



## Study quality of life and its dimensions among Ardabil university students and related factors

Rahim Masoumi, Firouz Amani, Anahita Zakeri\*, Ghasem Fattahzadeh-ardalani, Perham Mohammadi, Behnam Molaei and Vahid Abbasi

Ardabil University of medical science, Ardabil, Iran  
a.zakeri@arums.ac.ir

Available online at: [www.isca.in](http://www.isca.in), [www.isca.me](http://www.isca.me)

Received 16<sup>th</sup> January 2017, revised 8<sup>th</sup> February 2017, accepted 12<sup>th</sup> February 2017

### Abstract

The aim of this study was to assess the quality of life (QOL) and its related factors among Ardabil university students. This is a cross-sectional study that has been conducted in May 2015 on a sample of 153 university students which selected randomly from all universities in Ardabil city. The questionnaire SF-36 was used to assess the QOL and its dimensions among students which its reliability and validity was checked before. The relationships between QOL and the related factors including gender, academic year level, marital status, worry about the future, age and their knowledge about study fields were examined using statistical tests in SPSS.16. The  $p < 0.05$  was set as significant level. 8.4% of students were single, 88.9% had an interest in their field of study and 40% had concern about their job prospects. Female students, marriage students and students with age up 25 had higher QOL than other students. The relation between gender, age, marriage, concern about job prospects and interest to the field of study with QOL was statistically significant. The total score of QOL in students was in moderate level and we should plan interventional studies in future for raising their QOL.

**Keywords:** Quality of life, students, Ardabil.

### Introduction

Millions people study in Iranian universities annually and experience student life. The study at a young age is associated with the development of their personality. Modern life follows its changes form changes in knowledge, livelihoods and overall well-being of the people. Measure the concept of QOL especially among university students had many backgrounds. According the WHO definition, QOL is an understanding that one person obtain from own life position based on cultural context and value system that live in it. In addition, QOL is related to a common concept of Physical, emotional well-being, level of independence, social relationships and their relationships with leading environmental funds. QOL is a range of human needs that achieved by personal understanding and feelings of well-being. Quality of Life and specialized "health in relation to quality of life" included physical, mental and social health and this health influenced by opinions, experiences, Expectations and understanding.

Programming for health promotion of students, related to have some information about dimensions of QOL in students. Known their feeling, and factors Reinforce these feeling could help us for better programming in future for raising their QOL. The quality of life in students always due to exposure to multiple stressors such as academic problems, lack of job prospects, living in dormitories and lack of recreational facilities, exams, homework and doing academic projects is affected. Study in university due to multiple stressors, could exposure with decreasing QOL and associated with depression<sup>1-4</sup>.

A society that thinks about its health and future generations should investigate the stress risk factors and eliminate them and consequently decrease their depression and raising their quality of life. Researchers believed that study QOL and effort for raising it have main role in individual and social health. Students are a sample of active and talented people and society and are an essential part of future specialists in various fields of science, technology and art that make up the country.

So, their QOL and health will have effective role on their learning and increasing their knowledge and education. Many studies about QOL in students showed that the QOL in students in more time was lower than other people. The aim of this study was to assess the quality of life (QOL) of Ardabil university students during their education and explore the influencing factors of the QOL of students<sup>5-9</sup>.

### Materials and methods

In this descriptive cross sectional study, 153 of students selected randomly from all Ardabil city universities. The data collected by a SF-36 questionnaire included 36 items which each item has score between 0 to 100. Collected data analyzed by statistical methods in SPSS.16.

### Results and discussion

8.4% of students were single, 88.9% had an interest in their field of study and 40% had concern about their job prospects and 83.7% have age lower than 25 (Table-1).

Female students, marriage students and students with age up 25 had higher QOL than other students. The relation between gender, age, marriage, concern about job prospects and interest to the field of study with QOL was statistically significant (Table-2).

The mean score of QOL in scale social health was more than other dimensions and the mean of total QOL was 19.4±12 (Table-3).

The total level of QOL in students was in moderate level. (60.8%)

In general, 45.8% of students said their health status as good or excellent. Currently, the rate of health in 14.4% was better, 43.8% without change and in 41.8% was bad in compare with past year. In terms of physical function and limitations in daily activities in average about 92.6% of students have limitation in their activities. 71% of students have problem in work and daily activities due to problem in physical health.

**Table-1:** Demographic characterized of students

Variables	Groups	n	%
Age groups	<25	128	83.7
	25 and up	25	16.3
Marital status	Married	18	14.6
	Single	135	85.4
sex	Male	86	56.2
	Female	67	43.8
Interest in the field of study	yes	136	88.9
	no	17	11.1
The concern about job prospects	A little	61	40
	Moderate	68	44.4
	More	24	15.6
Entry year to university	Before 2014	74	48.4
	2014 and after	79	51.6

**Table-2:** Relation between QOL in students and demographic information

Variables	Groups	n	QOL score	p-value
Age groups	<25	128	68.5	0.003
	25 and up	25	75.6	
Marital status	Married	18	71.6	0.001
	Single	135	69.5	
sex	Male	86	61.4	0.002
	Female	67	70.6	
Interest in the field of study	yes	136	74.3	0.002
	no	17	64.2	
The concern about job prospects	A little	61	78.4	0.001
	Moderate	68	74.3	
	More	24	70.2	
Entry year to university	Before 2014	74	75.6	0.06
	2014 and after	79	74.1	

**Table-3:** QOL score between university students

QOL dimensions	min	max	Mean ± SD
Physical functioning	0	55	19.4±12
Role limitations due to physical health	0	75	29.1±23
Role limitations due to emotional problems	0	100	31.2±27.8
Energy/fatigue	10	80	50±14.4
Emotional well being	32	80	50.9±8.5
Social functioning	25	87.5	51.4±13.2
Pain	0	87.5	40.5±19
General health	25	75	47.5±9.7
Sub scale physical health	14.4	52.5	34.1±8
Sub scale mental health	25.6	73	45.8±9.3
Total QOL	23.9	60.9	40±6.9

Of all students, 68.8% due to mental problem such as anxiety and or depression have less time and accuracy. In totally we can say that in average these limitations were in 70% of students in this study. In past 4 weeks the mental and physical health condition have effective in disrupt relations between friends, family, neighbors and people among 96% of students. 94.1% of students in past 4 weeks have body pain that in 30.7% this rate was severe and more. The pain in 90.8% of students deal to prevent doing work by students that in 49% this pain is in severe level. In the energy/fatigue dimension, about 93% of students have necessary energy and fatigue and 7% haven't any energy. In emotional well being dimension, about 94.5% of students have mental health. In last 4 weeks the mental and physical condition could have effect on social activities in 69.9% of students. Of all students, 3.9% believed that compare to other people suffer to diseases is comfortable. About 98.7% of students have doubt to their health and 3.9% of students were expecting their health status will be worse in future. In term of score of QOL we can resulted that QOL in all students were in moderate level (60.8%) and the mean of QOL in all students was 40 which was lower than the normal score 100.

**Discussion:** Results showed that QOL in all students were in moderate and lower level. Lack of foresight and career and specific training programs deal to lower QOL among students. Fear of career is in 40% of university students and could affect their QOL. Many studies showed that that due to high prevalence of mental disorder and worry among students, in some academic fields most of students not satisfied from their QOL<sup>10-11</sup>.

Also Pasdar and et al in a study showed that QOL score in students with depression was lower than other students and in students living in dorms the score of QOL in the dimension environmental health was lower than other students. There wasn't any significant relation between economical and social status and the score of QOL in students. In this study 56.2% of university students were female and rest of them were male and score of QOL in female students was higher than male students<sup>4</sup>.

Soltani and et al in a study showed that most of students have QOL in moderate level and in all OOL dimensions there were significant differences between two sexes. Makvandi and et al in a study showed that the total score of QOL in male and female university students was similar and upper score of QOL as to physical health and lower score as to environmental health. Roze and et al in a study at 2003 showed that most of students with higher economic level status have upper QOL compare to other students which in line with our study results<sup>12-14</sup>.

Living in a dormitory accompany with less satisfied from the location and less access to health services. Salehi and et al in their study point that live in dormitory especially with more roommate accompany with more crowded and noise and deal to anxiety and decreasing QOL among university students<sup>15</sup>.

## Conclusion

Results showed that the total score of QOL in students was in moderate level and there were many effective factors on students QOL such as marital status, live in dorm, worry about job prospects, gender and age. We should plan interventional studies in future for raising their QOL.

## References

1. Nejati V., Ahmadi K., Sharifian M. and Shoaee F. (2012). Comparing quality of life dimension in different age decades: prediction for aging. *J. Fasa Univ. Med. Sci.*, 1(4), 227-232.
2. Harirchi M., Rasouli A., Montazeri A. and Eghlima M. (2004). Compare the level of QOL: Patients treated with dialysis and renal transplant recipients. *Payesh.*, 3(2), 117-121.
3. Testa M.A. and Simonson D.C. (1996). Assessment of Quality of-Life Outcomes. *N. Engl. J. Med.*, 334, 835-840.
4. Pasdar Y., Eizadi N., Safari R. (2013). Effective Factors on The Quality of Life in Female Students of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences. *S.J.I.M.U.*, 21(6), 33-41.
5. Cynthia R.K. (1998). Overview of quality of life and controversial issues. Sudbury: Jones and Bartlett Press, PP 23-30. ISBN-13: 978-0763749439.
6. Rezaei-Adaryani M., Azadi A. and Ahmadi F.A. (2007). Comparison of depression, anxiety, stress and quality of life in dormitories students of Tarbiat Modares university. *Iranian. Journal. of. Nursing. Research.*, 2(4-5), 31-8. (Full text in Persian)
7. Esfandyari G.H. (1999). Survey the stressor factors in Kordestan medical sciences university students and it relation with general health. *Journal. Of. Teb and Tazkiyeh.*, 57-63. (Full text in Persian)
8. Vaez M., Kristenson M. and Laflamme L. (2004). Perceived quality of life and self-rated health among firstyear university students: A comparison with their working peers. *Social. Indicators. Research.*, 68, 221-234.
9. Stewart-Brown S.J.J., Evans J. and Patterson S. (2000). The health of students in institutes of higher education: An important and neglected public health problem?. *Journal. Of. Public. Health. Medicine.*, 22, 492-9.
10. Philip H. (2003). The mental health of students in higher education. *Council. Report.*, 12, 465-9.
11. Yildirim Y., Kilic S.P. and Akyol A.D. (2013). Relationship between life satisfaction and quality of life in Turkish nursing school students. *Nurs. Health. Sci.*, 10, 75-82.
12. Soltani R., Kafae S., Salehi I., Karashki H. and Rezaee S. (2010). Survey the Quality of Life in Guilan University

- Students. *J.of.Guilan.University.Medical.science.*, 19(75), 25-35.
- 13.** Makvandi S. and Zamani M. (2011). The survey of quality of life and its dimensions in Islamic Azad University Ahvaz branch students in 2010. Jentashapir. *Journal. Of. Health. research*, 2(4), 191-200.
- 14.** Rose B. and Monae M. (2003). Health related quality of life in urban elementary school children. *Pediatrics*, 111(6), 1372-81.
- 15.** Salehi T. and Dehghan-nayyeri N. (2011). Relationship between anxiety and quality of life in students living in dormitories of Tehran University of Medical Sciences. *Payesh*,10(2), 175-81. (full text in Persian)