

## Quality of life Among College students

**Dr. Swapana Ramachandran**

Associate Professor

Department of Psychology, University College, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala, India

**Anuroop.D**

PG Research Student

Department of Psychology, University College, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala, India

### **Abstract**

*Quality of life is the general well-being of individuals and societies, outlining negative and positive features of life. It observes life satisfaction, including everything from physical health, family, education, employment, wealth, safety, security to freedom, religious beliefs, and the environment. The sample was selected using purposive sampling techniques and sample was taken from Thiruvananthapuram, Kollam, Alappuzha and Kottayam districts. 204 college students participated in this study. The assessment tool used in the present study was the Quality of life scale by Jamila K. Warriar and Dr.H. Sam Sananda Raj. The study employs a correlational research design. For analyzing the data, statistical tests such as ANOVA and post-hoc comparisons were used. Result also shows that quality of life has a significance difference with regard to socio demographic variables such as course of study, family type and socioeconomic status*

**Key Words:** *Quality of life, Sociodemographic variables, College Students*

### **Introduction**

The WHO, holds Quality of life to be an individual's perception of their position in life within their cultural context and system of values, and in relation to their ambitions, expectations, principles and concerns.

According to the WHO definition of Quality of life, a number of key characteristics emerge:

- QoL does not refer to the real, objective conditions in which the subject lives, but to their personal experience of those conditions.
- That personal experience may change over the course of the subject's lifetime.
- Each individual may make a different appraisal, depending on their experiences, needs and desires.
- The cultural context and the reference value system must be taken into account.

All these complex characteristics lead to the difficulty of measuring QoL, because its evaluation has to take into account all of these aspects. In recent years, evaluations of QoL have grown more focused on the subjective component than on the analysis of objective variables that are external to the subject. Psychology therefore has a great deal to offer to the study of QoL, in terms of explaining how subjects perceive QoL, which processes enable to experience satisfaction and what elements constitute such an experience.

Furthermore, it is not theoretically clear whether QoL should be defined comprehensively or as a concept arising from a combination of various dimensions. As a result, there is a lack of methodological unanimity as far as measuring QoL is concerned. The instruments proposed to that end thus include those that provide a single measurement referring to the general satisfaction of the individual, and others that assess different dimensions separately. The dimensions in question usually include physical and mental health, social interaction and emotional state. In the case of multidimensional instruments, a distinction is made between those developed for general application, regardless of the pathologies from which the population under assessment may be

suffering, and those designed specifically to evaluate the QoL of populations with a particular pathology.

In fact, more often than is not, the concept of QoL has been linked with the concept of health and with the new biopsychosocial model. This model is meant to overcome the traditional biomedical model that focuses on disease, its diagnosis and its treatment and, coming from a more inclusive standpoint, considers the boundaries between health and disease as being more diffuse, as in the case of chronic diseases. From the standpoint of this model, the objective would be to promote a longer and more satisfactory life, emphasizing in particular the quality of life. It is therefore common in this context to use the term health-related quality of life (HRQoL). Consequently, this new model understands health as being the result of interplay among physical, psychological and social factors in everyday life, i.e. the lifestyle of people, which plays a crucial role in the development of many of the diseases they suffer. From a psychosocial approach, the concept of lifestyle refers to patterns of behavior shared by a social group related to the values, customs and fashions prevalent in a given time. Thus, the social and cultural context largely determines the lifestyle of people, and major changes in this context in turn generate changes in lifestyle. Consequently, the climate of change that advanced societies are experiencing in the information society is generating a rich debate about the dangers, challenges and opportunities associated with this change. Thus, information overload, the need to manage this avalanche of information, its rapid obsolescence and how technology keeps us connected to work regardless of time or place, are all traits that lead us to doubt whether the network society favors a healthier lifestyle, or whether it instead generates a series of conditions that make such a lifestyle more difficult to achieve.

From the 70s, the assessment of QoL grew, with a coherent theoretical framework, established methods and various applications. In recent years, the assessment of QoL became useful to determine the impact of illnesses/diseases and many interventions. However, little attention has been given to QoL of university students during their educational process, which is recognized as a high-stress period. The said somatic events can cause damage to human QoL, a fact that has generated interest in the causes and methods used to mitigate the stress, as well as ways to sustain a good QoL. Excessive and continuous stress has effects that go beyond the mere health commitment, being the onset to the development of many diseases. The demands of modern life have often caused the onset of somatic events in young people (i.e., adolescents), so the endogenous and exogenous demands interact to affect negatively the academic performance and achievement of the students. The emotions experienced in the academic environment are known to be related to important outcomes, such as academic adaptation and success, and also to the student health and well-being. However, factors such as anxiety and stress can lead to poor academic performance and illness.

Therefore the quality of life is supposed to be an important factor in a student's academic life as well as personality development. Quality of life of college students is very important in order to tackle the physical, mental, social problems as early as possible to produce future leaders for the future developed nation.

### **Objective**

To understand the difference in Quality of life among adolescents with regard to sociodemographic variables like course of study ,family type and socioeconomic status.

## Hypotheses

There will be significant difference in Quality of life among adolescents with regard to sociodemographic variables like stream of study, family type and socioeconomic status

## Method

The sample for the present study consisted of 200 college students. The sample for the present study were collected from the districts Thiruvananthapuram, Kollam, Alappuzha and Kottayam using purposive sampling technique. The assessment tool used in the present study was the Quality of life scale by Jamila K. Warriar and Dr.H. Sam Sananda Raj.

## Statistical Analysis

The data collected was analysed with the help of SPSS .. For analyzing the data, statistical tests like ANOVA and post-hoc comparisons were used.

## Results

*Table 1: quality of life with respect to course of study*

Course of study	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig.
UG	67	100.985	15.530		
PG	123	110.073	13.370	6.80	.000
M.Phil	8	108.625	13.814		
Ph.D	6	97.50	16.404		

Summary of One-way ANOVA presented in the table 24 indicate the score of quality of life differ with respect to course of study,  $F = 6.80$ ,  $p < .05$ . Therefore the hypothesis “there is a

significant difference in quality of life of college students with respect to course of study” is accepted.

**Table 2:** Comparing variables using post hoc test

<i>(I)course of study</i>	<i>(J)course of study</i>	<i>Mean difference (I-J)</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
<i>UG</i>	<i>PG</i>	-9.088*	.000
	<i>M.Phil</i>	-7.639	.152
	<i>Ph.D</i>	3.485	.566
<i>PG</i>	<i>UG</i>	9.088*	.000
	<i>M.Phil</i>	1.448	.780
	<i>Ph.D</i>	12.573*	.036
<i>M.Phil</i>	<i>UG</i>	7.639	.152
	<i>PG</i>	-1.448	.780
	<i>Ph.D</i>	11.125	.149
<i>Ph.D</i>	<i>UG</i>	-3.485	.566
	<i>PG</i>	-12.573*	.036
	<i>M.Phil</i>	-11.125	.149

It is found that there is a significant difference in quality of life with respect to course of study and through post hoc test that the significant difference is found between the courses “UG-PG and PG- PhD”.

**Table3:** quality of life with respect to family type

Family type	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig.
Joint	27	113.037	14.132		
Nuclear	168	105.839	14.517	3.11	.046
Single parent	9	102.888	18.731		

Summary of One-way ANOVA presented in the table 26 indicate the score of quality of life differ with respect to family type,  $F = 3.11$ ,  $p < .05$ . Therefore the hypothesis “there is a significant difference in quality of life of college students with respect to family type” is accepted.

**Table 4:** comparing variables using post hoc test

(I)Family type	(J)family type	Mean difference	Sig.
(I-J)			
joint	Nuclear	7.197*	.019
	Single parent	10.148	.074

<i>nuclear</i>	<i>joint</i>	-7.197*	.019
	<i>Single parent</i>	2.950	.557
<i>Single parent</i>	<i>joint</i>	-10.148	.074
	<i>nuclear</i>	-2.950	.557

It is found that there is a significant difference in quality of life with respect to family type and through post hoc test that the significant difference is found between the family types “joint-nuclear”.

**Table 5:** quality of life with respect to socio economic status

Socio economic status	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig.
Upper	6	98.83	14.020		
Middle	188	107.54	14.640	4.529	.012
Low	10	94.80	13.130		

**Table 6:** comparing variables using post hoc

(I)socio economic status	(J)socio economic status	Mean difference (I-J)	Sig.
<i>upper</i>	<i>middle</i>	-8.079	.151
	<i>lower</i>	4.033	.592

---

<i>middle</i>	<i>upper</i>	8.709	.151
	<i>lower</i>	12.742*	.008
<i>lower</i>	<i>upper</i>	-4.033	.592
	<i>middle</i>	-12.742*	.008

---

Summary of One-way ANOVA presented in the table 28 indicate the score of quality of life differ with respect to socio economic status,  $F = 4.529$ ,  $p < .05$ . Therefore the hypothesis “there is a significant difference in quality of life of college students with respect to socio economic status” accepted.

It is found that there is a significant difference in quality of life with respect to socio economic status and through post hoc test that the significant difference is found between the socio-economic status “middle-lower”

### Discussion

Table 1 indicates that the quality of life of college students was found to have significant difference on the basis of socio demographic variable course of study. Therefore the hypothesis “there is a significant difference in quality of life with respect to course of study” is accepted. From ANOVA we can see that PG students possess a higher quality of life than other three courses. From table 2, through post hoc comparison, there exist a significant relationship is found between the UG-PG and PG-PhD. Comparing with UG students, PG Students have higher rate of quality of life, because PG students have more knowledge about the subject than the UG students. And they have more academic experience that of UG students. Comparing PhD

Students with PG students, it also shows that PG students are higher in quality of life than the PhD students. The result may be affected by sample size.

Quality of life of college students was found to have significant difference with respect to socio demographic variable which is depicted in table 3. Therefore the hypothesis “there is a significant difference in quality of life with respect to family type” is accepted. From table 3, we can see that joint family have a higher impact in quality of life than nuclear family and single parent. From the post hoc comparison, it was found that the significant difference was found between joint family-nuclear family. With comparing to nuclear family, joint family have higher quality of life. Because joint family gives an atmosphere where an individual’s thought process forms a good shape. Grandparents play a special role in teaching children ground rules about how to treat others in a healthy and better way. Children growing under grandparent’s supervision have a balanced set of mind with regard to behavior such as obedience, sacrifice, selflessness, sympathy and other important values. Children grow up to be emotionally stronger and mature than children growing in nuclear families. They also tend to build a stronger conscience and they have a sense of unity and affection. These advantages of growing in a joint family will increase the quality of life of student. Kumar and Tiwari (2016) conducted a study to examine the influence of family structure and family experiences on psychological differentiation in Indian environmental context. Two types of families, joint and nuclear were selected from the rural and urban region of India. The study was found that Family effect was statistically significant on religiosity, quality of life and happiness. In both family types, good family relationships such as care and warmth from spouses and family members could lead to closeness, sense of security and perceived love and then to happiness in life and a good quality of life. Quality of life is an individual factor. It depends upon the happiness and contentedness of an

individual, which in turn depends upon the people around the individual. Hence, the role of family. If there is no strong relation to other family members, people feel lonely and depressed and that reduces their quality of life. Netuveli et al. (2006) studied the quality of life at older ages, and found that the quality of life was improved by having trusting relationships with family and friends, frequent contacts with friends, life in good neighborhoods.

Table 5 indicates that the socio-economic status of college students was found to have significant difference in quality of life. Therefore the hypothesis “there is a significant difference in quality of life with respect to socio-economic status” is accepted. From the result, we can see that students who belongs to middle class show higher quality of life than the other two groups. Through post hoc comparison, which is depicted in table 6 it can be seen that the significant difference was found between middle class-low class. Middle class shows a high Rate of quality of life than the low class. Belonging to a middle-class family, children know the value of every single rupee, and we know how to wait for the things to happen, we knew the value of time and most importantly discipline and no lazying around. The sample size was not equally distributed, this may be affected the result of the present study. Keyvanara, Khasti, et al., (2015) aimed at studying the QOL in relation to socioeconomic status of the general population of Isfahan in 1390. And the result showed that there is a direct and significant relationship between quality of life and socioeconomic status variables in Isfahan. Another study conducted by Brennan et al., (2013) investigated the relationship between socioeconomic status (SES) and reported perceptions of quality of life (QOL) in a cross-sectional population-based analysis of a representative sample of Australian men. And the result show that Men from lower and upper SES groups have lower QOL compared to their counterparts in the mid SES group.

## Conclusion

From the obtained data, it is found that there is significant difference among college students in Quality of life with respect to course of study, family type and socio-economic status.

## References

1. Al Obaidi, L., & Mahlich, J. (2015). a potential gender bias in assessing quality of life—a standard gamble experiment among university students. *ClinicoEconomics and Outcomes Research: CEOR*, 7, 227.
2. Barayan, S. S., Al Dabal, B. K., Abdelwahab, M. M., Shafey, M. M., & Al Omar, R. S. (2018). Health-related quality of life among female university students in Dammam district: Is Internet use related?. *Journal of family & community medicine*, 25(1), 20.
3. Boozer, S. J. (2017). Effect of Physical Activity on Quality of Life for College Students: A Comparative Gender Study.
4. Brennan, S. L., Williams, L. J., Berk, M., & Pasco, J. A. (2013). Socioeconomic status and quality of life in population-based Australian men: Data from the Geelong Osteoporosis Study. *Australian and New Zealand journal of public health*, 37(3), 226-232.
5. Çiçek, G. (2018). Quality of life and physical activity among university students.
6. Cleofas, J. V. (2020). Student involvement, mental health and quality of life of college students in a selected university in Manila, Philippines. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 25(1), 435-447.
7. Dawkins, R. (1989). *The selfish gene*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

8. Deb, S., & Strodl, E. (2019). Quality of life and spirituality in Indian university students. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 14(2), 393-408.
9. Evans, Sherrill & Huxley, Peter. (2002). Studies of quality of life in the general population. *International Review of Psychiatry*. 14. 203-211. 10.1080/09540260220145028.
10. Ge, Y., Xin, S., Luan, D., Zou, Z., Liu, M., Bai, X., & Gao, Q. (2019). Association of physical activity, sedentary time, and sleep duration on the health-related quality of life of college students in Northeast China. *Health and quality of life outcomes*, 17(1), 124.
11. Keyvanara, M., Khasti, B. Y., Zadeh, M. R., & Modaber, F. (2015). Study of the relationship between quality of life and socioeconomic status in Isfahan at 2011. *Journal of education and health promotion*, 4.
12. Kumar, M. P., & Tiwari, S. N., (2016) Structural Influence of Family on Religious Orientation, Quality of Life and Happiness. *International Journal of Applied Psychology*, 6(4): 94-99 DOI: 10.5923/j.ijap.20160604.03
13. Mahmoud, M. A., & Fareed, M. (2018). Assessment of Quality of Life among Medical Students in Saudi Arabia: A Study Based on WHO-QOL-BREF Protocol. *International Journal of Medical Research & Health Sciences*, 7(10), 1-11.
14. Netuveli, G., Wiggins, R. D., Hildon, Z., Montgomery, S. M., & Blane, D. (2006). Quality of life at older ages: evidence from the English longitudinal study of aging (wave 1). *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 60(4), 357-363.
15. Nilsson, J., Rana, A. K., Luong, D. H., Winblad, B., & Kabir, Z. N. (2007). Health-related quality of life in old age: a comparison between rural areas in Bangladesh and

- Vietnam. *Asia-Pacific journal of public health*, 24(4), 610–619.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1010539510396699>
16. Nowak, P. F., Bożek, A., & Blukacz, M. (2019). Physical Activity, Sedentary Behavior, and Quality of Life among University Students. *BioMed Research International*, 2019.
  17. Nur, N., Kıbık, A., Kılıç, E., & Sümer, H. (2017). Health-related quality of life and associated factors among undergraduate university students. *Oman medical journal*, 32(4), 329.
  18. Ribeiro, C. G., Ferretti, F., & Sá, C. A. D. (2017). Quality of life based on level of physical activity among elderly residents of urban and rural areas. *Revista Brasileira de Geriatria e Gerontologia*, 20(3), 330-339.
  19. Ribeiro, I. J., Pereira, R., Freire, I. V., de Oliveira, B. G., Casotti, C. A., & Boery, E. N. (2018). Stress and quality of life among university students: A systematic literature review. *Health Professions Education*, 4(2), 70-77.
  20. Salati, M., Brunelli, A., Xiumè, F., Refai, M., & Sabbatini, A. (2008). Quality of life in the elderly after major lung resection for lung cancer. *Interactive cardiovascular and thoracic surgery*, 8(1), 79–83. <https://doi.org/10.1510/icvts.2008.184986>
  21. Seligman M, Mather P 2002. Authentic Happiness: Using the New Positive Psychology to Realize Your Potential for Lasting Fulfillment. New York: Free Press
  22. Shirazi, M., & Khan, M. A. (2013). Life satisfaction among professional and non-professional students in India. *International Journal of Applied Psychology*, 3(4), 109-113.

23. Suleiman, K., Alghabeesh, S., Jassem, H., Abu-Shahroor, L., & Ali, R. (2013). Quality of Life (QOL) among University Students in Jordan: A Descriptive Study. *Editors-in-Chief*, 647.
24. Sunden, S. (2019). Perceptions of Academic Success and Quality of Life Issues Among Undergraduate University Students.
25. Ventegodt, S., Merrick, J., & Andersen, N. J. (2003). Quality of life theory I. The IQOL theory: an integrative theory of the global quality of life concept. *TheScientificWorldJOURNAL*,
26. Wei, Yi, "Quality of Life and Health-Related Quality of Life in Children with Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy" (2014). Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository. 2557. <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/2557>
27. Yang, H. G., & Fan, C. J. (2017). The Perceived Effect of Quality of Life on College Learning Among Chinese Students. *Journalism*, 7(6), 334-343.