due to privacy loss respectively.

Table 3: Binary logistic regression estimates for Model-I (factors effect on self-privacy loss) and Model-II (factors and self-privacy loss effect on AP)

Independent variables	Model-I	Model-II
	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Odds ratio (95% CI)
Sex		
Male ^{RC}	1.000	1.000
Female	0.455* (0.206 – 1.007)	0.925 (0.411 – 2.081)
Religion		
Islam	1.000	1.000
Hindu	1.020 (0.375 – 2.773)	1.266 (0.448 – 3.356)
Marital status		
Unmarried ^{RC}	1.000	1.000
Married	1.176 (0.441 – 3.136)	0.482 (0.168 – 1.380)
Fathers Occu.		
Farmer ^{RC}	1.000	1.000
Service	1.278 (0.388 – 4.211)	0.732 (0.232 – 2.311)
Business	1.212* (0.395 – 3.723)	0.679 (0.221 – 2.081)
Others	1.619** (0.408 – 6.419)	0.205* (0.045 – 0.929)
Mothers edu.		
Illiterate ^{RC}	1.000	1.000
Primary	0.405 (0.095 – 1.724)	1.152 (0.271 – 4.895)
SSC	0.418 (0.086 – 2.030)	1.186 (0.253 – 5.571)
HSC	0.473 (0.074 – 2.034)	0.632 (0.102 – 3.928)
Higher	0.412 (0.059 – 2.896)	1.070 (0.184 – 6.231)
Family types		
Nuclear ^{RC}	1.000	1.000
Joint	0.657 (0.252 – 1.718)	0.973 (0.357 – 2.649)
Family practice		
Conservative ^{RC}	1.000	1.000
Old idea	0.240 (0.042 – 1.382)	2.223 (0.284 – 9.391)
Candid	0.106*** (0.033 – 0.342)	1.781 (0.497 – 6.375)
Modern idea	0.112*** (0.036 – 0.344)	1.065 (0.313 – 3.623)
Other	1.054*** (0.007 – 0.406)	0.434 (0.073 – 2.597)

Note: * indicates 0.05, ** indicates 0.005 and *** indicate 0.000 significance level ; RC is reference category

Table 3: (continued)

Independent variables	Model-I	Model-II
	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Odds ratio (95% CI)
Permanent residence		
Village ^{RC}	1.000	1.000
Upozila	1.284 (0.493 – 3.345)	0.598 (0.235 – 1.524)
City	0.499 (0.120 – 2.068)	1.285 (0.420 – 3.927)
Present residence		
Hall ^{RC}	1.000	1.000
Mess	1.284 (0.493 – 3.345)	2.868* (0.977 – 8.421)
Own home	0.499 (0.120 – 2.068)	1.834* (0.468 – 7.181)
Education cost		
Father ^{RC}	1.000	1.000
Not father	1.150 (0.385 – 3.434)	0.760 (0.235 – 2.457)
Living room		
Single ^{RC}	1.000	1.000
Double	1.672 (0.559 – 5.002)	1.354 (0.456 – 4.016)
Two more	1.366** (0.399 – 4.674)	1.249 (0.351 – 4.454)
Disturb by roommate		
Yes ^{RC}	1.000	1.000
No	1.724 (0.713 – 4.255)	1.708 (0.586 – 4.977)
Roommate respect privacy		
Yes ^{RC}	1.000	1.000
No	0.220*** (0.086 – 0.560)	2.451 (0.729 – 8.249)
Privacy important to you		
Yes ^{RC}	1.000	1.000
No	0.574 (0.122 – 2.690)	0.143** (0.031 – 0.657)
Do you aware for privacy?		
Yes ^{RC}	1.000	1.000
No	0.679* (0.322 – 1.434)	2.755** (1.248- 6.079)
Relation with friend?		
Good ^{RC}	1.000	1.000
Not good	0.508* (0.232 – 1.111)	1.603* (0.713 – 3.601)
Privacy at SSC & HSC		
Quiet ^{RC}		1.000
Noisy		1.600 (0.306 – 8.359)
Single		2.059* (0.892 – 4.749)
Two more		0.626* (0.208 – 1.883)
Angry for noisy		
Yes ^{RC}		1.000
No		1.889 (0.876 – 4.072)
Privacy loss in RU campus		
Yes ^{RC}		1.000
No		1.908 (0.680 – 5.349)
Privacy loss due to friend		
Yes		1.000
No		5.940*** (2.343 – 15.056)
Study problem due to privacy loss		
Yes		1.000
No		2.260* (0.986 – 5.180)
Privacy loss make upset		
Yes		1.000
No		2.851* (1.115 – 7.290)
Feel uncomfortable due to privacy loss		
Yes		1.000
No		3.306*** (1.365 – 8.007)

Note: * indicates 0.05, ** indicates 0.005 and *** indicate 0.000 significance level ; RC is reference category

6 DISCUSSION

This study is conducted to examine the factors influencing self-privacy loss and its impact on AP of the students' of Rajshahi University. This process of identification of factors must be given full attention and priority so that the teachers may be able to develop instructional strategies for making sure that all the students be provided with the opportunities to arrive at their fullest potential in learning and performance. Study reveals that sex, fathers' occupation and family practice are significantly associated with self-privacy loss of the students. It means self-privacy loss of the students' are very much depends on their family practice and social position. This finding is supported by the previous study [2], [7]. A significant association of noisy environment, self-privacy loss due to others, angry and upset for self-privacy loss, self-privacy loss painful and awareness of self-privacy loss with AP of students indicates that they have higher chances to face bad AP during study period. This study is also found that Fathers occupation, family practice, living room size, roommate respects, relation with friend and awareness for self-privacy loss have significant effect on self-privacy loss of the students during University study period. This finding is similar with previous study [6], [12]. Present residence, importance and awareness of self-privacy loss, relation with friend, privacy at school and college level study period, privacy loss due to friend and feel uncomfortable due to self-privacy loss have significant effect on AP of the students'. This is also similar with previous study [22], [23], [24], [26], [27].

7 CONCLUSION

The privacy and AP is one of the determinants of academic achievement motivation. An academically favorable environment is likely to enhance the student motivation to achieve academic success which in turns will contribute to good performance in University. The aim of the study is to investigate the factors affecting self-privacy loss and its effect on AP of the students of Rajshahi University on the basis of the authors' survey data. A throughout investigation and constructive analysis have performed for the assigned factors and the results are reported in the result discussion section. Firstly, association of self-privacy loss and AP with considered socioeconomic and self-privacy loss related factors have justified using contingency analysis. Secondly, two binary logistic regression model is applied separately, one for estimate the factors effect on self-privacy loss and another for estimate the effect of factors and self-privacy loss on AP of the respondents. The study revealed that family practice, noisy environment, fathers occupation and previous self-privacy loss have significant effect on present privacy loss and as well as AP of the respondents. On the other hand, present residences, importance of privacy, awareness of privacy, relation with friend and privacy loss due to friend have significant effect on AP of the respondents. The respondents with mental problem due to privacy related reason have vital effect on AP of the respondents. As therefore, it is necessary to provide information about the awareness of the importance of self-privacy and its bad impact on personal life as well as AP.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors wish to thank the respondents and the data collector for their patience and cooperation. Special thanks to Masters Students of the University of Rajshahi as study area for allowing the data collectors and providing the information.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ali, N. J.; Ali, K.; Najah, S. M. and Andin, S. A. S. (2009). "The Factors Influencing Students' Performance at University Teknologi MARA Kedah, Malaysia". *Canadian Research & Development Center of Sciences and Cultures*, Vol.3 No.4.
- [2] Barnard, W. M. (2004). "Parent involvement in elementary university and educational attainment", *Children and Youth Services Review*, 26, 39- 62.
- [3] Battle, J., & Lewis, M. (2002). "The increasing significance of class: The relative effects of race and socioeconomic status on academic achievement", *Journal of Poverty*, 6(2), 21-35.
- [4] Blevins, B. M. (2009). "Effects of socioeconomic status on academic performance in Missouri public university. Retrieved", from <http://gradworks.umi.com/3372318.pdf>
- [5] Crosnoe, R., Johnson, M. K., & Elder, G. H. (2004). "University size and the interpersonal side of education: An examination of race/ethnicity and organizational context", *Social Science Quarterly*, 85(5), 1259-1274.
- [6] Eamon, M. K. (2005). "Social demographic, school, neighborhood and parenting influences on academic achievement of Latino young adolescents", *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 34(2), 163-175.
- [7] Hanes, B. (2008). "The exploration of socioeconomic status and student achievement at Beverly elementary university", Mariette University.
- [8] Parri, J. (2006). "Quality in higher education", (11), 107-111.
- [9] Saxton, J. (2000). Investment in education: Private and public returns. Retrieved from <http://www.house.gov/jec/educ.pdf>. Shumox, L., & Lomax, R. (2001). "Parental efficacy: Predictor of parenting behavior and adolescent outcomes", *Parenting*, 2(2), 127-150.
- [10] Tinto, V. (1975). "Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research", *Review of Educational Research*, 45(1), 89-125.
- [11] Topman, R. M., Kleijn, W., Ploeg, H. M., and Masse! E. A. (1992). "Test anxiety, cognitions, study habits, and academic performance: A prospective study", *Advances in Test Anxiety Research*, 7, 221-241.
- [12] Tsinidou, M., Gerogiannis, V., & Fitsilis, P. (2010). "Evaluation of the factors that determine quality in higher education: an empirical study", *Quality Assurance in Education*, 18(3), 227-244.
- [13] West, C., & Sadoski, M. (2011). "Do study strategies predict academic performance in medical school"? *Medical Education*, 45, 696-703.
- [14] Womble, L. P. (2003). "Impact of stress factors on college students' academic performance. Undergraduate", *Journal of Psychology*, 16 (1), 16-23.
- [15] Pascarella, E. T. (1980). Student-faculty informal contact and college outcomes. *Review of educational research*, 50(4), 545. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543050004545>
- [16] Spady, W. (1971). Dropouts from higher education: Toward an empirical model. *Interchange*, 2(3), 38-62. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02282469>
- [17] Bean, J. P. (1985, Spring). Interaction effects based on class level in an

- explanatory model of college student dropout syndrome. *American Educational Research Journal*, 22(1): 35-64.
- [18] Adelman, C. (1999). *Answers in the tool box: Academic intensity, attendance patterns, and bachelor's degree attainment*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education Research and Improvements, U.S. Department of Education
- [19] Bean, J. P. (1986). Assessing and reducing attrition. In D. H. O'Sler (Ed.), *Managing College Enrollments: Number 53. New Directions for Higher Education* (pp. 47-61). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- [20] Fletcher, J. (1998). *A study of factors affecting advancement and graduation for engineering students* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Auburn University, Auburn, USA..
- [21] Ishitani, T., & Desjardins, S. (2002). A longitudinal investigation of dropout from college in the United States. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory, and Practice*, 4(2), 173-201.
- [22] Sieber, J. E. (1980). *Defining test anxiety: Problems and approaches*. In I. G. Sarason (Ed.), *Test anxiety: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 15- 42). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [23] Seipp, B. (1991). Anxiety and academic performance: A meta-analysis of findings. *Anxiety Research*, 4, 27-41
- [24] Sarason, I. G. (1980). *Test Anxiety: Theory, research, and applications*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.
- [25] Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research*, 45(1), 89-125.
- [26] Zeidner, M. (1990). Does test anxiety bias scholastic aptitude test performance by gender and socio-cultural group? *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 55, 145-160. doi: 10.1080/00223891.1990.9674054
- [27] Hembree, R. (1998). Correlates, causes, effects, and treatment of test anxiety. *Review of Educational Research*, 58, 47-77.

IJSER