

# Quality of Life among Youth: A Gender Study



**Archana Shukla**

Assistant Professor,  
Deptt. of Psychology,  
Lucknow University,  
Lucknow.



**Vimla**

Research Scholar,  
Deptt. of Psychology,  
Lucknow University,  
Lucknow

## Abstract

The present study endeavors to cast a glance at Quality of life among youth. The sample consisted 25 males and 25 females from University of Lucknow undergraduates belonging to age range 20 to 22 years. For Quality of life measurement WHO 1998 Quality of Life – BREF Questionnaire (Hindi version) was used. Results revealed the females quality of life was better than males. Females were higher on social relationship and psychological domains of quality of life as compared to the males. On the other hand males were higher on physical health and environmental domains of quality of life.

**Keywords:** Quality], Life, Gender, Measurment, Relationship.

## Introduction

A Country development depends upon youths. They are the pillars of a nation because they have more potential to do anything in a new and energetic ways. Youth stage is called as vibrant and glorious segment of life. In the report of Global youth index (2016) 1.8 billion people between the ages of 15 and 29. India is the second largest youth populated country. Largest youth population is presented in education sector like universities and college campuses. University is one of the biggest platforms of youth's population.

Youth has been defined as early adulthood. It is a reproductive as well as problematic phase of life (Hurlock, 1981).

This stage is characterized by psychological problems stress, suicidal thoughts, mood disturbances, depression, frustration leading to aggression. These hurdles affect to their quality of life. Youth add upon to a country's progress. Hence need arises to understand the quality of life of youth. It becomes imperative here to cast a glance at the concept of quality of life.

## Quality of Life

Quality of life is a very broad term. In a general term quality of life is defined as position of person in the life. WHO (1995) defined "Quality of life as individual's perception of their position in life in the context of the culture and value systems in which they live and in their relation to their goals, expectations, standards and concerns. It is a broad ranging concept affected in a complex way by the person's physical health, psychological state, level of independence, social relationships, personal beliefs and their relationship to salient features of their environment".

Moving on various domains of quality of life have been presented below, as provided by WHO (1996) four Domains of quality of life physical, psychological, social relationships, environmental. Media and day to day life show that youth are facing many difficulties in their life. These problems affect to their quality of life in all walks of lives. Now days quality of life of youth is deteriorating. There are paucity of the researches in this area. During review of literature found few researches on quality of life among youth.

## Review of Literature

Kamaraj.D et al (2016) found that Indian youth were lowest on psychosocial domains. Good life satisfaction predicts to good quality of life as compare to who were not satisfied from their lives. Reseacher found that people with good positive thoughts, self-esteem had better quality of life than those who had negative thoughts and low self-esteem. Standage M et al (2007) found that positive prediction of general self-esteem, will positively predict HRQOL. Mitchell CM et al(1997) found that in which, problem behaviours (antisocial behaviour, alcohol use, drug use, and risky sexual behaviour) and positive behaviours (school success, cultural activities, competencies, and community mindedness) were compared as predictors of quality of life and showed that positive behaviours were good

predictors of quality of life than the problem behaviours. Gilman R et al (2006) found that high life satisfaction were associated with some mental health benefits and thus leading to better Quality Of Life among youth. Aro H et al (1989), Berndt TJ et al (2002) found that family and friends also play a important role in life for better quality of life. Luther et al (2002) found that socioeconomic status also play an important role in quality of life. Economically strong youth showed good quality of life as compared to economically lowest.

Having gone through the concept of quality of life some questions came to mind viz what is quality of life? Are there gender differences in quality of life? What type of quality of life is prominent in males and females? Does age has an impact on quality of life? These were some questions that led to the inception of this study.

### Methodology

#### Objectives of the Study

1. To find out gender difference of quality of life among youth across gender.
2. To find out the gender difference in domains of Quality of life among youth across gender.

#### Hypothesis

1. Females would be higher on quality of life than males.
2. Males would be high on physical health and environmental domains of quality of life.
3. Females would be high on social relationship and psychological domains of quality of life.

#### Variable

##### Independent Variable

Gender

##### Dependent Variable

Quality of life

#### Instruments

World health organization Quality of Life – BREF Questionnaire (Hindi version). The Hindi version of the original scale was developed by Saxena, Chandiramani, and Bhargava (1998). They found that the reliability of the shorter version of scale is satisfactory. This scale contains 26 items, which measure four domains of Quality of life, namely physical health, psychological states, social relationships, and environment. Out of 26 items of the scale, only 24 items are used to calculate the scores of participants. Items 1 and 2 are the fillers, and they are not scored.

#### Sample

The study was carried out with 50 participants (25 male and 25 female) drawn from the Lucknow University who were day scholars of the Art faculty aged 20 -22 years. Purposive sampling method was used for selection of the sample.

#### Process and Method of Data Collection

Participation in the study was totally volunteer and participants have right to withdraw from the data collection at any point of time. Participants were given with WHOQOL –BREF 1998 Questionnaire. From each participants consent and demographical details has been taken in the study. The researcher was individually present with the

participants and given the clarification of the all queries and doubts related to the questionnaires.

#### Statistical Analysis

Mean, Standard deviation, t–test were used as statistical analysis procedure to analyze the responses obtained on given scale.

#### Results and Interpretation

##### Quality Of Life

Having already gone through the concept of quality of life in simple words QoL is associated with a positive value as happiness, success, wealth, health and satisfactions Bowling (1997). Analyzing the data that came across has been depicted in Table no – 1 indicates that obtained mean values for total quality of life are 62.40 and 80.64 for males and females respondents respectively. The obtained t – value is found statistically significant at df 48 on 0.05 level of significance. Hence the hypothesis is accepted that females would have higher level of quality of life than their male counterparts. Some statements said by females respondents at the time of data collection “परिस्थिति कुछ भी हो मैं खुद को हर परिस्थिति में मजबूत पाती हूँ” This was supported by Biswas et al(2018) who found that females had better quality of life as compared to males. Moving ahead as mention earlier there were four dimension/dimension of quality of life results of which have been discussed below one by one.

**Table 1: Showing Mean and T-Value of Quality of Life among Male and Female**

Variables	Gender	N	Mean	S.D	t-value
QOL	Male	25	62.40	6.26	5.92
QOL	Female	25	80.64	14.05	5.92

##### Physical Health

First domain of quality of life was physical quality of life. In simple words physical quality life includes health activities of daily living dependence on medicinal substances and fatigue, mobility, pain, and discomfort, sleep rest and work capacity. Analyzing the data that came across has been depicted in Table no – 2 indicates that obtained mean values for total physical health related quality of life are 22.68 and 17.76 for males and females respondents respectively. The obtained t – value is found statistically significant at df 48 on 0.05 level of significance. Hence the hypothesis is accepted that males would have higher level of physical health related quality of life than their female counterparts. The reported findings are empirically supported by Paro et al (2014) and many studies found that male are higher on physical level of quality of life. A probable reason of this finding is that India has been a male dominated society in which physical health of a son, husband, father or brother is taken good care of. Some statement given by male respondents at the time of data collection “मैं खुद को प्रायः स्वस्थ महसूस करता हूँ.” This is visible in perceptions of good physical health among males as compare to females.

**Table 2: Showing mean and t-value on the Domains of Quality of Life among males and females**

Sr. no	Gender	Domains	Mean	SD	t-value
1.	Male	Physical health	22.68	3.60	5.60
	Female	Physical health	17.76	2.50	
2.	Male	Psychological states	14.80	3.80	4.60
	Female	Psychological states	19.80	3.85	
3.	Male	Social relationship	7.80	0.53	3.77
	Female	Social relationship	10.64	0.53	
4.	Male	Environmental	27.52	7.86	3.22
	Female	Environmental	22.04	3.19	

**Psychological Quality of life**

Now moving on next domain of quality of life was psychological quality of life in simple words psychological quality of life include bodily image and appearance, negative feelings, self esteem ,spirituality, spirituality, religion and beliefs, thinking, learning memory and concentration WHOQOL(1998). Analyzing the data that came across has been depicted in Table no – 2 indicate that obtained mean values for total psychological quality of life are 14.80 and 19.80 for males and females respondents respectively. The obtained t – value is found statistically significant at df 48 on 0.05 level of significance. Hence the hypothesis is accepted that females would have higher level of psychological quality of life than their male counterparts. The reported findings are empirically supported by Paro et al (2014) and many other studies shown that females are higher on psychological level of quality of life because they have more potential to handle day to day life t situations. They being not only emotionally strong but also socially they can handle daily life hassles. Some statements were given by females respondents 'मेरा मन खुशमिजाज रहता है क्योंकि मैं हर परिस्थिति में स्वयं को मजबूत बना पाती हूँ'। The statement depicts strong psychological health and resilience among females.

**Social Relationship**

Next domain was of social relationship which includes what is the level of a person social activity, social support and sexual activity WHOQOL (1998). Analyzing the data that came across has been depicted in Table no – 2 indicate that obtained mean values for total social relationships are 7.80 and 10.64 for males and females respondents respectively. The obtained t – value is found statistically significant at df 48 on 0.05 level of significance. Hence the hypothesis is accepted that females would have higher level of social quality of life than their male counterparts. The reported findings are empirically supported by Paro et al (2014) where females having found good in social relationship. Some statements given by female respondents at the time of data collection मेरी पड़ोसियों और लोगों से हमेशा से बनती है और मैं अपने आप में खुश रहती हूँ ।

**Environmental quality of life**

In simple words environmental quality of life include that financial resources, freedom physical safety, and security, health and social care: accessibility and quality home environment, opportunities for acquiring new information skills and participation in opportunities for recreation WHOQOL(1998). Analyzing the data that came across has been depicted in Table no – 2 indicate that obtained mean values for total environmental quality of life are 27.52 and 22.04 for males and females

respondents respectively. The obtained t – value is found statistically significant at df 48 on 0.05 level of significance. Hence the hypothesis is accepted that males would have higher level of environmental quality of life than their female counterparts. The reported findings are empirically supported by Muhamed et al (2013), Paro et al (2014). Here one thing is need to understand that India is patriarchic country. In this country more and more freedom is given to boys than girls. Some statements said by male respondents at the time of data collection मैं तो कॉलेज से घर तक के सभी रिश्तों को बाखूबी निभा लेता हूँ और मुझे अपने आस- पास का वातावरण अपने अनुकूल लगता है "।

**Conclusion and Implications**

To sum up of the overall study researcher found that females quality of life better than males. Results also revealed that male were higher on physical and psychological domains of quality of life. Other side females are higher on social and psychological domains of quality of life because they always interact with anyone.

Many studies on Quality of life were found on clinical aspects of patients like cancer patients, HIV AIDS patients. Paucity of the researches are on the youth quality of life of youth. Need is to understand what are the factors that effects their quality of life and how it can be improved. Immediate demand is to implement the physical curriculum activities in the universities and colleges campus level that would focus more on enhancing ones QOL. Counselors and psychologists are needed in higher institutions viz universities and colleges for crisis management among youth. At last these activities can be helpful to improve the quality of life of youths in higher education institute

**References**

1. Aro H, Hanninen V, Paronen O. *Social support, life events and psychosomatic symptoms among 14-16 year-old adolescents. Social Science and Medicine.* 1989;29(9):1051-6. 27.
2. Berndt TJ. *Friendship quality and social development. Current Directions in Psychological Science.* 2002;11(1):7-10.
3. Biswas A, Bhattacharjee.S, and Mukherjee (2018). *A Quality of Life among adolescents studying in Bengali and English medium schools of Siliguri subdivision, Darjeeling district, West Bengal, Journal of Comprehensive Health, Volume 6, Issue 1, January 2018.*
4. Bowling A: *The concept of quality of life in relation to health. Medicina nei secoli* 1995, 7(3):633.

5. Christina MM and Janette B. *The Structure of Problem and positive behavior among American Indian Adolescents: Gender and Community differences.* *American J Comm Psychol.* 1997;25(3):257-88.
6. Hurlock, Elizabeth.B (1981) *Developmental Psychology A life span approach fifth edition 21st reprint (1981) edition*
7. Kamraj.D, sivaprakasam. Ravichandran E,sivprakasam. E, and Pasupathy.U (2016) *Perception of health related quality of life in healthy Indian adolescents Int J Contemp Pediatr.* 2016 Aug;3(3):692-699.
8. Luthar SS, Becker BE. *Privileged but pressured? A study of affluent youth.* *Child development.* 2002 Jan 1;73(5):1593-610.
9. *Report on Global youth index (2016).*
10. Osman,T.Muhamed,et all.(2013) *Quality of Life among University Students in a Single Malaysian Institute Vol 75, No. 10;Oct 2013.*
11. Paro HBBMS, Silveria PSP, Perotta, B,et al,*Empathy among medical students: is there a relation with quality of life and burnout ? PLOS one* 2014,9:e941339
12. Rich G, Huebner ES. *Characteristics of Adolescents Who Report Very High Life Satisfaction.* *J youth and Adolescence.* 2006;35(3):311-9.
13. Standage M, Gillison F. *Students motivational responses toward school physical education and their relationship to general self-esteem and healthrelated quality of life.* *Psychol Sport and Exercise.* 2007;8(5):704-21.
14. Saxena,S., Chandiramani,K., & Bhargava, R.(1998). *WHOQOL-Hindi: A questionnaire for assessing quality of life in health care settings in India.* *The Natioanl Medical Jouranl of India,* 11,155-157.
15. WHOQOL Group (1995). *The world health organization quality of life assessment (WHOQOL).**Social Science and Medicine,* 41, 1403-1409.
16. WHO (1998) *The WHO QOL assessment (WHOQOL): Development and general psychometric properties.* *Soc Sci Med,*1998, Jun,46(12):1569-85
17. WHO (1996) *.WHOQOL-BREF, Introduction, Administration, Scoring and Genetic Version of the Assessment, Field Trial Version, Dec.1996, Project on mental Health, WHO, Geneva,27, Switzerland.*